THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

The University Faculty Senate

AGENDA

Tuesday, January 28, 2020
112 Kern Graduate Building

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

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

A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Minutes of the December 3, 2019 Meeting in The Senate Record 53:3

B. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report of January 14, 2020 Appendix A

C. REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL - Meeting of January 14, 2020

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

E. COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

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

SPECIAL INFORMATIONAL REPORT

Senate Committee on University Planning

“Census 2020: Penn State You Count!” Report on the Work of the Complete Count Committee Appendix B
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]
G. FORENSIC BUSINESS

Senate Committee on Education

Encouraging Use of Affordable Course Materials
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Appendix C

H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules

Revisions to Senate Constitution, Article II – Membership, Section 5 (Including World Campus Student Government Association)
(Introduced at December 3, 2019 meeting)

Revisions to Senate Bylaws; Article I, Section 1: Officers
(Introduced at December 3, 2019 meeting)

Appendix R

I. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules

Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article III Section 3
Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits

Appendix D

Senate Committee on Education

Changes to Senate Policy 56-30 Withdrawal

Appendix E

Senate Committee on Student Life

Proposed Senate Policy 89-00 “Student Privacy Regarding Letters of Recommendation”

Appendix F

J. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

None

K. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling & Student Aid

Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded to Undergraduates*

Appendix G

Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs

General Education Assessment 2015-2019
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Appendix H
Interim Report Senate Feedback on One Penn State 2025’s Goal of Curricular Coherence [15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion] Appendix I

Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities


Senate Committee on Global Programs

Family Travel Approval Rates [5 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion] Appendix K

Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology

Google Suite for Education Appendix L

Penn State GO Mobile Application Appendix M

[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion for both reports]

Senate Committee on Outreach

Student Engagement Network [10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion] Appendix N

Senate Committee on University Planning


Biennial Development and Alumni Relations Report [15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion] Appendix P

* No presentation of reports marked with an asterisk.

L. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

None

M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, March 17, 2020, 1:00 p.m., Room 112 Kern Graduate Building.

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

DATE: January 15, 2020

TO: Nicholas Rowland, Chair, University Faculty Senate

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

The Senate Curriculum Report dated January 14, 2020 has been circulated throughout the University. Objections to any of the items in the report must be submitted to Kadi Corter, Curriculum Coordinator, 101 Kern Graduate Building, 814-863-0996, kkw2@psu.edu, on or before February 13, 2020.

The Senate Curriculum Report is available on the web and may be found at: http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/senate-curriculum-reports/
SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING

“Census 2020: Penn State You Count!” Report on the Work of the Complete Count Committee

(Informational)

Charima Young, Director of Local Government and Community Relations, and Mike Stefan, Director of State Relations, will present “Census 2020: Penn State You Count!,” a report on the work of the Complete Count Committee.
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Census 2020
Penn State You Count!

Michael Stefan, Director of State Relations
Charima Young, Director of Local Government and Community Relations

Census 101

• Everyone Counts
• It’s in the constitution
• It’s about fair representation and redistricting
• Taking part is your civic duty
• It’s about $675 billion
• Census data are being used all around you
• College campuses generally have low response rates
• Privacy Protection
Importance of Census 2020

**Pennsylvania**
- $26.8 Billion annually to fund vital programs
- Fair Political Representation
- Housing and Infrastructure Development
- Federal Highway Program
- Programs targeting rural communities

**Centre County**
- Public Safety
- Emergency Preparedness
- Schools
- Hospitals
- Roads
- Public Works

---

Importance of Census 2020 Cont.

Pennsylvania Federal Assistance Programs that Distribute Funds
Total Program Obligations: **$26,793,367,770**
Per Capita: **$2,093**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Assistance Program (Medicaid)</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)</td>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Planning and Construction</td>
<td>DOF</td>
<td>States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care (Title IV-E)</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care and Development Fund Entitlement</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The George Washington Institute of Public Policy
Per Capita calculation: Total amount per population
Obligation/Population per state/per capita dollars
Census 2010 Response Rate

In Pennsylvania, the 2010 average response rate in Pennsylvania was 81.8 percent.

University Park
• Average predicted low response score of 40.05%

State College Borough
• Average predicted low response score of 30.6%

Census 2020 Complete Count Committees

State College Borough
• Pennsylvania State University (PSU)
• State College Area School District (SCASD)
• U.S. Census
• Centre County Planning Office
• Planned Parenthood-PA Advocates
• Global Connections
• Borough of State College
• Halfmoon Township
• Harris Township
• Interfaith
• Ferguson Township
• Patton Township

Centre County
• Pennsylvania State University (PSU)
• State College Borough
• Bellefonte Borough

Pennsylvania State
• Created by Exec. Order 2018-05
• 45 Members appointed by the Governor, including business, academia, community and nonprofit organizations, religious communities, and elected and appointed officials
• Penn State is a member
Penn State You Count!
Complete Count Committee

Departments

- Office of Government and Community Relations
- Student Affairs (Off-Campus Student Housing, Center for Character, Conscious, and Public Purpose, Student Services, etc.)
- Student Organizations (UPUA, IFC, Multi-cultural Caucuses, etc.)
- Housing and Ancillary Services
- Strategic Communications
- Office of General Counsel
- State College Borough
- Centre County
- Census Bureau
- Global Programs
- PSU Data Center
- Commonwealth Campuses

Penn State You Count!

Challenges and Barriers

- Timing
- Apathy
- Government Mistrust/Privacy Concerns
- Unaware
- Too Busy/Doesn’t Impact Me
- Parents Will Complete the Form
- Inconvenient
- Misinformation
Census 2020 Timeline

- March 12 Houses and apartments receive “Invitation to Participate”
- March 26 Non-responders receive a paper questionnaire
- April 1 “Census Day”
- April 15 Enumerators visit non-responding households

Penn State University Census 2020 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Staff Advisory Council Presentation</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Academic Leadership Council Presentation</td>
<td>President’s Council Faculty Senate Presentation Student org. Kick-off Marketing Kick-off</td>
<td>Marketing Campaign Activities to create Census awareness &amp; participation</td>
<td>Call to action CENSUS Day--April 1st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Penn State
How You Can Get In Involved?

• Share information about the Census with students, staff, and faculty

• Mention Census 2020 at campus sponsored events

• Incorporate Census 2020 information in e-newsletters and other publications

Thank You!

Mike Stefan
mrs383@psu.edu
814-865-6563

Charima Young
ciy2@psu.edu
814-865-6563

PennState
In September 2019, the student senators from the University Park Undergraduate Association (UPUA) brought to the attention of the Committee on Education concerns raised by students regarding the use of third-party materials in courses at Penn State. Third party course materials include supplemental materials provided by a publisher, including electronic media enhancements to a required textbook, presentation slides, text banks, workbooks, or homework applications. They also would include add on programs or applications needed for course work. These materials often present a significant added cost to the student in addition to the required textbook. Supplemental digital material (e.g., access codes for web sites or programs) also limit the ability of students to purchase used textbooks or sell back textbooks, thereby raising the price of the required textbooks for that course. Results from a 2018 survey conducted by UPUA survey indicate that the use of paid courseware services in the classroom may not always warrant the burden the associated costs place on students, with 85 percent of students reporting that they did not feel the price of the service was justified by its use in the course, and 57 percent of students reporting having been in at least one course where the professor failed to utilize a service they were required to pay for (“Third Party Homework Access Survey”, 2019).

One potential solution for reducing the cost burden of course materials is to encourage the use of Open Educational Resources (OERs) in place of traditional textbooks or 3rd party add on materials. Another partial solution would be to improve upon efforts to make course costs transparent to the students by streamlining and improving the timeline for course material selection.

The Committee on Education is seeking information to begin to address these issues. We are looking for input from faculty on ways that the use of OERs and other affordable courseware options can be encouraged and what the parameters of reasonable use of add on course materials might be. We are seeking input on the following questions:

1. How can we ensure that all required and recommended course materials and their necessity are effectively communicated to students in a timely fashion?
2. What are the perceived barriers to course material selection that faculty experience? What can we do to help mitigate any barriers in order to encourage faculty to adopt open and affordable course materials?
3. In the event that the use of costly required materials are not communicated to students before the start of the course, what recourse should students have? Should this be the same in the event that costly required course materials are not utilized as part of the course?
4. To what extent is adoption of third-party course materials acceptable? At what point does an instructor using a publisher produced “pre-packaged” course become unacceptable?
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Senate Standing Rules; Article III, Section 3: Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate (and development of procedures when applicable)

Introduction and Rationale
The Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits (JCIB) has been engaged in discussion regarding the committee’s membership and duties. We believe we provide an important link between the University Faculty Senate, Human Resources, the University Administration, and faculty and staff. Through our discussions, we have concluded that the membership of the committee should be amended to provide input from a broader range of employees, both faculty and staff. Consequently, we propose changes to the membership of the committee, such that at least three of the faculty members must not also serve on the Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits and that the non-faculty committee membership consist of fixed numbers of staff and administrative members.

Recommendation
Recommendation 1: That Article III, Section 3 of the Senate Standing Rules be and is hereby amended as follows:

Please note that the following contains strikethroughs for deletions and bold text for additions. Additionally, deleted text is delimited with [Delete] [End Delete], while added text is delimited with [Add] [End Add].

[Delete] (a.) Membership
Six faculty members appointed by the Chair of the Senate. Four of the faculty members serve rotating three-year (renewable) terms; the fifth faculty member, selected from the Faculty Benefits Committee, serves a one-year (renewable) term; the sixth faculty member is a retired faculty senator, and serves a one-year (renewable) term. At least one faculty member must be from University Park and one faculty member from a location other than University Park.

(2) Seven members appointed by the President. One member shall be selected from the Staff Advisory Committee; one member shall be selected from the Teamsters Local Union No. 8; and one member shall be selected from the Office and Professional Employees International Union (OPEIU) Healthcare Pennsylvania.

(3) The Chair of the Committee is appointed jointly by the President and the Chair of the Senate from among the faculty members on the Committee. [End Delete]
[Add] (a.) Membership

(1) Six faculty members appointed on a rotational schedule by the Chair of the Senate in consultation with the Committee on Committees and Rules:

- Four of the faculty members shall be appointed from the Senate membership; at least three of the four faculty members shall be drawn from outside the University Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits; each shall serve a three-year (renewable) term
- The fifth faculty member shall be selected from the Committee on Faculty Benefits (Chair, Vice-Chair, or other designee from the Committee on Faculty Benefits), serving a one-year (renewable) term
- The sixth faculty member shall be a retired faculty senator, serving a one-year (renewable) term
- At least one faculty member must be from University Park and one faculty member must be from a location other than University Park

(2) Seven members appointed by the President, each serving one-year (renewable) terms:

- Four members shall be selected from Administration
- One member shall be selected from the Staff Advisory Council
- One member shall be selected from the Teamsters Local Union No. 8
- One member shall be selected from the Office and Professional Employees International Union (OPEIU) Healthcare Pennsylvania.

(3) The Chair of the Committee is appointed jointly by the President and the Chair of the Senate from among the faculty members on the Committee. [End Add]
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Changes to Senate Policy 56-30: Withdrawal

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate and Development of Procedures When Applicable

Rationale
The number of veterans and U.S. Armed Forces servicemembers attending the University has increased over the last decade and we expect to see their number continue to increase. There are approximately 5,600 students across Penn State’s campuses who are either veterans or servicemembers. The active-duty servicemember and activated reserve-component servicemember portion of this student community are committed to serve our nation with a world-wide deployment responsibility and are subject to change of assignments/duty location, all which can occur with little or no notice. The dynamic nature of their national service can cause interruptions in their academic progress which in turn jeopardizes their ability to pursue a degree. A short- or no-notice change of duty station or deployment order often results in a student not being able to complete a full schedule of courses for a given semester. This situation is out of the student’s control. With Penn State’s flexible learning options, some students find themselves in a position where they have the capacity to complete a portion of their schedule of courses for a given semester when faced with this situation but are not able to do so without negative financial consequences due to Penn State policy. Currently, their only options are to late drop courses, which carries a negative financial consequence, or to withdraw from all courses under the university’s current Military Withdrawal Policy to avoid negative financial consequences.

The current Military Withdrawal Policy recognizes that these students encounter unique situations as a result of their service and ensures the university accommodates those students without negative financial consequence for a situation that is out of their control. Revising current policy to allow students to continue with a portion of their schedule of courses without negative financial consequence will continue the military withdrawal policy’s spirit of intent while greatly improving our service to this student community and helping them continue their academic progress.

Recommendation
We recommend that Penn State’s Military Withdrawal Policy be revised to allow students to partially cancel their schedule of courses for a given semester. This Partially Cancelled Schedule Policy will allow students who are faced with short- or no-notice military relocation or deployment orders to continue their academic progress, if they are able, and to avoid the negative financial consequences of not completing a course after the drop/add period.
Revised Policy

56-30 Withdrawal
A student who is unable to complete a schedule of courses for a given semester may withdraw from enrollment in all courses at the University. The student may withdraw any time up to and including the last day of classes, before the final examination period begins. If the student is a degree candidate, then at the time of withdrawal from enrollment in courses the student also withdraws from the university as a degree candidate. Thus, to enroll in courses at a later time as a degree candidate, a request for re-enrollment as a degree candidate must be made in accordance with the policies and procedures for re-enrollment given in Section 58-00. If the person is a nondegree student who wishes to enroll in courses at a later time, the policies and procedures given in Section 14-00 must be followed. Students withdrawing from enrollment in courses at the University before the end of a semester receive refunds according to a schedule detailed under the section on tuition and fees in the current Baccalaureate Degree Programs Bulletin or a current copy of the Schedule of Courses.

[Add]Active-duty service members or activated reserve-component members of the U.S. Armed Forces (not a contractor or civilian working for the military) and/or spouses/domestic partners of active-duty members or activated reserve-component members who are ordered by their military service to relocate or deploy and, as a result, are unable to complete a schedule of courses for a given semester may request a Partially Cancelled Schedule. Full military withdrawals will be considered in cases where the student is unable to complete their full schedule of courses. This type of withdrawal will be in accordance with the policies and procedures for withdrawal given in Section 56-40. A Partially Cancelled Schedule will be considered in cases where the student is only able to continue with a portion of their scheduled courses as a result of their military relocation or deployment. In the case of a partially cancelled schedule, students will be allowed to drop a portion of their scheduled courses after consulting their college/academic unit, and they will maintain their status in the university as a degree candidate.[End Add]

At University Park, if the director of University Health Services determines that a student is unable to complete a schedule of classes because of illness, the director may give the student permission to withdraw from the University. The director of University Health Services should inform either the dean of the college of enrollment or the director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies if the student is enrolled in that division of this action. If the student is not able to initiate a withdrawal, the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled or the director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies if the student is enrolled in that division may do so upon proper notification. At other locations, if the executive officer or a designated academic officer determines that a student is unable to complete a schedule of classes because of illness, the executive officer or designated academic officer may give the student permission to withdraw from the University and may also initiate the withdrawal.

If a student is suspended or dismissed from the University for nonacademic reasons, the director of Judicial Affairs should inform either the dean of the college of enrollment, or the director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies if the student is enrolled in that division, that the student has been separated from the University. If the student fails to initiate a withdrawal, the dean or the director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies may do so upon proper notification.
If a degree candidate does not register for consecutive semesters (with the exception of summer session) and does not file for a leave of absence, the person’s status as a degree candidate is automatically terminated. The person must request re-enrollment and be accepted as a degree candidate following the policies and procedures of Section 58-00 before resuming as a degree candidate.

A person who was a degree candidate but who has withdrawn from the University may wish to enroll in courses at another university or college while absent from the University. To return to the University as a degree candidate, the person must request re-enrollment and be accepted as a degree candidate, following the policies and procedures given in Section 58-00. A degree candidate who wishes to take courses at another institution only during the summer session need not apply for re-enrollment as a degree candidate for the following fall semester. The procedures for obtaining credit for courses taken at other universities and colleges can be found in Sections 42-80 and 42-90.

Note: Before attending the other institution the candidate should secure from the dean of the college in which the candidate is enrolled, or the director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies if the candidate is enrolled in that division, verification that the courses to be taken are appropriate for the candidate’s program. The candidate should prepare a written request to the director of admissions in order to determine what credits are transferable. In addition, the candidate may be requested to provide a catalog from the other institution.
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COMMITTEE ON STUDENT LIFE

Proposed Senate Policy 89-00 “Student Privacy Regarding Letters of Recommendation”

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate (and development of procedures when applicable)

Rationale
As an educational institution, it is essential to protect our students’ right to privacy to a high standard. Enacted in 1974, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) is a federal law that protects the privacy of student education records. Educational institutions receiving federal funds, such as Penn State, are expected to comply with the law. According to Penn State’s “FERPA Frequently Asked Questions,” hosted by the University Registrar, “FERPA gives students … basic rights with respect to their education record,” of special note in this instance, “the right to control disclosure of their education record.” Educational records “take many forms,” and include, for example, “grades,” information about “student course schedule,” and “disciplinary records” related to but not limited to academic integrity violations. Letters of recommendation for undergraduate and graduate students generally include information like this or information similar to the description of educational records in FERPA.

According to FERPA, written consent is required to share educational records of a student. Thus, while it would seem that consent to share information in a student’s educational record is implied in the act of asking for a letter of recommendation in the first place, it is not.

There are conditions under which student education records may be disclosed without the student’s consent. Thus, FERPA does permit some exceptions to the written consent rule, for example, faculty can disclose student educational records without student consent to “officials at an institution in which the student seeks or intends to enroll or is currently enrolled.” It would seem that sharing information in a student’s educational record in a letter of recommendation to “officials at an institution in which the student seeks or intends to enroll or is currently enrolled” is a condition under which student education records may be disclosed without the student’s consent. However, this interpretation has been contested at a number of educational institutions, including colleges and universities, which require or recommend obtaining written consent for the disclosure of information from a student’s educational record in a letter of recommendation. While the range of these schools defies simple summary, some of these institutions are considered Penn State’s closest peers, for example, Michigan State University, Rutgers University, University of Minnesota, and University of Iowa, among others.

1 Last revised July 2017, and available at: https://www.registrar.psu.edu/confidentiality/FERPA_faq.cfm
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Available at: https://ogc.msu.edu/faq/ferpa-faq.html#question6
5 Available at: https://uec.rutgers.edu/programs/ferpa-student-privacy/for-faculty-and-staff/
6 Available at: https://www.asr.umn.edu/training-and-support/ferpa-resources
7 Available at: https://registrar.uiowa.edu/ferpa-frequently-asked-questions-faqs
In this line of emerging thought, the Central New Mexico Community College has an instructive comparison of statements appropriate under FERPA and statements inappropriate under FERPA. Their site, “FERPA and Student Recommendations/References,”\(^8\) reads:

**Statements Allowed Under FERPA**

The following kinds of statements would be allowed under the FERPA:

“I have found _________ to be an excellent student. The quality of her writing is exceptional and she demonstrates insight and strong critical thinking skills during class discussion and in her approach to her academic work.”

“___________ has demonstrated to me that he is dependable, conscientious and punctual. This is evidenced by his attendance patterns, his classroom behavior and the interaction he has with me in the classroom.”

**Statements Not Allowed Under FERPA**

The statements that follow would not be allowed because they refer to information from the student’s educational record which is protected information:

“I have found ___________ to be an excellent student. He earned a grade of “A” in my class, has a cumulative GPA of 3.7 and has successfully completed 90% of the courses he has attempted.”

“___________ has demonstrated to me that she is dependable, conscientious and punctual. This is evidenced by the fact that she has only missed two of my classes this term and has never had a single incident of academic dishonesty or student discipline during her time at CNM.”

The distinguishing feature, in the comparison, is the inclusion or exclusion of student educational records (e.g., grades, GPA, etc.).

Currently, Penn State Policy AD-11, “University Policy on Confidentiality of Student Records,”\(^9\) contains a protection for students in relations to letters of recommendation, in particular, related to their confidentiality rather than context. Policy AD-11 reads:

A student may waive his/her right to access to confidential letters of recommendation that he/she seeks for admission to any educational agency or institution; for employment; or for application for an honor or honorary recognition. The student must be notified on request of all such individuals furnishing recommendations, and the letters must be solely for the stated purpose for which the student was notified and for which he/she waived his/her right of access. Such waivers may not be required as a condition for admission to, receipt of financial aid from, or receipt of any other services or benefits from such agency or institution.

---

\(^8\) Available at: [https://www.cnm.edu/depts/dean-of-students/faculty-resources/ferpa-and-student-recommendations-references](https://www.cnm.edu/depts/dean-of-students/faculty-resources/ferpa-and-student-recommendations-references)

\(^9\) Last revised June 2019, and available at: [https://policy.psu.edu/policies/ad11](https://policy.psu.edu/policies/ad11)
The thinking is that if one assumes that a letter of recommendation for a student is part of that student’s education record, then that student has a legitimate right to read the letter unless they waive their right to access the letter.

In complement, the University Registrar has a form for students requesting letters, “Request for Letter of Recommendation.” The form contains two major points of consent. The first mirrors AD-11 regarding the confidentiality of student letters of recommendation: “I hereby” either “waive” or “do not waive” “my right to see the recommendation at any time in the future.” The second is in regard to education records: “I consent to the release of any information from my education record (e.g. grades, GPA) that is deemed appropriate for purposes of the recommendation or evaluation.” The online form, once printed and signed by the student, is then presented to the individual asked to make the recommendation. Despite holding its users to the high standard found in other institutions, the University Registrar’s form is optional, even if, according to AD-11, disclosure of student education records to a third party with a legitimate educational interest is only permissible after “prior written consent” has been obtained.

In reaction, the Committee on Student Life proposes the creation of a Senate Policy for letters of recommendation that protects our students’ right to privacy to the highest standard. Please note that individuals writing letters of recommendation for students at Penn State are often faculty, but faculty are not the only Penn State employees asked to write letters for students. If, therefore, Senate policy were developed regarding letters, then that policy would apply only to faculty. Also, while “prior written consent” could imply the use of the University Registrar’s form, replete with a printed and signed hardcopy, it may be best if this decision is left up to individual faculty to determine what is most appropriate to document student consent (e.g., written in an email or using an alternative form).

**Recommendation**

The Committee on Student Life recommends the creation of a Senate Policy on letters of recommendation and the adoption of the following policy language:

**Senate Policy 89-00 “Student Privacy Regarding Letters of Recommendation”**

Prior to submitting a letter of recommendation, faculty shall obtain written documentation of a student’s pledge to “waive” or “not waive” their right to see the requested recommendation in the future. Also prior to submitting a letter of recommendation, faculty shall obtain written consent from a student to release information from their education record as deemed appropriate for purposes of the letter. For peace of mind, faculty members may wish to obtain written consent from students to use information from the student’s educational record even in instances where the faculty does not ultimately use the information. Electronic documentation (e.g., email, online forms, etc.) satisfies the written documentation requirement.

---

10 Last revised November 2009, and available at: [http://www.registrar.psu.edu/student_forms/request_for_recommendation_form.cfm](http://www.registrar.psu.edu/student_forms/request_for_recommendation_form.cfm)
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Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded to Undergraduates

(Informational)

On behalf of the Faculty Senate, the Office of Student Aid facilitates the awarding of University Scholarships designated as ‘Faculty Senate Scholarships.’ Twenty-one endowments and one annually funded source generate the support for these undergraduate awards. As a whole, the Faculty Senate endowments require recipients to be academically talented and demonstrating financial need. Individually, most of the endowments have a unique eligibility preference that we are required to honor. Donors agree to scholarship guidelines that can include both general eligibility criteria and specific preferences that donors have chosen. For instance, several guideline preferences specify students from a particular high school, city, or county; more specify students who have demonstrated leadership skills, service to community and school, and/or participation in extra-curricular activities.

Faculty and staff at each campus nominate students who have reached at least their third semester of enrollment at Penn State. In most cases, financial aid officers solicit nominations from faculty, rank order the nominees, and submit names and brief comments about the academic merit and extra-curricular activities of each nominee. The Office of Student Aid then matches a pre-determined number of nominees to appropriate guidelines and funds. Typically, in late July or early August, students receive formal scholarship award letters sent from the Faculty Senate Office. Each letter identifies the name of the Faculty Senate Scholarship, the award value, and the one-year term of the award, as well as provides the donor name and a request for a thank you note.

In consultation with the Faculty Senate Office and under guidelines developed by the committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid (ARSSA), the Office of Student Aid ensures the equitable distribution of scholarships across all campuses. Campus allotments are in proportion to campus undergraduate enrollments.

In the 2018-19 academic year, Penn State undergraduates received a total of $267,342 in Faculty Senate Scholarship awards. The majority of recipients are from Pennsylvania (85%), and they are enrolled in 19 different academic colleges. Available spending tends to fluctuate year to year based on the value of the University’s investment pool and the available endowment earnings. A three-year comparison follows and confirms this fluctuation in available dollars and resulting awards.
## Faculty Senate Scholarship Awarding: A Three-Year Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Recipients</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollars Awarded</td>
<td>$267,342</td>
<td>$256,300</td>
<td>$258,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Award Value</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Award Value</td>
<td>$1,082</td>
<td>$1,059</td>
<td>$1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median GPA</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attached report shows the distribution of scholarships across campuses, colleges and class.

## 2017-2018 Faculty Senate Fund Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT RECIPIENTS</th>
<th>247</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dollars Awarded</td>
<td>$267,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Award Value</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Award Value</td>
<td>$1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median GPA</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Need Index</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Faculty Senate Scholarships are awarded to undergraduates across all campuses. The number of awards made per campus is in proportion to campus vs. total undergraduate enrollment figures from the University Budget Office’s fall head count, prior to the year of awarding.

**Campus Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS</th>
<th># OF AWARDS</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL AWARDS</th>
<th>FALL ‘17 ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.86%</td>
<td>3,893</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.45%</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubois</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.67%</td>
<td>4,502</td>
<td>5.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.48%</td>
<td>5,077</td>
<td>6.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPUS</td>
<td># OF AWARDS</td>
<td>% OF TOTAL AWARDS</td>
<td>FALL '17 ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>% OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont Alto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>60.13%</td>
<td>46,610</td>
<td>60.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes Barre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Campus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Scranton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

01/28/20

CAMPUS | # OF AWARDS | % OF TOTAL AWARDS | FALL ‘17 ENROLLMENT | % OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
York | 3 | 1.21% | 983 | 1.28%

TOTAL | 247 | - | 76,997 | -

B. The majority of Faculty Senate Scholarship recipients are from Pennsylvania.

PA

Number of Awards: 212 – 86% of Total

Non-PA

Number of Awards: 35 – 14% of Total

Total Number of Awards: 247

C. Faculty Senate Scholarship recipients represent each of the Academic Colleges. The table below shows the distribution of recipients for the last three years across all academic colleges. This table is not intended to compare to Table A since the student’s academic college is not a factor in the selection of Faculty Senate Scholarship recipients. Although the College distribution is not an exact representation of the enrolled College attendance, an effort is made to closely distribute awards to all Academic Colleges.

**College Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington College</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona College</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend College</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks College</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smeal College of Business</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital College</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald P Bellisario College of Communications</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Undergraduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth &amp; Mineral Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Class Distribution

**Sophomores (4% of Total)**

- Semester Standing 3: Number of Awards 1
- Semester Standing 4: Number of Awards 9

**Juniors (30% of Total)**

- Semester Standing 5: Number of Awards 29
- Semester Standing 6: Number of Awards 47

**Seniors (66% of Total)**

- Semester Standing 7: Number of Awards 31
- Semester Standing 8: Number of Awards 57
- Semester Standing 9: Number of Awards 43
- Semester Standing 10: Number of Awards 17
- Semester Standing 11: Number of Awards 13

**Total** Number of Awards: 247
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General Education Assessment 2015 - 2019

(Informational)

Introduction

In November of 2015, The Penn State Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost charged a Special Joint Committee for General Education Assessment (the Committee) to implement assessment of General Education outcomes, develop a regular and ongoing assessment plan, and serve as a liaison between the University Standing Committees on Curricular Affairs and General Education, and the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research. The committee was converted to a Standing Committee in April 2016.

Since 2016, the Committee has developed a General Education Assessment Plan and a timeline for assessment activities. The committee has created several datasets, administered student surveys and developed a process for collecting direct evidence of student learning that reflects the revised General Education learning objectives and foundational/domain criteria.

Collecting evidence of student performance in General Education courses will eventually impact all faculty members who teach General Education courses because the plan calls for assessment of all revised General Education learning objectives and foundational/domain criteria. For that reason, the information in this report is of particular importance, because it provides background, as well as expectations, that faculty members who teach General Education courses need to know. The first section following the Executive Summary, “Calling all Faculty - Essential Contributors to General Education Assessment” outlines those specific expectations based on the current assessment of integrative thinking.

Information

The following report outlines activities undertaken by the Standing Joint Committee on General Education Assessment from 2015 to 2019, prepared by the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research.
Executive Summary ................................................................................................................. 3
Calling all Faculty: The Most Essential Contributors to General Education Assessment .... 4
Background .................................................................................................................................... 5
Standing Joint Committee for General Education Assessment ........................................ 6
Charge .................................................................................................................................. 6
Scope .................................................................................................................................... 6
Membership and Selection ................................................................................................. 7
Duties ................................................................................................................................... 7
General Education Assessment Plan and Timeline ................................................................. 7
Goals ..................................................................................................................................... 8
Datasets, Measures and Other Products .............................................................................. 9
Datasets .............................................................................................................................. 10
Curriculum/Course Maps ................................................................................................... 10
Assessment of Courses and Student Performance ............................................................. 10
Surveys ....................................................................................................................................... 10
General Education Assessment Timelines .......................................................................... 10
Learning Objectives and Foundation/Domain Criteria Assessment Timeline .................. 11
General Education Datasets ............................................................................................... 12
Student Enrollment by General Education Domain ......................................................... 12
Level of Prescriptiveness in General Education Courses by Academic Program ............. 13
Course and Student Performance Assessment ................................................................... 13
Initial Student Performance Data Collection Efforts ......................................................... 13
Integrative Thinking Assessment ....................................................................................... 15
Assessment Surveys .............................................................................................................. 17
2017 Student Surveys .......................................................................................................... 17
2019 Student Survey ........................................................................................................... 17
General Education Assessment - 2020 and beyond ............................................................... 23
Executive Summary

The Standing Joint Committee on General Education Assessment (the Committee) has conducted multiple assessment activities since its formation in 2015. The purpose of this report is to apprise faculty of those activities - especially those involving the direct assessment of student learning in General Education courses because all faculty teaching those courses will eventually be called upon to contribute to the assessment. Thus, the first section of the report describes what faculty can expect when one of their courses is included in efforts to assess General Education learning objectives or foundational/domain criteria. The remainder of the report documents the recent history of General Education assessment, including current plans and summaries of completed assessment activities.

Assessment of General Education is directed by the Committee and conducted by Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research (OPAIR) staff in collaboration with the Office for General Education. The Committee was charged in 2016 to plan and implement assessment of General Education. It is co-chaired by representatives from OPAIR and the University Faculty Senate’s Standing Committee on Curricular Affairs and includes representatives of the Office for Undergraduate Education, the Office for General Education, and six University Senators, among others.

The assessment plan developed by the Committee is framed around three major goals, listed below, and includes objectives and measures appropriate for assessing them. The plan is accompanied by a timeline and cycle of assessment activities.

1. Penn State students will develop critical foundational skills and breadth of knowledge across the domains.
2. Penn State students will experience enhanced personal and professional growth.
3. Penn State students will have opportunities for integrative learning.

Based on the Committee’s scope and duties, as well as members’ interests, OPAIR staff have developed specific datasets to document patterns of course offerings and student enrollment, student grades by major and location, and level of prescriptiveness in General Education requirements by academic program. OPAIR staff have also conducted assessment of General Education learning objectives by collecting evidence of student performance in General Education courses, with special emphasis on integrative thinking. A summary of the results of a spring 2019 student survey is also included in the report.

These products, assessment activities, and survey results will serve as a baseline against which to compare aspects of General Education under the previous requirements and the revisions that went into effect in 2018. They further describe a range of opportunities in which to collect evidence that can be used to improve student learning and advance a systematic approach to assessing General Education at Penn State.

We encourage those seeking additional information to contact the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research with questions at loa@psu.edu or 814-863-8721.
Calling all Faculty - Essential Contributors to General Education Assessment

In 2015 the Faculty Senate approved the development and implementation of a plan to assess the revised General Education requirements, including the learning objectives and foundation/domain criteria, to ensure that students are meeting Penn State’s expectations. As a faculty member teaching General Education courses, you have a vital role to play in the assessment.

What follows is an example of what you can expect when one of the General Education learning objectives or foundation/domain criteria addressed by your course is being assessed. The process described below was developed to assess Integrative Thinking in fall 2019 and may be adjusted in the future to address other objectives or foundation/domain criteria.

The first step in the process was to identify faculty assigned to teach courses that were aligned with integrative thinking through the proposal process. An initial email was sent by OPAIR staff and the Assistant Dean for General Education to these faculty about 3 months prior to the beginning of the fall semester. This message introduced the process of assessing student learning in General Education, explained its importance, provided instructions in multiple formats, and outlined a timeline.

OPAIR staff sent a second email two weeks prior to the start of the semester. This email repeated much of the information from the first one because many faculty members were assigned to teach the courses after the first message was sent and therefore did not receive it. In addition to updated information about what faculty would be expected to contribute, this message also included a rubric designed to score student performance on an assignment aligned with integrative thinking, announcements about webinars faculty could join to learn more about the assessment process and expectations, and a due date. Around this time the Vice Provost of Planning and Assessment and the Vice President and Dean for General Education sent an email to faculty encouraging them to participate in the assessment.

After the semester began, faculty received an additional email that included a link to an online form where they would enter their assessment evidence. The form requested the following information.

- Course learning objectives (from an uploaded syllabus)
- Course description (from an uploaded syllabus)
- Description and assignment instructions from one major assignment that addresses the learning objective
- Student performance on that assignment, ideally using a rubric designed by faculty in collaboration with OPAIR staff

Following the end of late drop, OPAIR staff will send a link to a student survey to the faculty and request that they forward it to their students and encourage them to complete it because their perspectives are critical for General Education assessment.

The multiple emails in this process resulted from the fact that we were developing the process and materials as we went along. The next cycle of General Education assessment will likely include fewer email messages and may or may not include a student survey, depending on the objective being assessed. In addition, the rubric may be replaced by another tool for scoring student performance.
Faculty can submit their information any time during the semester. OPAIR staff will analyze what is collected, report findings to the Committee, and provide an aggregated summary to the faculty who submitted information.

Finally, it is critical to state explicitly: information collected in any General Education assessment approach will not be used to assess or evaluate faculty performance. All findings from General Education assessment will be reported in aggregate form with identifiable information from either faculty or students removed. Furthermore, the process for assessing General Education is separate from the process for assessing program-level outcomes.

Additional detailed information about the fall 2019 assessment of integrative thinking process on which this exemplar process is based begins on page 15. The fall 2019 instructions and rubric are available in Box.

Background

In 2013, the University Faculty Senate and the Provost initiated a process to review and revise the University’s General Education curriculum and assessment. A General Education Task Force that was convened to accomplish this completed their work in April 2015, and their recommendations were approved by the Faculty Senate.

Like the previous General Education curriculum, the revised curriculum requires baccalaureate degree students to complete 45 credits of courses from a distribution of courses in Writing (GWS), Quantification (GQ), Arts (GA), Humanities (GH), Health and Wellness (GHW), and Natural Sciences (GN). Associate degree students complete a similar set of course distributions for a total of 18 credits. New requirements also include enrollment in Inter-Domain courses specifically designed to address integrative thinking, and achievement of a C or better in Writing/Speaking and Quantification courses. Under the new curriculum each of the pre-existing General Education courses are being “re-certified” by the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee to show that they address the new General Education learning objectives and foundational/domain criteria.

During the same year that the revised General Education curriculum was approved, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) conducted their periodic review of Penn State. In June 2015 the Commission re-affirmed Penn State’s accreditation status. Their statement urged Penn State to document “further implementation of the assessment of general education outcomes within the institution’s overall plan for assessing student learning, and evidence that such assessment results are used for curricular improvement.”

Following Faculty Senate approval of the recommendations, the Office of the Provost and the University Faculty Senate initiated preliminary work to develop a process to assess General Education by charging a Special Joint Committee for General Education Assessment (referred to as “the Committee” throughout this document). The Committee developed a proposal for assessing General Education which was approved by the Faculty Senate in March 2016. The
Committee, which guides the General Education assessment process, was converted to a standing committee in April 2016.

*The previous information is adapted from the April 1, 2017 monitoring report submitted to MSCHE (pp. 25 – 29).*

Standing Joint Committee for General Education Assessment

Since its inception, the Committee has provided guidance and direction for a range of assessment activities that have been conducted, primarily, by Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research (OPAIR) staff. Below is a summary of the charge, scope, membership, and duties of the Committee.

**Charge**

The Committee was charged to:

- Further implement the assessment of general education outcomes within the institution’s overall plan for assessing student learning, and evidence that such assessment results are used for curricular improvement.
- Develop a regular and ongoing assessment plan for (current) General Education, following the principles described in the April 28, 2015, University Faculty Senate’s Approved Legislative Report entitled, “Revision to General Education Curriculum”.
- Consult and maintain liaison with the University Faculty Senate Standing Committees on Curricular Affairs and Undergraduate Education (currently Committee on Education).
- Consult and maintain liaison with the Office of Planning and Assessment (currently the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research or OPAIR).

The Committee is governed by Standing Rules, Article II, Section 4. These rules include language outlining the committee’s scope, membership, and duties.

**Scope**

The Scope of the Committee includes development of datasets to inform general education assessment. According to the Standing Rules, such datasets should include, but not be limited to:

1. A General Education Curricular Inventory that shows patterns of course offerings, student enrollment, and student grades by major and location.
2. General Education curriculum mapping that shows the relationship between General Education and undergraduate majors.
3. General Education course objective mapping that shows the relationship to General Education learning objectives.
4. The new standing joint committee should collect and use data in an ongoing way to examine student outcomes, such as:
   a. student success (e.g., time-to-degree, graduation rate, and other institutional data) and
b. student learning (e.g., coursework, engaged scholarship projects, and other factors that provide evidence of learning).

The data should also be used to inform curricular improvement, including but not limited to:

- decisions about the General Education curriculum, including questions about the efficacy of pathways to support integrative thinking;
- effective assessment practices and processes, especially those that can be shared across disciplines; and
- decisions about availability of General Education curricular components across the University, including gaps and trends. The goal should be to develop an analytic assessment plan, supported by data that informs curricular improvement and evolves over time.

### Membership and Selection

The Faculty Senate, Office of Undergraduate Education, and the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research jointly appoint the Committee. Membership of the Committee is outlined in the rules as follows, along with the names of current members:

- the associate vice provost for learning outcomes assessment (co-chair) - Suzanne Weinstein
- the chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee (co-chair) – Brandi Robinson
- the associate vice president and associate dean for Undergraduate Education – Jeff Adams
- the director and assistant dean of the Office for General Education – Maggie Slattery
- a member of the Graduate council - vacant
- an associate dean from Penn State Libraries – Rebecca Miller
- a student government representative – Chelsey Wood
- six University Faculty Senators – Asad Azemi, Roger Egolf, Joyce Furfaro, Richard Robinett, Ira Saltz, and Keith Shapiro

*As of January 1, 2020, this role will be filled by the assistant vice provost for planning and assessment (Daniel Newhart).

### Duties

The rules also outline duties, most of which are included in the scope. In addition to those activities, the Committee is expected to cooperate with the University Committee on Assessment of Learning (UCAL) and is responsible for developing an analytic assessment plan, which evolves over time and informs curricular improvement. The next section outlines the current plan.

### General Education Assessment Plan and Timeline

One of the initial activities undertaken by the Committee was to develop a basic General Education Assessment Plan (see Table 1). This plan has evolved since 2016 and reflects the current priorities and understanding of General Education at Penn State. The plan is a living document.
which may change over time to reflect the interests and priorities of future stakeholders and be adjusted as we learn more about students’ General Education experiences.

**Goals**

The General Education Assessment Plan is framed around three major goals of the General Education Program at Penn State:

1. Penn State students will develop critical foundational skills and breadth of knowledge across the domains.
2. Penn State students will experience enhanced personal and professional growth.
3. Penn State students will have opportunities for integrative learning.

Table 1 displays sets of activities and objectives that are nested within each of the major General Education assessment goals. The table also indicates a range of specific assessment measures that the Committee has identified as appropriate approaches for collecting evidence that each objective has been achieved.

**Table 1: General Education Assessment Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOAL 1: Penn State students will develop critical foundational skills and breadth of knowledge across the domains.</td>
<td>General education course offerings</td>
<td>Students will meet performance expectations for General Education key and domain learning objectives.</td>
<td>Student performance on in-course signature assessments that align with general education objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students will have sufficient opportunities to achieve General Education learning objectives.</td>
<td>Curriculum map of General Education courses vs. General Education domain and key learning objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students will have sufficient opportunities to enroll in General Education courses when they want to, and in the appropriate sequence.</td>
<td>Student survey; Enrollment dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requiring a C or above in GWS and GQ courses will improve student success in subsequent courses in their programs of study.</td>
<td>Student performance in select major courses for which GWS or GQ courses are prerequisites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL 2: Penn State students will experience enhanced personal and professional growth.</td>
<td>General education course offerings</td>
<td>Students will report that General Education has a substantial impact on success in their majors.</td>
<td>Student survey/alumni survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students will report that General Education has a substantial impact on their thinking, perspectives, interests and/or career goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GOAL 3: Penn State students will have opportunities for integrative learning. | General Education integrated studies course seed grants | Faculty will create general education courses that emphasize knowledge integration and transfer | Inter-domain and Linked course activities and assignments |
| | General Education Inter-domain and Linked course offerings. | Students will have sufficient opportunities to enroll in Inter-Domain and Linked General Education courses. | General Education course enrollment dataset; Student survey |
| | | Students will meet the integrative thinking objective in both Inter-domain and Linked courses. | Student performance on in-course signature assessments that align with the integrative thinking General Education objective. |

Datasets, Measures and Other Products

The General Education Assessment Plan outlines a range of specific datasets, measures and products that are listed below. Since 2016, substantial work has been undertaken to collect the evidence requested in the charge or by the Committee, prescribed by the assessment plan, or necessary for assessment activities. Later sections provide additional details about those items, which are marked with an asterisk.
Datasets

- Patterns of course offerings and student enrollment*
- Student grades by major and location*
- Prescriptiveness of General Education requirements by academic program*
- Student performance in select major courses for which GWS or GQ courses are prerequisites

Curriculum/Course Maps

- Curriculum mapping that shows the relationship between General Education and undergraduate majors*
- Course objective mapping that shows the relationship of courses to General Education learning objectives

Assessment of Courses and Student Performance

- Analysis of Inter-Domain and Linked course activities and assignments*
- Student performance on signature assessments aligned with the integrative thinking General Education objective.*
- Student performance in General Education courses*

Surveys

- Student survey*
- Alumni survey

* items have either been addressed, or have been advanced substantially through coordination, data collection, and analysis

General Education Assessment Timelines

Timelines and cycles for the examination of individual components of the plan over a 5-year period are provided below.

Table 2: General Education Assessment Timeline

The following table outlines the cycles for several major components of the overarching plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Assessment</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Update General Education course enrollment dataset*</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Education curriculum mapping that shows relationship between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Education and Undergraduate majors</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Objectives and Foundation/Domain Criteria Assessment Timeline

Penn State’s program of General Education is designed to support student achievement related to seven Learning Objectives, two Foundation Skills, and five Knowledge Domains. The following table outlines the current schedule for assessing each component.

Table 3: Student Performance Assessment Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Learning Objectives Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 (pilot)</td>
<td>Foundation/Knowledge Domain: None; Learning Objective: Integrative Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>Foundation/Knowledge Domain: GA and GN; Learning Objectives: Creative Thinking, Critical and Analytical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>Foundation/Knowledge Domain: GWS; Learning Objective: Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>Foundation/Knowledge Domain: GHW and GH; Learning Objective: Global Learning; Social Responsibility and Ethical Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-2023</td>
<td>Foundation/Knowledge Domain: GS and GQ; Learning Objective: Key Literacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-2024</td>
<td>Foundation/Knowledge Domain: None; Learning Objective: Integrative thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Education Datasets

OPAIR staff have developed several datasets for the Committee to reference in its oversight of General Education assessment. These datasets contain the following information:

- patterns of course offerings and student enrollment,
- student grades by major and location, and
- curriculum mapping that shows the relationship between General Education and undergraduate majors

Student Enrollment by General Education Domain

OPAIR staff created a dataset that provides information about 2016-17 enrollment in General Education courses by College (University Park Colleges, Campus Colleges, and University College). This dataset also includes the number of students who earned specific grades in each course in each College. The dataset could be used, for example, to determine the number of students who received an A in a specific General Education course at a specific college. This dataset is intended to provide baseline information that may be used in the future for longitudinal analysis and will be updated every two years.

The dataset was used to determine the General Education courses that comprise 70% of credit hours in each domain (see Table 4). This resource shows the courses that students most commonly enroll in and helps in designing assessment activities because it indicates courses where evidence about students learning in the domain criteria is easily accessible. Furthermore, it can be compared to the same dataset in future years. One caveat is that in some domains (e.g. GQ and GN), the courses on this list are most likely included because they are required by the major rather than because students freely chose them.

Table 4. General Education Courses that comprise 70% of enrollment in each domain

(2016/2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GQ</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>GH</th>
<th>GN</th>
<th>GS</th>
<th>GHA</th>
<th>GWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAT200</td>
<td>COMM150</td>
<td>HIST20</td>
<td>HIST140</td>
<td>CHEM110</td>
<td>ECON102</td>
<td>NUTR251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH140</td>
<td>PHOTO100</td>
<td>HIST21</td>
<td>HIST143</td>
<td>CHEM111</td>
<td>PSYCH100</td>
<td>NUTR100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH21</td>
<td>MUSIC7</td>
<td>RLST1</td>
<td>AFR192</td>
<td>ASTRO1</td>
<td>ECON104</td>
<td>KINES61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH141</td>
<td>ART20</td>
<td>PHIL103</td>
<td>PHIL103W</td>
<td>PHYS211</td>
<td>SOC1</td>
<td>KINES77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH110</td>
<td>MUSIC4</td>
<td>HIST11</td>
<td>SPAN131</td>
<td>CHEM112</td>
<td>IST110</td>
<td>BBH101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH22</td>
<td>THEA100</td>
<td>HIST144</td>
<td>CAS201</td>
<td>BIOL141</td>
<td>HDFS129</td>
<td>BBH19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH220</td>
<td>ENGL50</td>
<td>CAMS45</td>
<td>HIST118</td>
<td>BIOL110</td>
<td>SOC19</td>
<td>BBH143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH26</td>
<td>INART115</td>
<td>WMNST106</td>
<td>COMM168</td>
<td>PHYS212</td>
<td>COMM100</td>
<td>KINES88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPSC121</td>
<td>ART100</td>
<td>COMM110</td>
<td>SC297</td>
<td>BISC3</td>
<td>ECON302</td>
<td>KINES68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH112</td>
<td>PHIL1</td>
<td>RLST101</td>
<td>EGEE101</td>
<td>PSYCH121</td>
<td>BBH146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH111</td>
<td>HIST1</td>
<td>PHIL105</td>
<td>GEOSC10</td>
<td>ECON304</td>
<td>KINES81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC5</td>
<td>CMLIT108</td>
<td>HIST130</td>
<td>CHEM113</td>
<td>PLSC1</td>
<td>KINES82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC109</td>
<td>PHIL119</td>
<td>CAMS33</td>
<td>BISC4</td>
<td>SRA111</td>
<td>KINES17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC9</td>
<td>HIST10</td>
<td>PHIL2</td>
<td>BIOL142</td>
<td>HDFS229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INART116</td>
<td>CAMS25</td>
<td>SPAN130</td>
<td>BIOL129</td>
<td>CRIMJ100</td>
<td>KINES72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART1</td>
<td>PHIL14</td>
<td>HIST175</td>
<td>CHEM101</td>
<td>PSYCH221</td>
<td>KINES84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART50</td>
<td>HIST121</td>
<td>ENGL184</td>
<td>PHYS250</td>
<td>LER100</td>
<td>FDSC105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INART5</td>
<td>C1280</td>
<td>PHIL7</td>
<td>PHYS214</td>
<td>AFR110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEA105</td>
<td>AMST105</td>
<td>RLST104</td>
<td>EGEE102</td>
<td>PLSC14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of Prescriptiveness in General Education Courses by Academic Program

Academic programs at Penn State employ different levels of prescriptiveness within their major curriculum, which impacts students’ ability to choose General Education courses. Some programs dictate a majority of the General Education courses (e.g. Nursing), whereas other programs allow more choice (e.g. Liberal Arts). Because differences in prescriptiveness may impact other aspects of students’ General Education experience, OPAIR staff used the information in the Undergraduate Bulletin to create a curriculum map that shows how each undergraduate major aligns with its required General Education courses. This matrix was used to determine the level of prescriptiveness of General Education courses by academic program, and can be leveraged to explore, for example, whether student satisfaction with, or perceptions of, General Education are related to the number of General Education courses students are free to choose.

Course and Student Performance Assessment

Initial Student Performance Data Collection Efforts

During spring 2016, the Committee developed and piloted a course form, called a memo, to gather preliminary information on:

- alignment between current General Education courses with the revised General Education Key Learning Objectives (e.g. effective communication, critical and analytical thinking),
- what pedagogies are used to support student development,
- and what assessment methods are used to measure achievement of course objectives.

This pilot effort was designed to collect evidence of student learning in General Education courses as well as prepare faculty for the re-certification process. The course memos gathered information from a sample of 60 courses across all domains and offered at Penn State University Park and Penn State Scranton. The review revealed that, when unrestrained in the number of Learning Objectives they should indicate, many faculty members checked nearly all as being
addressed in their courses. As a result of this review, the Committee recommended that General Education course guidelines clarify the importance of emphasizing a smaller number of learning objectives through intensive course activities and assessments.

In fall 2016, the Committee developed a second pilot course memo to further support faculty preparation for course recertification. The goal was to gather initial course assessments that align with the revised General Education Learning Objectives. The revised pilot memo was administered to faculty teaching Humanities (GH) and Quantitative Reasoning (GQ) courses and asked faculty to provide the following information:

- alignment of course learning objectives with General Education learning objectives (choose at least 2 and no more than 4);
- alignment of course learning objectives with Foundation or Knowledge Domain criteria (choose at least 3);
- direct assessment evidence as to how the course assesses at least one General Education learning objective and one Foundation or Knowledge Domain criterion;
- at least two course pedagogies and activities used to develop student abilities toward achievement of the General Education learning objectives described above.

Faculty were also asked to share performance expectations for each assessment described, whether students met performance expectations, and what actions were planned to improve the course. An analysis of fall 2016 course memos highlighted the wide range of innovative course activities, including pedagogies and assignments used by faculty to develop student abilities. The Committee reiterated the importance of an online information repository for faculty to gain ideas for course design and assessment. Analysis of the course memos also revealed that many faculty are already using course improvement practices to “close the loop.” The data revealed that faculty are setting performance expectations for each learning assessment, comparing assessment findings with expectations, and making course changes as a result. Finally, the Committee also observed that some faculty members were unclear about how to develop strong, measurable course learning objectives, assessments or performance expectations. The Committee recommended offering faculty development workshops to help faculty understand and utilize knowledge of course design and assessment methods.

The 2016 pilot efforts have informed subsequent approaches to assessing General Education objectives, in particular with respect to designing manageable large-scale data collection procedures, fostering buy-in among faculty and administrators in a highly decentralized curricular context, and streamlining and managing the time and effort necessary for participation in our efforts.

The previous information is adapted from the [April 1, 2017 monitoring report](#) submitted to MSCHE (pp. 25 – 29).
Integrative Thinking Assessment

During fall 2018, OPAIR staff, with guidance from the Committee, developed and piloted an approach to assessing integrative thinking. This pilot also served to develop procedures with potential applicability for assessing achievement of the other General Education objectives and domain criteria.

These efforts began with lessons learned from the pilot assessments conducted in 2016. Specifically, the OPAIR team worked to develop a streamlined template that could be distributed widely, was simple and intuitive, but that still collected necessary evidence.

Fall 2018 Integrative Thinking Assessment

The Committee began by identifying information necessary to assess the extent to which a given course addressed integrative thinking, as well as how well students performed on an assignment that evaluated integrative thinking. Items requested of instructors included a course description, course learning objectives, description of an assignment that evaluated integrative thinking, and aggregated evidence of student performance on that assignment. OPAIR staff developed an online form using Qualtrics through which instructors could submit this information.

In mid-September 2018, OPAIR staff emailed academic leadership with lists of instructors (pulled from institutional data) at their college or campus who were slated to teach Inter-Domain courses designed specifically to address integrative thinking and the new General Education requirement that students enroll in an Inter-Domain or Linked course. These emails asked academic leaders to identify instructors who should be exempt from participation (e.g. graduate students). A week later, leadership in OPAIR and the Office for General Education jointly emailed the remaining instructors to describe the need to assess General Education and encourage them to participate in the assessment. Following that email, OPAIR staff sent instructors a link to the Qualtrics form, completion instructions, a sample completed form, and encouragement to contact OPAIR with questions or issues.

In December 2018 and January 2019, OPAIR staff analyzed the resulting data by reviewing the following:

- the learning objectives,
- the extent to which at least one learning objective and the course description referred explicitly to integrative thinking,
- the alignment between the objectives and the assignments – in particular, the assignment related to integrative thinking,
- and the degree to which students met the instructors’ expectations on the integrative thinking assignment.

The fall 2018 pilot integrative thinking assessment effort did not foster high levels of engagement from instructors (47/141 = 33% response rate), nor information that could be used to
compare student performance across courses, but it did provide insight about how to improve the process. In addition, instructors who had participated provided feedback that helped OPAIR staff better understand their experiences and develop additional strategies to enhance the process.

The pilot experience and instructor feedback resulted in several revisions to the process. Key among them were:

- developing a more intentional and timely campaign to notify and educate participants,
- engaging leadership at several levels to encourage buy-in;
- creating guiding materials that describe what instructors would be asked to provide, as well as how the information would be evaluated, prior to the semester in order to provide instructors time to make changes to courses or syllabi, if they chose to do so;
- reducing the amount of information requested;
- standardizing the student performance data; and
- collecting student perceptions of their exposure to integrative thinking.

These general lessons informed the revised fall 2019 integrative thinking assessment procedure.

Fall 2019 Integrative Thinking Assessment
Beginning in May 2019, OPAIR staff used institutional data to develop a list of instructors slated to teach integrative thinking courses in fall 2019. The list included all instructors teaching courses that were explicitly aligned with the integrative thinking objective based on their re-certification, rather than only those teaching Inter-Domain courses.

OPAIR staff provided the instructor lists to the relevant academic administrators but did not suggest removing any of the instructors on the list because anyone teaching a General Education course is expected to address the objectives selected when the course was re-certified. These instructors were then notified by OPAIR staff about their role in the upcoming assessment. This initial notification email included a link to a short video explaining the purpose of General Education assessment, information they would be asked to provide, a request to administer a survey to students, and the importance of their role in the assessment. OPAIR staff promised to contact them again with additional information prior to the fall semester.

Because the data collected in fall 2018 did not enable aggregation of student performance across courses, OPAIR staff worked closely with the General Education Scholars and instructors teaching courses aligned with integrative thinking to develop a rubric theoretically suitable for any integrative thinking assignment.

In early August 2019, OPAIR emailed academic leaders to remind them of the fall assessment and request that they encourage their instructors to participate. Following that, the Vice Provost for Planning and Assessment and the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education sent an email to the instructors encouraging their participation. About a week later, OPAIR staff emailed instructors a revised instructional document which included the recently-designed
rubric, as well as an invitation to one of two webinars developed to provide an explanation of the instructions and allow attendees an opportunity to ask questions. A follow-up email provided an updated instructional video. The instructions included reference to a student survey on integrative thinking, which would be administered following late-drop.

In mid-October, the Integrative Thinking Qualtrics form, along with the instructional document and rubric, was sent out to all 413 instructors on the list. In addition, a Box folder was created to store the materials. Instructors have until January 10, 2020 to submit their information. OPAIR staff will analyze the data and share it, in aggregate form without attribution, with the Committee and the instructors who participated in late spring 2020.

Assessment Surveys

2017 Student Surveys

In spring 2017, OPAIR, with advisement from the Committee, conducted two exploratory student surveys. One targeted upper-level and graduating students and focused primarily on their retrospective perceptions of a range of General Education experiences. The other used institutional data to survey groups of students, each which had been identified as having completed requirements related to one of the General Education domains. Due to challenges in how these surveys were administered and analyzed, data and findings were not fully analyzed or reported, but the experience served as a basis for the 2019 student survey.

2019 Student Survey

The following section outlines the development, administration and key findings from a student survey focusing on students’ perceptions of their General Education experiences.

Survey Development

Building on lessons learned during the development and administration of the 2017 General Education student surveys, OPAIR staff worked with the Committee to design and administer a survey that would focus on the objectives outlined in the overall General Education Assessment Plan that could be addressed with a survey of students.

The survey questions were designed to address the following objectives:

1. Students will have sufficient opportunities to enroll in General Education courses when they want to, and in the appropriate sequence.
2. Students will report satisfaction with the breadth of General Education courses and the contribution of those courses to their educational experiences, careers, and everyday lives.
3. Students will report that General Education has a substantial impact on success in their majors.
4. Students will report that General Education has a substantial impact on their thinking, perspectives, interests and/or career goals.
OPAIR staff piloted finalized questions with a group of students employed as part of Penn State’s New Student Orientation. Student perspectives and ideas were incorporated into the survey instrument.

The final instrument consisted of 10 Likert-type questions that prompted students to rate 36 aspects of their General Education experiences along several scales. The survey also included three open-ended questions asking students to share their perception of the purpose of General Education, explain the impact of General Education on their educational experiences, and provide suggestions about how to improve General Education.

Survey Administration
To administer the survey, OPAIR staff used institutional data to develop a sample of students who had completed at least seven semesters of coursework (excluding transfer students). This strategy enabled investigation of students who had (presumably) finished or nearly finished their General Education requirements. Furthermore, because these students enrolled prior to the 2018 change in General Education requirements, student responses can be compared with those of students who started in 2018 or later in a subsequent survey. The sample was drawn from all Penn State campuses that serve undergraduate students and was designed to be representative by campus location if the survey received a 10% or greater response rate.

The survey was managed online using the Qualtrics platform. It was open for just over three weeks and reminder emails were sent every 3-4 days. Participants were offered a chance to win one of 30 $15 amazon.com gift cards, funded by the Office for General Education, as an incentive for completing the survey.

Select Findings
The survey garnered a final response rate of 16.6% and included responses from students at all locations and virtually every academic major. Roughly 60% of the respondents identified at female, and 40% as male. Respondents were White (73%), Hispanic/Latino (7%), Asian (7%), Black/African American (4%), International (4%), Two or more races (3%), and Unknown (2%).

A large majority of respondents expressed satisfaction with the flexibility of General Education requirements, the selection of courses available, and their ability to enroll in General Education courses (see Figure 1). Over 60% of respondents indicated that at least one General Education course addressed the broad goals of General Education, such as helping them understand complex ideas and events in new ways or helping them prepare for their chosen career paths and everyday life (see Figure 2). Sixty percent or more of the respondents somewhat or strongly agreed that General Education classes expanded their perspectives and were a worthwhile part of their education (see Figure 3). About 50% of respondents somewhat or strongly agreed that General Education courses complemented their field of study or enriched their understanding of topics related to their majors (see Figure 4). Finally, over 78% of respondents indicated that how a course fits into their schedule, finishing the General Education requirements, and their interest in the topic are moderately or very important factors in choosing a General Education class (see Figure 5).
Figure 1: Opportunities to enroll in General Education courses

- Flexibility in how I could meet my Gen Ed requirements: 23% Dissatisfied/Somewhat Dissatisfied, 77% Somewhat Satisfied/Satisfied
- The selection of Gen Ed classes available: 27% Dissatisfied/Somewhat Dissatisfied, 73% Somewhat Satisfied/Satisfied
- Ability to enroll in Gen Ed classes outside of my major: 20% Dissatisfied/Somewhat Dissatisfied, 80% Somewhat Satisfied/Satisfied
- Ability to enroll in Gen Ed classes that fit my schedule: 15% Dissatisfied/Somewhat Dissatisfied, 85% Somewhat Satisfied/Satisfied
- Ability to enroll in Gen Ed classes early on in my academic career: 18% Dissatisfied/Somewhat Dissatisfied, 82% Somewhat Satisfied/Satisfied
- Ability to enroll in Gen Ed classes outside of my major: 17% Dissatisfied/Somewhat Dissatisfied, 83% Somewhat Satisfied/Satisfied
- Ability to enroll in Gen Ed classes recommended/required by my major: 14% Dissatisfied/Somewhat Dissatisfied, 86% Somewhat Satisfied/Satisfied
Figure 2: General Education's Contributions to Students' Education, Careers and Lives

- **Helped prepare you for your chosen career path.**
  - None: 31%
  - 1-3 Classes: 46%
  - 4-6 Classes: 17%
  - 7 or More Classes: 6%

- **Helped prepare you for everyday life.**
  - None: 31%
  - 1-3 Classes: 48%
  - 4-6 Classes: 15%
  - 7 or More Classes: 6%

- **Helped you understand yourself better.**
  - None: 29%
  - 1-3 Classes: 48%
  - 4-6 Classes: 17%
  - 7 or More Classes: 6%

- **Helped you grow in non-academic ways.**
  - None: 21%
  - 1-3 Classes: 50%
  - 4-6 Classes: 22%
  - 7 or More Classes: 7%

- **Stimulated you intellectually.**
  - None: 12%
  - 1-3 Classes: 51%
  - 4-6 Classes: 26%
  - 7 or More Classes: 11%

- **Helped you understand complex ideas and events in new ways.**
  - None: 18%
  - 1-3 Classes: 53%
  - 4-6 Classes: 23%
  - 7 or More Classes: 7%

- **Broadened your understanding of national and world events.**
  - None: 16%
  - 1-3 Classes: 54%
  - 4-6 Classes: 24%
  - 7 or More Classes: 6%

- **Introduced you to topics you have since pursued in extra-curricular experiences, internships, or other out-of-class activities.**
  - None: 36%
  - 1-3 Classes: 49%
  - 4-6 Classes: 12%
  - 7 or More Classes: 3%

- **Helped you develop new knowledge or skills you will use again.**
  - None: 12%
  - 1-3 Classes: 59%
  - 4-6 Classes: 23%
  - 7 or More Classes: 6%

Figure 3: General Education’s Contributions to Students’ Education, Careers and Lives

- **Were as important as classes in my major.**
  - Strongly disagree/Somewhat disagree: 69%
  - Somewhat agree/Strongly agree: 31%

- **Expanded my perspective on a range of topics.**
  - Strongly disagree/Somewhat disagree: 28%
  - Somewhat agree/Strongly agree: 72%

- **Are among my most valuable educational experiences.**
  - Strongly disagree/Somewhat disagree: 63%
  - Somewhat agree/Strongly agree: 37%

- **Were a worthwhile part of my PSU education.**
  - Strongly disagree/Somewhat disagree: 40%
  - Somewhat agree/Strongly agree: 60%
Figure 4: General Education’s Contributions to the Major

- Motivated me to learn about topics outside my major:
  - Strongly disagree/Somewhat disagree: 36%
  - Somewhat agree/Strongly agree: 64%

- Primarily addressed topics outside of my major:
  - Strongly disagree/Somewhat disagree: 17%
  - Somewhat agree/Strongly agree: 83%

- Complemented my major field of study:
  - Strongly disagree/Somewhat disagree: 50%
  - Somewhat agree/Strongly agree: 50%

- Enriched my understanding of topics related to my major:
  - Strongly disagree/Somewhat disagree: 51%
  - Somewhat agree/Strongly agree: 49%

Figure 5: Factors Influencing Choice of General Education Classes

- Just to finish requirements:
  - Not at all important: 3%
  - Slightly important: 14%
  - Moderately important: 30%
  - Very important: 53%

- Rating tools/social media:
  - Not at all important: 17%
  - Slightly important: 23%
  - Moderately important: 28%
  - Very important: 32%

- Who is teaching the class:
  - Not at all important: 9%
  - Slightly important: 21%
  - Moderately important: 33%
  - Very important: 38%

- Recommendation from professors:
  - Not at all important: 14%
  - Slightly important: 32%
  - Moderately important: 35%
  - Very important: 19%

- Recommendation from advisers:
  - Not at all important: 14%
  - Slightly important: 30%
  - Moderately important: 38%
  - Very important: 17%

- Recommendation from friends:
  - Not at all important: 15%
  - Slightly important: 29%
  - Moderately important: 33%
  - Very important: 24%

- Relevance to my intended career path:
  - Not at all important: 18%
  - Slightly important: 26%
  - Moderately important: 30%
  - Very important: 26%

- My interest in the topic(s):
  - Not at all important: 5%
  - Slightly important: 16%
  - Moderately important: 38%
  - Very important: 41%

- How they fit my schedule:
  - Not at all important: 5%
  - Slightly important: 10%
  - Moderately important: 25%
  - Very important: 60%
Student Perspectives on the Purpose and Impact of General Education and Suggestions for Improvement

Through open-ended questions, students shared their perceptions of the purpose of General Education, the impact of General Education, and their ideas for improving General Education by responding to open-ended questions. Their responses were coded for emergent categories and themes. While the questions were distinct, there were common themes across the responses. For example, responses to all questions included comments related to the connection between General Education and a students’ major.

The most comment themes related to the purpose of General Education included broadening educational experience, learning outside the major, and developing a well-rounded person or education. Respondents most frequently indicated that General Education had little or no impact. However, students also asserted that General Education provided knowledge and skills, among other benefits. The most common suggestions for improving General Education included increasing course availability, including variety and online offerings, and changing the requirements by modifying, reducing or removing them.

Summary

Survey responses revealed that students were generally satisfied with the flexibility of their General Education requirements and the selection of classes available. In addition, most students were satisfied with their ability to enroll in classes under a variety of circumstances. These results suggest that Penn State is doing a good job ensuring that a sufficient number of General Education courses are offered but has room to improve.

Most students indicated that at least one class addressed the broad goals of General Education, such as helping them prepare for their careers, stimulating them intellectually or broadening their understanding of national and world events. Though the percentages who claimed that at least one class addressed these goals are high (over 70%), one 3-credit course represents only 7% of the General Education requirements. Less than 40% of respondents claimed that at least four classes (26% of the requirements), addressed these broad goals of General Education. Penn State students may benefit if more General Education courses explicitly addressed one or more of the overarching goals.

Over half of the students agreed that General Education courses expanded their perspective and were a worthwhile part of their education. Slightly over one-third agreed that General Education courses were as important as their major classes or among their most valuable educational experiences. Although these might seem like low percentages, they are positive given that most students come to Penn State to earn a degree in a specific discipline.

The connection between General Education and respondent’s majors was confirmed by about 50% of students, who agreed that General Education courses complemented or enriched their majors or complimented their major field of study. A higher percentage (83%) agreed that
General Education courses primarily address topics outside their majors. Given that General Education seeks to support the majors while also providing a “well-rounded” education, these findings are satisfying.

When responding to questions about the factors that influence their choice of General Education courses, the largest percentage of respondents consider superficial factors, such as how General Education courses would fit into their schedule and whether the course would help them to finish their requirements, as important. However, almost as many respondents regard interest in the topic as an important factor in choosing their General Education courses, suggesting that they are using General Education for exploration, which is consistent with the goals of the requirements.

The current survey results suggest that the General Education requirements are serving students well, though some improvements may prove beneficial. These results also provide a valuable baseline with which to compare students who enrolled after 2018 and must adhere to the revised requirements. The survey results are available on the General Education page of the OPAIR website.

**General Education Assessment Next Steps**

The past three years have set the groundwork for further General Education assessment activities. Baseline datasets and student perspectives of General Education will allow for comparisons between the previous General Education requirements and those that became effective in summer 2018. Investigations of student performance related to General Education have provided a model for future assessment of General Education objectives and foundations/domains, that has the potential to lead to improvement of student learning in General Education.

In early 2020, the integrative thinking data will be analyzed and reported by OPAIR staff. The Committee will turn its attention to assessment of student performance related to additional General Education objectives and foundation/domain criteria, and to additional assessment activities outlined in the timeline.
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At the December 3, 2019 Faculty Senate plenary session, the Curricular Affairs committee held a forensic session to begin obtaining feedback and input from Faculty Senators on OPS 2025. In addition to the discussion, written feedback was collected after the meeting, and submitted via the Senate web site discussion forum.

The transcribed comments from all of the submitted paper comments are in Appendix A; these reflect a wide range of perspectives and ideas about Penn State curriculum and curricular processes. All of the comments are valuable. The general themes that are emerging are:

**Student-Focused**
- students taking any course at any unit of the university, and meeting a grade threshold, must be accepted by any other unit of the university;
- students need to be able to move and trust that courses/content are reasonably the same, regardless of location;

**Curriculum-Focused**
- course content needs to fit together through sequence of program;
- courses/programs need to be aligned across campuses; the 80/20 rule needs to be followed/enforced;
- curricula should be constructed around learning objectives, allow different pathways to meet objectives
- reduce curricular/course redundancies;

**Faculty-Focused**
- need flexibility/academic freedom/location-specific strengths and intellectual/scholarly diversity;
- need support for faculty led, peer-evaluation and assessment;
- feelings of distrust/fear that this means UP telling Commonwealth colleges and campuses what to do/lack of trust/lack of mutual respect;
- need support, not another unfunded mandate - curricular work takes time, effort, collaboration;
- need to include full time and adjunct/part-time faculty
- need curricular proposal/revision process streamlining;

SCCA continues work on our charges for the year, these comments and other feedback from Senators and their constituents will be incorporated – ongoing and regular opportunities for input are planned.

SCCA has begun discussion of curricular processes and timelines; Figure 1 is a graphic representation of the steps and roles of faculty, Senate, and administration in our shared responsibilities for curriculum development and implementation:
1) New curricular ideas begin with the faculty. Consultation among faculty, within a single discipline or across multiple disciplines, at one campus or across many or all Penn State campuses, is a critical step for generation of new ideas and proposals for course and program curricula. Disciplinary communities have been envisioned, in several prior reports by Faculty Senate, to play a central role in consultation. However, there remain ill-defined processes for consultation, challenges with defining and establishing appropriate consultation groups and disciplinary communities, and a sense of insufficient support for healthy and collaborative disciplinary communities.

2) All curricular proposals come to the Faculty Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs for review and approval, using processes that are defined by Faculty Senate policies and guidelines established in the Guide to Curricular Procedures. Ideas for new or changed university curricula, such as the general education curriculum, are considered by multiple Senate committees and legislative changes are approved only by the Senate as a whole. The arrows in the graphic indicate that there can be iterations between faculty and SCCA on proposals and curricular changes. As pointed out in the comments from the Forensic session, there are opportunities to review and to streamline Senate processes.

3) After Senate approval of a new or changed curriculum proposal, these are subject to administrative approval and subsequent implementation.

4) Implementation steps include entry in the course catalog, LionPATH, and the bulletin. They can include updates to admissions and marketing materials, websites, new student orientation presentations, advising materials, etc. and extensive involvement of multiple supporting administrative staff and offices.

SCCA has regular liaison with staff in the Registrar’s office on implementation of change proposals and bulletin updates, and ongoing collaboration with several offices on implementation of a new curriculum management system (CIM). Our goal and commitment are to improve workflow and streamline processes while maintaining transparency and ensuring thorough consultation: an informational report with process updates and CIM implementation is anticipated later this year.
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Figure 1.

**Curriculum**

- **Ideas generation: new programs and courses**
  - Faculty Disciplinary Communities Consultation

- **New or changed curriculum structure, policy**
  - Faculty Senate (as elected faculty representatives)

- **New or changed program or course**

- **Administrative approval**
  - Dean, Provost, BOT
  - Programs as needed,

- **Implementation**
  - Administrative offices, units, and information systems (Registrar, LP, ACUE, UE, etc)

- **Defined processes and support**
  - Senate defined processes (streamlining needed)

- **Administrative offices, units, and information systems**
Appendix A. Comments received in writing at the December 3, 2019 University Faculty Senate Plenary Session, in response to the question:

“What does a coherent curriculum mean to you?”

A coherent curriculum is one when if I take a course at one location it should count at all other Penn State locations. This includes an understanding that the same courses at different locations will cover similar things - but also a willingness to accommodate me if I take a class at Behrend and if I then transfer to U Park and U Park doesn't offer that class. They will try to accept it as something. What I don't like is what some programs - like Criminal Justice/Administration of Justice does now where they will only accept a certain number of classes from the branches.

It is increasingly important to prepare students to address wicked problems such as climate change and sustainability. This lens for addressing various challenges should not (and cannot) be limited to students studying these topics explicitly. How can we integrate issues of environmental, economic, and social sustainability and ethics broadly across our curriculum?

Program Curriculum: a collection of courses whose content is connected/integrated and that builds on detail and skills to move students from novice to mastery levels. *Concise and purposeful program goals accomplished thru these courses. Course Curriculum: course content that is connected and builds in a logical way to promote student learning and understanding. * Must: well-written course learning goals and content that supports these goals.

A coherent curriculum is one in which courses/requirements are portable across campus locations and whose same courses exhibit a degree of consonance in respect to content and learning outcomes.

A clear "chain of custody" of who (Which program/faculty) have charge, final judgement, about courses and programs Systematic/program-level management of programs (as mentioned during forensic discussion on 12/3/2019)

Coherence 1) ETM requirements for similar degrees are similar (eg BSB ETM vs Altoona BSB ETM) so that students can go through ETM for 1 degree program and then be able to do the other programs if their degree plans have changed

The course is the same no matter what campus the course is taken at

80/20 rule applied, monitored and remediated for all locations that offer a course. Review of syllabi offered by any and all fac members on an on-going and scheduled process to assure that a student who takes a PSU course gets what was approved by Fac Senate - leaving room for faculty academic freedom but maintains that no matter where you get a PSU degree it is rigorous and consistent. Urgency to require the UP and campus faculty / departments to work together to assure the curriculum is coherent. A monitored process that is faculty inclusive and driven and transparent. Coherence needs to meet future students' needs not only current or past faculty experience. Evidence-based, stakeholder input, + industry based. Create curriculum facilitators for each college to help programs and majors do this. I’ve helped folks do this and it is very
time-consuming to pull in faculty to assure their voices heard along with the groups mentioned above. Assessment is key and that needs to be at the forefront of this process, and not an afterthought, as the industries move to more complexity-based needs/outcomes.

A student can be assured that upon successful completion of a course they can enroll in any subsequent course requiring that knowledge without wondering if they will have what other students in another section or campus offering the course have. Students will be able to have multiple pathways that will lead to their degree. Students would have the confidence in their choices of degree knowing that they will be able to benefit from both the multi campus structure and the universities approach to mobility to reasonably pursue and complete their degree in a timely fashion. thanks for leading the session today

1. common overall objectives for curriculum and individual courses; should be room for specific sub-objectives. 2. ease of transition between campuses - courses should be roughly the same and satisfy prerequisites

Basic components of a course taught at different locations should contain standardized core content and learning objectives

On the level of courses: a coherent curricular means that assessments are connected meaningfully with the goals, learning objectives and materials/class/other experiences. Coherence across a program means that courses are not redundant, echo each other's themes, interleave with one another, intercoordinated longitudinally and vertically. If there is a truly coherent curriculum across the program, I would like to learn about it! The challenges of achieving that level of cooperation and communication are multi layered.

Two parts: 1. a set of classes that build consecutively toward appropriate mastery of a field of knowledge. 2. is supporting set of classes that build thinking skills come up particularly those necessary to propagating western, libertarian systems of knowledge.

Courses in a major connect content, draw connections between classes, minimize unnecessary overlap between classes. For example: math course having examples in major

Coherent curriculum at PSU equals surveillance and control of all from University Park. Mistrust of professor quality at Commonwealth campuses. Generally – not a PSU thing - for focus on learning objectives and competencies. That's it!

A coherent curriculum consists of diverse parts that fit together, it does not mean a shrunken curriculum that consists only of courses that are offered everywhere, as we need to continue to encourage location specific offerings that best serve particular campus and student needs. PS -we were at the end of the time for the forensic discussion, so I didn’t comment then, but I’d like to add that a barrier to faculty participation in curricular processes, including curricular coherence, is the perception and sometimes the reality, that the process is cumbersome and overly time consuming. If you can streamline the routine aspects of curriculum change, and make that known, more faculty may be inclined to participate.
Similar learning outcomes. Things to consider: 1 are we talking about coherence at the course level or at degree level? 2- who gets to decide on what is coherent? UP? 3 - are UP/department/programs willing to have the input and work with Commonwealth campuses faculty to create this coherence? Will they value and validate the contributions from the campuses’ faculty? Yes, I am implying they do not or rarely do.

In a coherent curriculum, courses proceed in a clear sequence that ensures students acquire and master forms of knowledge they develop into a rich and well-rounded body of knowledge

As mentioned in the Senate plenary session today, achieving a coherent curriculum will be forever impossible without processes in place to assess university courses as they are taught at University Park in the Commonwealth campuses. These peer (faculty) assessments will take time, energy, and resources. They cannot be implemented as “just another” unfunded demand on faculty time. However, if we seek to achieve curricular coherence throughout “one Penn State” we have no other option.

It means departments being encouraged to consider courses from other programs rather than reinventing the wheel, for this to happen, though our budget model needs to change so that sharing is encouraged rather than wasted. The flipside of this is that programs also need to be willing to share their courses.

Being a branch campus student, having coherent curriculum is extremely important. Very robust amount of our students are 2+2 or 3+2 students. When bringing this question to my peers we have a very difficult time with the transitioning process from campus to campus.

1. Coherent curriculum – Broadly similar requirements across programs, policies applied evenly and consistently across programs and across campuses. ETM/GPA for ETM, credit range to graduation etc. 2. Faculty are engaging in course development to match their expertise and interest 3. Engagement in curricular process is largely unrewarded – no release/extra compensation for either a tenure-track or fixed term faculty. 4. Perceptions of academic freedom and reluctance of faculty to teach a course differently than they have been. Perceptions of program heads that students should be kept “in-house” and take most classes within major, even with similar courses exist - courses limited to student in that major

a coherent curriculum is unchanging from professor to professor and campus to campus. A key aspect to this is the accessibility and expectation of resources, like textbooks, and the maintained integrity of courses as Penn State courses and not third-party courses

Clear, timely and transparent communication within and across units with respect to curricular matters. Structure and flexibility - an appropriate balance to accommodate diversity, in its many forms, across the institution

Connectivity – proper vertical progress and horizontal connection with other disciplines. Forward moving (not circular!), with clear endpoints, goals accomplished, but no dead end save of course final degrees. Minimal repetition, by far the strongest complaint from upper level
students. Enable faculty creativity, coherence is not uniformity. Address non-thematic activity: hours of lab, report, any other experiential learning versus a dry syllabus

1. Consistency in content from one section of a course to another and or 2. One version of a major versus two, three, or four versions and or 3. Coherence within a given program

I think there needs to be more cohesion across the amount of work required for a three-credit course. I teach online courses that are rigorous and have had multiple students complain about the amount of required work compared to other classes that they take. There should be guidance on the amount of required work and all three credit courses should be consistent. I don’t want to lower the standards of my course but get pressure from students through SRTEs.

A coherent curriculum makes sense – courses feed into each other and build as they progress. It’s understandable - students can make their way through the requirements in a logical, manageable way. A coherent curriculum also needs to have some baseline similarities across units. Of course, taught one place should be comparable to all iterations of that course. (above is primarily concerned with course coherence rather than total curricular coherence)

A curriculum that is coherent across campuses. This way a degree or course list would be similar and translatable from one campus to another

I think for all courses with the same number of credits, we need to have the same number of hours in class. As an example, for engineering design 100/100 S students need to go to class nearly six hours every week but this course is three credits. I understand that this course is a first-year seminar course but it is not fair to faculty who teach this course for three credits for students. The first semester I was hired at Penn State I had to teach three sections of this course roughly going to class 18 hours a week well it is considered only three courses if this course required six hours a week why not to break it to two courses to be fair to faculty and students!!!
Thanks 😊

Programs with the same name at different campuses have different strengths and the focus that is different. Coherent curriculum should not remove the diversity of the programs. 80% of course outcomes being consistent is a good goal.

I agree with the 80% of the content the same. When a program is to undergo this process – be sure the person doing the process has experience in curricular design and mapping

A coherent curriculum means sequence of courses – the collection of courses specifically for a major or minor build on each other and complement each other. Prerequisites for a course should actually be helpful to one’s understanding of course materials. For example, in my 300 level ECON courses I’ve had my professors practically state that the 100 level ECON prerequisite courses don’t teach you anything for these classes. Also, coherence among advisers!!

A common set of learning goals/objectives across the course, that though it may be offered at different sites and have different methods of content delivery, are met and assessed with all
iterations. The student success at one site is seamlessly accepted/transferable to all other sites offering said curriculum

The student experience in individual courses is not uniform. Math 110/140/141 is not the same at UP versus a commonwealth campus. OER’s are normally helpful in creating uniform experiences across sections and campuses, see psych 100. We cannot achieve degree cohesion without first creating course experience cohesion

A coherent curricula means that when a student takes a course at any Penn State campus, she can expect to come away having learned the same, relatively few “larger” topics. The smaller details can differ between campuses, and faculty members should have the freedom to focus on different topics related to their interests or research, as long as a set of larger concepts are communicated. Also, faculty should always have the freedom to assess students in whatever manner she feels is valuable

A coherent curriculum means a consistent set of learning outcomes across the same course at multiple campuses and sufficient coordination among campuses and programs to allow flexibility to students in the path to their major

Coherent curriculum - not sure it can be defined for our campus system to the satisfaction of all involved. Consistent would be a word I would use or possibly logical. Barriers - recruiters/employers. Different at different campuses, have different requirements for student employment

An organized curriculum that is carefully planned

All courses, taken anywhere in the University will prepare students to be successful in following courses at any location

A curriculum where the order courses are taken to improve the knowledge base in a developmental manner for the individual students needs and goals within a major. I’m not so sure general education courses should be incorporated in this sort of process

Synergistic flow of coursework and practicum, internship, experiences, that prepare our graduates for their respective fields

To be honest, I’m not sure. I think it means that the requirements make sense for the major in question. It’s important for everything to be up-to-date and relevant. Courses should build on the skills and knowledge students have gained as they advance to graduation.

Progressive levels of mastery within subjects. Clear connections across disciplines that are complementary. Clear goals about knowledge and skills mastery associated with a particular “level” within the curriculum

Coherent curriculum should not mean everybody is teaching what the world campus does. Diverse curriculum serve needs of students better. Especially for commonwealth campuses
Clear, transparent pathways. What’s required needs to be visible to all across the Commonwealth. Having multiple versions of the same major is not clear nor coherent. Also a curriculum that is all or nearly all prescribe is not ideal – it may not fall into the question of coherent, but it is unfortunate. Courses that build a foundation (that is meaningful) and connect to subsequent courses is really important. We need more oversight than just individual courses.

This is tough. My best thought is that the curriculum within a program be logical and ordered. Perhaps, the idea is that programs have a set of outcomes, what do we want our graduates to be? To do? How should they appear (i.e. how should graduates of our university present themselves)? And that course curriculum be designed to advance the student to these ends. Courses should build and complement and be reasonably integrated. By this I mean that second and third level courses draw specifically on prior developed competencies and that intro level courses be designed with ultimate outcomes, at least to a degree, in mind.

A program that facilitates learning for all types of learners. A consistent curriculum that can be taught anywhere – web, RI – by any qualified faculty member. Academic freedom to educate tomorrow’s leaders through current use of technological tools and social media platforms.

Coherent curriculum with upper level classes that build on knowledge gained in previous classes leading to both a broad awareness and understanding of society and a specific expertise in the chosen majors of the students. It will be across the University, not a curriculum designed to keep students staying put in academic units out of fear by these units of declining enrollments.

Curriculum should be more flexible to allow for different career interests and needs. Coherent curriculum would require both technical and non-technical competency development. Students should be able to design their coursework to meet career needs as well as set them up for success by aligning with workforce needs. So a student that needs/wants marketing or computer science skills/knowledge should be able to take these types of courses. Leadership and professional skills should not be only co-curricular.

That the individual academic units, Commonwealth campus or University Park colleges, have the ability to craft the programs which are best suited for their student populations, while allowing for sharing of best practices and a credible peer review for these programs. Any effort to create a uniform degree program for all programs across the entire system will result in an overly cumbersome coordination challenge which will only hinder our collective ability to best serve our diverse student body.

I’m more concerned about what that “concept” means in actual practice. Specifically, I foresee this as an opportunity for UP colleges and schools to assert control at the expense of the commonwealth colleges.

I’m not sure I understand the concept of a coherent curriculum. A major/minor program should be coherent with every class supplementing and building upon the others. University wide all students share a core of classes – i.e. general education so as to be well-rounded citizens.
For a geographically dispersed campus, it means having substantial overlap in class content, so that students earning degrees from Penn State reflect that high quality, regardless of campus or class section. Making process deterministic as opposed to hit and miss sections/campus location. Coherent curriculum is easier to achieve in science and engineering field, not so much in liberal arts.

1. Students should follow a logical progression of courses, with lower level courses, or those they take in their initial semesters, giving them the necessary skills to succeed in more advanced courses that build on those skills. This does not necessarily mean that lower level courses should be broader in scope whereas in some cases, depending on the subject and feel the study, it is more effective for intro courses to have a more limited scope. 2. One area in which Penn State really fall short is an offering a cohesive curriculum across colleges or even across departments within a single college. There is next to no coordination/ collaboration among departments in my experience within liberal arts, and very little strategic thinking in terms of hiring. The only example I know of in liberal arts is last year’s cluster hire in African American studies. The recent changes to gen Ed curriculum are not a solution. It is very hard to even find collaborators in other schools, and team teaching is next to impossible. I should also say that even with in my own department there is next to no coherence. Part of this has to do with a huge number of lecturers and teaching professors, and a disconnect between them and tenure line faculty. Our head is loathe to let the tenure line faculty have any say in the overall design of the curriculum – in part, I suspect, because s/he doesn’t want to rock the boat and require low paid lecturer/teaching faculty to learn to teach new courses. At the same time, many of the tenure line faculty have no desire to teach anything new and regardless of the course title they are assigned to cover, they teach the (same) material they are most comfortable with. Add to this the top down nature of Penn State, which means that our head can make random changes to individual courses based on unfounded impressions that “students don’t like surveys “etc. I would also reiterate that new curriculum development takes time and should be compensated with course releases. Speaking personally, I will say that I spearheaded the creation of a new minor, with all new courses, and received zero compensation.
University policy AC-76 “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” establishes the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and defines the committee’s scope and operation. The committee may review petitions from faculty members and administrators who assert that he or she has suffered a substantial injustice resulting from a violation of academic freedom, procedural fairness, or professional ethics.

The 2018-2019 committee received fifteen petitions from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019. Over the last five years, the committee has examined between seven and fifteen petitions per year. One petition was carried over to the committee from the previous year bringing the total to 16 cases.

Petitioners may claim any or all of the three categories of complaints in their petition. Three complaints claimed violation of academic freedom, six included complaints of professional ethics, and thirteen claimed violations of procedural fairness. Petitions could also list a complaint in the “other” category. These issues included contract renewal, administrative misuse of SRTEs, conflict of interest and changing expectations midway through tenure.

Of the sixteen petitions that were reviewed, the committee completed thirteen. Two petitions were withdrawn for ombudsperson consultation. One petition was reopened and will carry forward to the 2019-2020 committee.

According to AC-76, in the event that claims of bias or discrimination are a component of the case, the petitions are sent to the Office of Affirmative Action for a parallel review. Two petitions were sent to Affirmative Action for parallel review.

The committee voted to conduct informal investigations for five cases and document reviews of the full committee on three. The topics of the petitions varied widely. They included promotion and tenure processes, workplace climate, misuse of student evaluations, performance evaluation, revocation of contract, and problems with promotions.

The chair wishes to thank the members of the 2018-2019 committee, each of whom devoted significant time and thoughtful consideration to each petition. The committee members express our appreciation to all ombudspersons across the University for their contributions toward resolving conflicts and disputes at their colleges and campuses. We would especially like to thank the University Ombudsperson Mohamad Ansari who has worked to improve processes, ensure compliance with policies and training and support the unit ombudspersons in their work.

Additionally, the committee acknowledges the efforts of Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, Kathleen Bieschke, who works with the committee to ensure fair processes for all petitioners.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON GLOBAL PROGRAMS

Family Travel Approval Rates

(Informational)

CONTEXT
Effective July 1, 2016, the Penn State Office of Risk Management, in collaboration with the Vice Provost of Global Programs, instituted a policy requiring all participants on a Penn State faculty-led Education Abroad (EA) program to be officially affiliated with the Pennsylvania State University. In addition to defining participants more explicitly, the policy stipulated that faculty and staff acting in a leadership role with an EA program may not bring a “guest” with them while leading a program on behalf of the University except with the approval of the Vice Provost for Global Programs.

This policy is codified in TR01 International Travel Requirements under the section on Who May Participate in University Affiliated Student Group International Travel. The policy currently states the following, “Community members (including alumni, spouses and children of students) are not permitted to accompany University Affiliated Student Group International Travel. Rare exceptions may be made for community members serving as official University volunteers, and permission for such an exception may only be granted by the by the Vice Provost for Global Programs, after consultation with the Risk Management Office and the sponsoring unit’s Budget Executive, Dean or Chancellor.”

After its first release, the interpretation of TR01 policy has been loosened and TR01 is currently being re-written. The final version has not been released at the time of this report.

SCOPE
The tracking of TR01 implementation and enforcement began informally as Global Programs did not have informed expectations regarding the volume of requests for exception. Some requests went directly to the Vice Provost while others came to an individual within Education Abroad. Although formal tracking mechanisms for recording requests, deliberations, and decisions were eventually developed, the office does not have exact records of all requests received and all decisions given by the Vice Provost.

Per Global Programs’ records, there have been 45 documented requests since July 1, 2016 and a total of 42 approvals for a 93.33% approval rate.

CONSIDERATIONS
A number of factors influence whether or not a request for exception is approved. Ultimately the decision is that of the Vice Provost in consultation with the University Risk Officer. Among key considerations are:

- The location of the program;
• The program leader’s experience leading EA programs and familiarity with the host location;
• Whether or not the program is relatively stationary or if it involves a considerable amount of travel from location to location;
• The presence of on-site assistance, through professional learning abroad staff, and the contractual obligation of these staff to provide 24-7 student support;
• The duration of a guest’s stay with the program leader and that guest’s stated intentional involvement with the program;
• The rationale for why the program leader is advocating for an exception for a particular guest(s).

It should be noted that under no circumstances are any University funds to be used in any way to support a guest’s presence with a program leader. This includes incremental increases in accommodation costs to house additional guest(s). Certain program partners (i.e. third-party program providers) also have policies regarding the presence of guests which may stipulate, among other things, that guests are not allowed during program dates or that a program leader must pay for the presence of a care giver to supervisor guests who are minors.
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Background and Explanation

This informational report was requested by the Faculty Senate to provide information on the newly available Google Suite (G Suite) for Education for Penn State faculty, students, and staff. The G Suite of tools includes Google Drive, Docs, Sheets, Slides, Forms, and more. These tools are labeled collaboration tools as they allow users to collaborate seamlessly on the documents via technology.

Three years ago, Penn State Information Technology (IT) did a study of email, calendar, and collaboration tools to determine current usage and a desired future state. The study found the following:

- Faculty and students were extensively using the G Suite of Collaboration Tools both for coursework and research collaboration.
- Faculty reported that when working across institutions, Google Docs were far more utilized than other collaboration tools.
- Students were arriving at Penn State having used the G Suite of Collaboration Tools for much of their K-12 schoolwork.
- The G Suite of Collaboration Tools was available without a fee for higher education institutions, and the legal terms and conditions for an enterprise solution allowed for additional data protections for Penn State users.

These findings led to a recommendation that in addition to the Microsoft suite of tools (Word, Excel, PowerPoint, Teams, SharePoint, etc.) Penn State IT provide an additional service of G Suite collaboration tools (without email and calendar) so that faculty, students, and staff could work with the tools that best meet their needs.

On November 1, 2019, the university launched the G Suite for Education for Penn State. Faculty, students, and staff can login to G Suite using their Penn State credentials. Users will be directed to the Single Sign On page and they will then have full access to the tools (except for email and calendar).

More Information

- To access the G Suite of Tools: https://gsuite.psu.edu
- Instructions for accessing your G Suite the first time: https://pennstate.service-now.com/sp?id=kb_article_view&syparm_article=KB0012931&sys_kb_id=cbd82bb51b0cccd4eeea0dad4bcb8b
- Examples of applications and training materials: https://gsuite.psu.edu/applications-and-training/
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Penn State GO Mobile Application

(Informational)

Background
This informational report was requested by the Faculty Senate to provide information on the soon to be released Penn State Mobile application, Penn State GO. The university has lacked a single, unified Penn State mobile application. As the university adopted One Penn State 2025, a mobile application and a web portal were identified as priorities for the university. The Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer charged a committee to develop a mobile strategy and define and deploy a Penn State mobile application. The committee membership includes faculty, students, and staff. Initially, the primary audience for the app will be students, with expanded functionality for faculty and staff being deployed as the university prioritizes the functionality.

Penn State GO Mobile App Information

The Penn State Go Mobile App will launch in early spring semester 2020. The functionality you see above is the core set of features that students requested of a mobile app. Additional functionality will be rolled out as we complete load testing. Initially, users will be able to choose a location, with Commonwealth Campuses being a single location. Campus-specific locations will be deployed as the app matures and campuses will be able to have input into what their users see on the interface. In the future, users will be able to choose a persona based on role (student, faculty, alumni, visitor) or location (University Park, World Campus, Commonwealth Campus). The nature of the mobile app will allow for departments, colleges, and programs to create mobile app modules which will be able to be tailored to a specific role. This technology will help us address the One Penn State 2025 Guiding Principle #1: Provide a seamless, mobile student...
experience. The app also provides a web portal (a sample is shown below) that will be a one-stop shop for student access to university resources.

More Information

https://mobile.psu.edu
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By enabling even more students to have transformative experiences, the Student Engagement Network is helping to make Penn State a more vibrant place to live, learn, and grow. The network, which launched in 2017, is a comprehensive initiative across twenty-four campuses that connects students with curricular and co-curricular opportunities such as research, student organization involvement, community leadership, study abroad, internships, arts and performances, and more. Out-of-classroom learning accelerates students’ development and enhances their preparation for life after graduation. A joint effort between Undergraduate Education, Student Affairs, and Outreach and Online Education, the Student Engagement Network has built strong programs that impact students, faculty, staff, and communities locally, nationally, and globally.

The Student Engagement Network:
- Educates the Penn State community about student engagement partnerships and opportunities;
- Helps students discover engagement opportunities that match their goals and interests;
- Prepares and advises students for engagement experiences through the grant program;
- Coordinates campus events that showcase student, faculty, staff, and community work;
- Provides faculty and staff the opportunity to explore the scholarship of engagement as fellows and scholars;
- Connects the Penn State community to experiences that enrich learning and impact.

Michael Zeman, Director of Student Engagement since November of 2016, holds a B.S and M.S in Kinesiology from Penn State University. He was the director of the Science Outreach office in the Eberly College of Science from 2008-2017. He is an active Biology 141 instructor, Human Anatomy and Physiology.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING

Annual Capital Construction Report 2019-2020

(Informational)

The Annual Capital Construction Report for 2019-2020 will be presented.
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University Capital Plan
Update

Fiscal Year 2018-2019 to Fiscal Year 2022-2023

Strategic Philosophy of the '19-'23 Capital Plan

- Balance E&G allocation of capital: Facility + Program → Greatest Impact
  - FCNI, Total Backlog, Backlog $S/SF - focuses bad building list
  - Accreditation, Recruitment, Retention, Modernization, Strategic Plan

- For New Building/Addition Projects and Whole-Building Renewal Projects, focus on:
  - Strong programs where investments are needed to maintain or regain prominence
  - Programs or campuses with strategic importance (stabilize or grow programs)

- Balance University Park and Commonwealth Campuses Spending (75/25)
  - Focus on program impacting investments to stabilize or grow programs (in turn enrollment)
  - Supports Land Grant missions or enables research/grant support and growth

- Ratio of ('Keep Up' + 'Catch Up') : (new buildings + additions) → (67/33)

- Ratio of (System Renewal) : (Whole-Building Renewal) → (25/75)

- For System Renewal, focus on correcting worst conditions

- Begin University Capital Plan with a 10% to 15% contingency
## Self-Supporting Units - Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>A&amp;BS</th>
<th>ICA</th>
<th>ARL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Supported Borrowing</td>
<td>$ 375.0</td>
<td>$ 355.6</td>
<td>$ 150.4</td>
<td>$ 139.6</td>
<td>$ 1,020.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Leases and Contingencies</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Reserves and 'Other'</td>
<td>375.0</td>
<td>273.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>688.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Initiated Fees Projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 775.0</td>
<td>$ 662.3</td>
<td>$ 340.4</td>
<td>$ 156.1</td>
<td>$ 1,933.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Education and General - Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Borrowing</th>
<th>Operating Budget</th>
<th>Capital Reserves</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Total ($ in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and General Borrowing</td>
<td>$ 610.0</td>
<td>$ 640.0</td>
<td>$ 720.0</td>
<td>$ 750.0</td>
<td>166.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>188.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities Renewal Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves (from Capital Assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Initiated Fees Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves (from Central)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400.0</td>
<td>320.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Proceeds from Prior Capital Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Reserves, Energy Savings Program, and 'Other'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Capital*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>260.0</td>
<td>220.0  200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 2,119.3</td>
<td>$ 2,131.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Additional Funding Anticipated
University Capital Plan Projects

Fiscal Year 2018-2019 to Fiscal Year 2022-2023

Animal, Veterinary and Biomedical Sciences Building

- 105,052-square foot building
- Replaces ~62,000 square foot Henning Building
- Creates state-of-the-art facility with both laboratories plus research and teaching space
- Increases vivarium cage capacity
- Maintains (and strengthens) connection to Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building
- Supports both existing programs and projected growth

Under Construction
Construction Started in October 2019
Construction Complete in December 2021
$98.3M
College of Engineering Research and Teaching Space I

- Five-Floor (plus basement) / 275,000-square foot building
- Replaces program space in both Engineering Units and Hammond Building
- Modernizes College of Engineering facilities
- Focuses on both increased utilization and/or sharing
- Reimagines synergies and consolidates where possible
- Spaces designed by typology, not department
- Omits need for swing space

In Design
Construction Start in April 2021
Construction Complete in August 2023
$225.0M

College of Engineering Research and Teaching Space II

- Four-Floor (plus basement) / 104,200-square foot building
- Attaches to and/or shields West Parking Deck
- Co-locates and/or modernizes Factory for Advanced Manufacturing Education Laboratory; the Learning Factory; and the School of Engineering Design, Technology, and Professional Programs
- Provides state-of-the-art high-bay, research space
- Provides views of ‘engineering on display’
- Enhances West Campus quad
- Omits need for swing space

In Design
Construction Start in October 2020
Construction Complete in August 2022
$88.0M
Appendix O
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James Building Replacement

- Six-Floor / 100,000-square foot building
- Develops a multi-use Center of Innovation, Making, and Learning
- Develops a state-of-the-art entrepreneurial and/or makerspace ‘hub’
- Relocates College of Earth and Mineral Sciences Dean’s Suite
- Relocates College of Information Sciences and Technology Dean’s Suite
- Relocates Happy Valley LaunchBox
- Provides state-of-the-art Instructional and/or research laboratories
- Ties downtown State College to University Park campus

Under Construction
Construction Started in December 2019
Construction Complete in July 2021

$56.8M

Liberal Arts Research and Teaching Building

- ~134,800-square foot building
- Replaces un-salvageable Oswald Tower
- Centralizes College of Liberal Arts departments
- Develops shared collaboration and/or Instructional spaces
- Expands Atwater Museum of Anthropology
- Provides general-purpose classrooms
- Provides state-of-the-art instructional and/or research laboratories

In Design
Construction Start in August 2021
Construction Complete in August 2023

$112.6M
Physics Building and Osmond Laboratory Renovation

- 105,000-square-foot building to support the Department of Physics
- Renovates East Wing (46,940-square-feet) of Osmond Laboratory
- Creates specialized laboratory space to both attract and/or retain faculty with international leadership
- Provides modern teaching spaces
- Addresses stormwater issues
- Elevates the Department of Physics to a 'Top Ten' graduate program

In Design
Construction Start in October 2021
Construction Complete in December 2023
$148.8M

Sackett Building Renovation (and Addition)

- Converts to a Classroom and Office Building
- Complete Interior Renovation
- Strategic Improvements to the Envelope
- Replaces the 1958 additions with symmetrical additions that match the original proportions designed by Charles Klauder
- Replaces both the Fourth Floor addition and the roof with a Mansard-style roof
- New Elevator
- Provides locations for large classrooms and/or office space

Programming
Construction Start in August 2023
Construction Complete in April 2025
$60.0M
University Art Museum

- Relocates the Palmer Museum of Art to the Arboretum
- Convenient access for all visitors
- Improves the overall Arboretum experience
- Increases the collection-on-view from 4% to upwards of 7%
- Provides a multi-purpose space for outreach to the local community

In Design
Construction Start in June 2020
Construction Complete in May 2022

$71.1M

Willard Building Renovation (and Addition)

- Establishes the state-of-the-art Donald R Belloisario Media Center
- Consolidates Belloisario College of Communications spaces
- Incorporates both the Daily Collegian and the Media Effects Research Laboratory
- Creates Office of Strategic Communications Suite
- Improves Pollock Road entrance
- Replaces aging HVAC system

Under Construction
Construction Started in September 2019
Construction Complete in September 2020

$47.6M
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Academic Learning Center - Harrisburg

- 60,000-square foot Classroom Building
- Various-Sized Classrooms
- Large Lecture Halls
- Lounge
- Offices
- Recital Hall
- Studios
- Study Spaces
- Trading Room

Programming
Construction Start in May 2022
Construction Complete in December 2023

$50.0M

Erie Hall Replacement - Behrend

- Replaces the original recreational center on campus
- Meets current needs of students
- Creates additional space for student life
- Updates office space for both University Police and Personal Counseling
- Relieves pressure on over-programmed Junker Center

In Design
Construction Start In September 2020
Construction Complete in July 2022

$25.0M
System for Integrated Management, Budgeting, and Accounting

- Replaces the Integrated Business Information System
- SAP S/4HANA Implementation
- Creates better business practices
- Leverages currently-working solutions
- Streamlines both arcane and/or inefficient business processes
- Provides the University with better data

SIMBA
SYSTEM FOR INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT + BUDGETING + ACCOUNTING

Under Construction
'Construction' Started in June 2018
'Construction' Complete in July 2020

$100.0M

Water Reclamation Facility

- Renovates and/or replaces aged infrastructure
- Maintains and/or improves the impact of the University's wastewater on the local watershed
- Updates treatment trains to minimize operational risks during times of highly-variable flows and loadings
- Maintains flexibility for future campus growth
- Maximizes opportunities to be utilized as an educational environment

Under Construction
Construction Started in March 2019
Construction Complete in July 2021

$65.2M
**West Parking Deck and West Campus Road Extension**

- Six-Level / 1,653-Space Parking Deck
- White Course Drive Extension
- Located in Red A Parking Lot, adjacent to Earth and Engineering Sciences Building
- CASA Bus Stop
- Bicycle Shop and Storage
- Expanded Stormwater Basin
- Solar Power Installation-Ready

Supports future West Campus expansion
East-facing façade designed to accommodate College of Engineering Research and Teaching Space II

In Design
Construction Starts 'Soon'
Construction Complete in November 2020

$60.6M

---

**West Campus Steam Plant - Combined Heat and Power System**

- Natural Gas-fired Combustion Turbine and Heat Recovery Steam Generator Installation
- Boiler 6 Demolition
- Boiler 8 Rehabilitation
- West Campus Electrical Substation Upgrade

Addresses both continued campus growth and steam demand
Reduces both greenhouse gases and purchased electricity

Under Construction
Construction Started in September 2019
Construction Complete in October 2021

$49.0M
### Education and General

#### 'Catch Up' and New Buildings (and Additions) • UP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering Research and Teaching Space I</td>
<td>$225.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics Building and Osmond Laboratory Renovation</td>
<td>148.8</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Research and Teaching Building</td>
<td>112.6</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal, Veterinary and Biomedical Sciences Building</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering Research and Teaching Space II</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Art Museum</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackett Building Renovation (and Addition)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Building Replacement</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard Building Renovation (and Addition)</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deike Building Renovation</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Contingencies</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies of Potential Projects</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                     | $969.0|

_P = Programming ● D = Design ● C = Construction_

---

#### 'Catch Up' and New Buildings (and Additions) • CWC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Learning Center - Harrisburg</td>
<td>$80.0</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Community Center Renovation (and Addition) - Berks</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie Hall Replacement - Behrend</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education Building Renovation - Abington</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Building Renovation (and Addition) - Altoona</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Building Renovation - DuBois</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley Building Renovation (and Addition) - Lehigh Valley</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostermayer Laboratory Renovation - Greater Allegheny</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health Building - Mont Alto</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union Renovation (and Addition) - New Kensington</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects &lt;$10.0M (5 Projects)</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                     | $244.7|

_P = Programming ● D = Design ● C = Construction_
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Education and General

Smaller Renovation Projects
- University Park (22 Projects)  $90.8
- Commonwealth Campuses (11 Projects)  $42.3

Systems Upgrades
- University Park  $132.9
- Commonwealth Campuses  $45.8

Major Maintenance
- University Park  $142.2
- Commonwealth Campuses  $45.8

Energy Savings Program
- Energy Savings Program  $79.0

Information Technology
- System for Integrated Management, Budgeting, and Accounting (SIMBA)  $100.0

---

Education and General

Infrastructure
- Water Reclamation Facility  $65.2  C
- West Parking Deck and West Campus Road Extension  $60.6  D
- West Campus Steam Plant - Combined Heat and Power System  $49.0  C
- Utilities Renewal Program (Distribution)  $75.0
- New Construction Support - University Park  $15.7
- East Campus Thermal Storage  $12.3
- Projects <$10.0M (14 Projects)  $56.1

Total  $334.1

P = Programming  ● D = Design  ● C = Construction
## Appendix O

### College of Medicine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milton S. Hershey Medical Center - Innovation Pavilion for Research and Learning*</td>
<td>$321.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton S. Hershey Medical Center - Children's Hospital Overbuild</td>
<td>148.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton S. Hershey Medical Center - Parking Deck</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$504.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Projects underlined

### Auxiliary and Business Services

**'Catch Up' and New Buildings (and Additions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pollock Residence Halls Renovation - Phase 3A -- Ritner Hall, Shulze Hall, and Wolf Hall</td>
<td>$98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollock Residence Halls Renovation - Phase 3B -- Heister Hall, Porter Hall, and Shunk Hall</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Residence Halls Renovation - Phase 2B -- Bigler Hall, Curnix Hall, and Packer Hall</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Residence Halls Renovation - Phase 2C -- Hastings Hall, Snyder Hall, and Stone Hall</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Residence Halls Renovation - Phase 2A -- Geary Hall and Spraul Hall</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waring Dining Commons Renovation</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Student Center - Tully's Renovation - Berks</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park Airport Improvements (Mostly FAA-Supported)</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nittany Village Purchase - Harrisburg</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nittany Lion Inn Renovation</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$506.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**'Keep Up' - Deferred Maintenance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Food Services</td>
<td>$85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Services</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Services</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$108.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Intercollegiate Athletics and the Applied Research Laboratory

### Intercollegiate Athletics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center of Excellence</td>
<td>$188.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natatorium Replacement</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holuba Hall, Lasch Football Building, and Nittany Outdoor Football Practice Fields Renovation**</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Tennis Training Facility</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Practice Facility</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Field Renovation</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects &lt;$10.0M (3 Projects)</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$495.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Applied Research Laboratory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West II Replacement and West IV Replacement</td>
<td>$44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Park Road Purchase</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Thomas Water Tunnel Renovation</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Plant Relocation</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West IV Purchase</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects &lt;$10.0M (5 Projects)</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$143.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Priorities and Go / No Go decisions will be based upon return on investment results

** Design trending forward
O. Richard Bundy III, Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations, will present the Biennial Development and Alumni Relations Report.
BIENNIAL DEVELOPMENT AND ALUMNI RELATIONS REPORT

Dave Lieb
Senior Associate Vice President for Development
Faculty Senate Meeting
December 3, 2019

DIVISION OF DEVELOPMENT AND ALUMNI RELATIONS

• Office of University Development

• Penn State Alumni Association
RATIONALE FOR FUNDRAISING CAMPAIGNS

- Links institutional strategy to philanthropic partnerships
- Maximizes Penn State’s impact
- Defines fundraising priorities
- Creates urgency and focus – timeline and public goal
- Establishes greater accountability and ownership
- Invests more time and resources in fundraising enterprise
- Deepens volunteer engagement and partnerships
- Attracts and retains development staff

A GREATER PENN STATE IMPERATIVES AND THEMES

- Open Doors
  - Undergraduate scholarship support
  - Graduate fellowship support
- Create Transformative Experiences
  - Global Engagement
  - Digital Innovation
  - The Arts and Humanities
- Impact the World
  - Water, Food, and Energy Security
  - Human Health
  - Economic Prosperity
A GREATER PENN STATE
Time Elapsed: 60.0% as of June 30, 2019

Open Doors – Goal: $500M
Current Progress: $323.4M (64.7%)

Create Transformative Experiences – Goal: $225M
Current Progress: $149M (66.2%)

Impact the World – Goal: $475M
Current Progress: $464.3M (97.8%)

TOTAL FUNDRAISING PROGRESS – Goal: $1.0B
Current Progress: $1.1B (68.0%)

COMMITMENTS
Fiscal Year End – July 1 through June 30
**RECEIPTS**  
Fiscal Year End – July 1 through June 30

- **FY’11**: $274,832,041
- **FY’12**: $208,677,042
- **FY’13**: $237,779,280
- **FY’14**: $271,101,131
- **FY’15**: $225,998,105
- **FY’16**: $229,970,823
- **FY’17**: $202,918,823
- **FY’18**: $322,723,773
- **FY’19**: $240,311,685

**CAMPAIGN EXTENSION ANALYSIS**  
FY19 PROGRESS PLUS FY20 GOAL SETTING PROJECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Total</th>
<th>6/30/19 Progress</th>
<th>FY20 Goal Setting Targets</th>
<th>FY20 Goal Setting + Previous Commits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,600,000,000</td>
<td>$1,087,435,815</td>
<td>$407,531,000</td>
<td>$1,494,966,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIVE APPROACHES TO ANALYZE CAMPAIGN EXTENSION VIABILITY

- Continue Baseline
- Historical Forecasting
- Gift Officer Ratings
- Data Discounting
- Gift Officer Review

INPUT FROM UNIT ACADEMIC AND DEVELOPMENT LEADERSHIP

- Review of all data related to the extension analysis including detailed lists of prospects and related ratings information
- Input on an individual prospect level
- Opportunity to confirm current fundraising priorities and advance additional priorities
FUNDRAISING THEMES

- Successful conclusion of existing fundraising priorities
- Engineering complex
- New University Museum
- Consortium to Combat Substance Abuse
- Millennium Scholars Program
- One Penn State 2025

REVISED CAMPAIGN TIMELINE AND GOAL

- Extend the campaign by one year to conclude on June 30, 2022
- Increase the goal by $500 million
- $2.1 billion final goal for A Greater Penn State for 21st Century Excellence
NEXT STEPS

- Finalize unit goals
- Determine new goals for the three Campaign Imperatives and Additional Philanthropy
- Messaging and communications to support the new goals and timeframe

---

A GREATER PENN STATE – CURRENT GOALS

Time Elapsed: 66% as of October 31, 2019

Open Doors – Goal: $500M
Current Progress: $340.8M (69.4%)  

Create Transformative Experiences – Goal: $225M
Current Progress: $169.8M (75.5%)  

Impact the World – Goal: $475M
Current Progress: $490.6M (103.3%)  

TOTAL FUNDRAISING PROGRESS – Goal: $1.6B
Current Progress: $1.2B (75.0%)
A GREATER PENN STATE – NEW GOALS
Time Elapsed: 55.5% as of October 31, 2019

Open Doors – Goal: $656M*
Current Progress: $345.8M (52.9%)

Create Transformative Experiences – Goal: $295M*
Current Progress: $169.8M (57.6%)

Impact the World – Goal: $624M*
Current Progress: $490.6M (78.6%)

TOTAL FUNDRAISING PROGRESS – Goal: $2.1B
Current Progress: $1.2B (57.2%)

*Imperative goals shown are estimated based on percentage of original goal.
Final Imperative goals are still to be determined.
Who do we serve?

- 82% Alumni (141,731)
- 2% Parents (2,975)
- 3% Students (5,404)
- 13% Friends (22,659)

Total Members: 172,769
Streamed live and archived at alumni.psu.edu/huddlelive
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CITY LIGHTS
PENN STATE’S FACULTY AND ALUMNI STARS COME TO YOU

Jan 22
Fort Lauderdale

Jan 23
The Villages, FL

May 13
Harrisburg Campus

May 14
Philadelphia

May 28
Pittsburgh

Great Valley

QUESTIONS?
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Senate Constitution, Article II – Membership, Section 5 (Including World Campus Student Government Association)

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

Rationale

For the first time in its 21-year existence, World Campus students elected student government leadership to represent the voices of its thousands of on-line learners, an election that took place on-line the week of April 15, 2019. In order for the new government to advocate for the interests and concerns of World Campus’ more than 14,000 on-line learners, leadership needs access to a seat at the University Faculty Senate. The World Campus Student Government Association joins three other student-run government bodies at the University: the University Park Undergraduate Association, the Graduate and Professional Students Association, and the Council of Commonwealth Student Governments – all of which are welcome to the Senate.

Recommendations:

Recommended changes to the Senate Constitution Article II – Membership, Section 5 are as follows:

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

Section 5

(a) The following persons shall be ex officio members of the Senate: the President of the University; the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University; the Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School; the Chair of the Academic Leadership Council; the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education; the University Registrar; the Executive Director, Division of Undergraduate Studies; and any elected member of the Faculty Advisory Committee who is not an elected faculty senator.

(b) The President may appoint other University personnel to membership in the Senate on an annual basis. The total number of appointed and ex officio members (not including any member of the Faculty Advisory Committee) shall not exceed a number equal to ten percent of the elected faculty senators.

(c) The full-time, degree-seeking students at the University shall be represented by student senators elected by their units and by three ex officio student senators from undergraduate
student government organizations and one graduate and professional student government organization.

Student senators shall be allocated as follows:

(1) One undergraduate student from each of the colleges at University Park

(2) One student from each of the following locations or units:

- Penn State Abington
- Penn State Altoona
- Penn State Berks
- Penn State Erie, The Behrend College
- Penn State Great Valley
- Penn State Harrisburg, The Capital College
- Dickinson Law
- Penn State Law
- Division of Undergraduate Studies
- Graduate School
- College of Medicine

(3) Two students from the University College

(4) [Delete] Three [End Delete] [Add] Four [End Add] leaders of student government organizations, as follows:

(i) One representative of the University Park Undergraduate Association
(ii) One representative of the Council of Commonwealth Student Governments
(iii) One representative of the Graduate and Professional Student Association
(iv) One representative of the World Campus Student Government Association.*[End Add]

Whenever comparable units are added to the University or created through reorganization, each new unit shall elect one student senator. The term of a student senator shall be one year.

(d) The retired faculty of the University shall be represented by two elected retired faculty senators.

---

Revised Policy/Policies (Clean Copy)

Section 5

(a) The following persons shall be ex officio members of the Senate: the President of the University; the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University; the Vice President for
Research and Dean of the Graduate School; the Chair of the Academic Leadership Council; the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education; the University Registrar; the Executive Director, Division of Undergraduate Studies; and any elected member of the Faculty Advisory Committee who is not an elected faculty senator.

(b) The President may appoint other University personnel to membership in the Senate on an annual basis. The total number of appointed and ex officio members (not including any member of the Faculty Advisory Committee) shall not exceed a number equal to ten percent of the elected faculty senators.

(c) The full-time, degree-seeking students at the University shall be represented by student senators elected by their units and by three ex officio student senators from undergraduate student government organizations and one graduate and professional student government organization.

Student senators shall be allocated as follows:

(1) One undergraduate student from each of the colleges at University Park

(2) One student from each of the following locations or units:

Penn State Abington
Penn State Altoona
Penn State Berks
Penn State Erie, The Behrend College
Penn State Great Valley
Penn State Harrisburg, The Capital College
Dickinson Law
Penn State Law
Division of Undergraduate Studies
Graduate School
College of Medicine

(3) Two students from the University College

(4) Three leaders of student government organizations, as follows:

(i) One representative of the University Park Undergraduate Association
(ii) One representative of the Council of Commonwealth Student Governments
(iii) One representative of the Graduate and Professional Student Association
(iv) One representative of the World Campus Student Government Association

* Whenever comparable units are added to the University or created through reorganization, each new unit shall elect one student senator. The term of a student senator shall be one year.
(d) The retired faculty of the University shall be represented by two elected retired faculty senators.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

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

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

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate (and development of procedures when applicable)

Introduction and Rationale

The University Faculty Senate does most of its work in Standing and Special Committees. However, Senate Officers are unable to participate in regular committee meetings, vote on committee business, or participate in their caucuses during their terms of office because they are involved in leadership endeavors. The smaller the unit the more adversely affected the unit is when one (or more) of their senators is elected to be an Officer and, therefore, cannot sit on a Standing Committee and represent their college or campus.

In addition to diminishing unit representation on Standing Committees where Officers would otherwise be a voting participant, it also burdens the Standing Committees who need active members with expertise to fulfill their charges and produce their reports. For smaller units, this may mean their remaining senators can only serve on the two committees required by our standing rules, which leaves little or no room for those units to have additional voting and debate representation on other impactful committees. For the smallest units, this may mean their remaining senators cannot even serve on the three committees required by our standing rules. It also denies smaller units voices on the floor during plenary session discussion and debate because the role of the Officers is to represent the Senate as a whole rather than their unit specifically.

Consequently, the Committee on Committees and Rules recommends that units whose senators are officers should have the option to appoint elected alternate senators to serve in place of the officers and attend committee and plenary sessions with all the rights and responsibilities of all elected senators. In these instances, their terms will last only for the duration of the respective officers’ terms of office.

Recommendation

Recommendation 1: That Article I, Section 1 of the Senate Bylaws be and is hereby amended as follows:

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

(1) Article I – Officers Section 1

(a) The officers of the Senate shall be a Chair, a Chair-Elect, an Immediate Past Chair, and a Secretary.
(b) Elected Senators shall elect annually a Chair-Elect and a Secretary from among faculty members who are serving as elected faculty senators in the current Senate year. The Secretary shall be eligible for reelection but shall serve no more than three consecutive one-year terms. The Chair-Elect, at the end of one year of service in that office, shall automatically succeed to the office of Chair. The Chair, at the end of one year of service in that office, shall automatically succeed to the office of Immediate Past Chair. [Add] The units from which the Chair-Elect and Secretary were elected may provide elected alternates to serve on the Standing Committees of the Senate and in the Plenary Sessions of the Senate. [End Add]
MINUTES OF SENATE COUNCIL  
Tuesday, January 14, 2020 – 1:30 p.m.  
102 Kern Graduate Building


**Absent:** R. Jolly, R. Pangborn

Chair Rowland called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 14, 2020, in 102 Kern Graduate Building.

The minutes of the November 12, 2019 meeting were approved.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS**

The Faculty Advisory Committee to the President met this morning, and discussed:

1. Review of Faculty Advisory Committee (a.k.a., time for a little self-reflection).
2. Teaching Faculty Promotion Raises.
3. Digital Professionalism.
4. Specifying Appropriate Circumstances for Immediate Tenure.
5. Informational Report on Communication During and After a Crisis.
6. How peer institutions manage threatening behavior from students to instructors.

The next FAC meeting is scheduled for February 25, 2020. Please submit any topics for FAC consideration to any of the Senate Officers or the elected FAC members, Bonj Szczysgien Carey Eckhardt, and Rosemary Jolly.

**Remarks from the Chair:** None

**Vice Presidents’ and Vice Provosts’ Comments**

**Provost Jones** discussed changes to the way that Penn State reports graduation rates. Past Integrated Postsecondary Education Data system (IPEDS) 6-year graduation rate was from Penn State “Main Campus” but based on new requirements and the status of Penn State as one university, the new data will include all students across campuses. If a student starts at one campus and graduates from another, they
will be counted in their original campus graduation rate. This will mean that last year’s rate of 86% will drop to 69%. Work will need to be done to push this rate up. (Transfer students from outside the university have a graduate rate of 86% but they are not counted in the IPEDs data.)

The Provost also reported for Rob Pangborn who was unable to attend.

As of 1/12/2020:
- Total Applications to date are 82,474, an addition of 1,750 from previous week. Applications are down 2.5% from last year, mostly due to declining international applications, but up 42% from 2018.
- African American are up 2.5%, Hispanic/Latino down 0.5%, PA down 5.0%, Out-of-state up 2.5%, and International down 16.9%.
- Offers are at 44,795, up 35% from last year. UP offers are up 50.4%. Offers to Commonwealth Campuses are up 15.2% from last year and up 90.1% compared to 2018 owing to the Early Action program.
- Also due to the Early Action program, African American offers are up 30%, Hispanic/Latino offers are up 25%; PA offers are up 20%, Out-of-state offers are up 34%, and International offers are up 295%.

(Note: Decisions were sent prior to the winter break to the 50,000 applicants who met the November 1 Early Action application deadline and sent this past week to the 20,000 additional November Pool applicants.)
- Paid Accepts total 3,396, up 27.0% from last year (and an addition of about 400 over last week’s total).
- UP paid accepts are at 2,118, up 62% from last year and Commonwealth Campus paid accepts are at 1,278, down 6.8% from last year but up 4.3% from 2018.
- PA paid accepts are up 23%, Out-of-state paid accepts are up 42%, and international paid accepts are up 30%.

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Kathy Bieschke discussed ongoing Executive Searches. Two searches were finalized in December, Dean of the College of Arts & Architecture and Vice Provost for Global Programs. Steve Carpenter is the new dean of the College of Arts and Architecture and started his position on January 1, 2020. I want to thank Hari Osofsky for her leadership of this search. Our incoming Vice Provost for Global Programs is Roger Brindley from the University of South Florida, and Roger will be joining us in early April. Many thanks to Marcus Whitehurst for his leadership of this search.

Applications for 2020-2021 Administrative Fellows program are due January 30. Mentors this year are Nick Jones, Provost; Madlyn Hanes, Vice President for the Commonwealth Campuses; and Tracey Huston, Vice President for Outreach. More details about this program can be found on the website (vpfa.psu.edu). You need not be nominated to apply; self-nominations are welcome. If you know of someone interested in academic administration, or if you are interested, please consider submitting application. If you have any questions, you may contact me or any current or former administrative fellows (some of whom are in the room!).

Vice President for the Commonwealth Campuses, Madlyn Hanes discussed the work on the promotion to full professor task force. The taskforce has completed interviews in small group sessions and that information is being collated and will help with recommendations to increase the speed and rate of promotion to full professor for faculty at the campuses. There are chancellor searches underway at Berks, Abington and Brandywine.
**Vice Provost for Educational Equity, Marcus Whitehurst** discussed the Martin Luther King Dinner being held in the Bryce Jordan Center (This is a ticketed event). There are also Days of Dialog being held that will be moderated by Sam Richards. The University Community Survey will soon be distributed. A letter from President Barron will announce the survey and a personal link will be sent to each employee’s email.

**Vice Provost of On-line Education, Renata Engel** discussed the addition of an Executive Director of World Campus to focus on Enrollment Management and create an integrated team with units such as the Bursar and Registrar. World campus has done very well in the US News and World Reports. Of 350 institutions only Penn State rated in the top ten in six categories. Penn State World Campus was also commended for their support of veterans.

**Chair Elect, Beth Seymour**, None.

**Secretary, Judy Ozment**, None

**Immediate Past Chair, Michael Berebe**, None

**Executive Director, Dawn Blasko**, None

**Councilor’s comments**, None

**ACTION ITEMS**

Revisions to the “Guidelines for Review of the Establishment, Reorganization, Naming, or Discontinuation of Academic Organizational Units were approved and will now go to the Provost for approval. The Unit constitutions of Penn State Beaver and Penn State Berks were reviewed and approved. Editorial changes to change HR-23 to AC-23 were approved.

**GRADUATE COUNCIL.**

Kent Vrana announced that there is a new SARI training module that all new faculty must use. Best Practices of the National Academy might be brought back to PSU. Is it a hardship for faculty to be required to send their publications to ScholarSphere. The next meeting of Graduate Council is Wednesday, February 12, 2020.

**SENATE AGENDA ITEMS FOR JANUARY 28, 2020**

**FORENSIC BUSINESS**

Senate Committee on Education, “Encouraging Use of Affordable Course Materials.” A motion to place the report on the agenda was made by a Nousek/Ozment motion. 15 minutes was allotted.

**LEGISLATIVE REPORTS**

Committee on Committees and Rules, “Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article III Section 3 Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits”. A motion to place the report on the agenda was made by a Kirby/Eckhardt motion.
Committee on Committees and Rules, “Revisions to Standing Rules, Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment.” This report was pulled from the agenda by the committee for additional consideration.

Committee on Education, “Changes to Senate Policy 56-30 Withdrawal.” A motion to place the report on the agenda was made by Nousek/Ozment motion.

Committee on Student Life, “Proposed Senate Policy 89-00, Student Privacy Regarding Letters of Recommendation”. A motion to place the report on the agenda was made by a Kirby/Eckhardt motion.

**ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS: None**

**INFORMATIONAL REPORTS**

Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid, “Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded to Undergraduates.” The report was placed on the agenda on a Nousek/Ozment motion. The report will be presented on the web.


Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs, “Interim Report Senate Feedback on One Penn State 2025’s goal of Curricular Coherence.” The report was placed on the floor on an Eckhardt/Szczygiel motion. (15 Minutes allotted for presentation and discussion).

Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibility, “Annual Report for 2018-2019. The report was placed on the floor on a King/Szczygiel motion (5 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion).

Senate Committee on Global Programs. “Family Travel Approval Rates.” The report was placed on the agenda by a Stine/Hughes motion. (10 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion).

Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems and Technology, “Google Suite for Education”. The report was placed on agenda by a King/Mangel motion. (7 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion).

Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems and Technology, “Penn State GO Mobile Application. “Google Suite for Education”. The report was placed on the floor by a King/Mangel motion. (7 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion).

Senate Committee on Outreach. “Student Engagement Network.” The report was placed on the agenda on a Nousek/Hughes motion. (10 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion).

Senate Committee on University Planning. “Annual Capital Construction Report.” The report was placed on the agenda on a Stephens/Ozment motion. (15 minutes were allotted for presentation and discussion).

Senate Committee on University Planning. “Biennial Development and Alumni Relations Report.” The report was placed on the agenda on a Stephens/Ozment motion. (15 minutes were allotted for presentation and discussion).

Senate Committee on University Planning. “Penn State You Count!” Report on the Work of the Complete Count Committee. The report was placed on the floor on a Posey/Snyder motion. (15 minutes have been
allocated for presentation and discussion). The agenda was reordered by a 2/3 vote to place this report at the top of the Senate Agenda.

On a Sinha/N Jones motion, the agenda was approved for the January 28, 2020 meeting of the University Faculty Senate.

A motion was made by Eckhardt/Kirby to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 pm. The next meeting will be on February 25, 2020.

*Dawn G. Blasko, Executive Director*
Date: January 21, 2020

To: All Senators and Committee Members

From: Dawn Blasko, Executive Director

Following is the time and location of all Senate meetings January 27 and 28, 2020. Please notify the University Faculty Senate office and committee chair if you are unable to attend.

MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 2020

6:30 p.m. Officers and Chairs Meeting – 102 Kern Graduate Building
8:15 p.m. Commonwealth Caucus Meeting – 102 Kern Graduate Building

TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2020

8:00 a.m.
   Intercollegiate Athletics – 102 Burrowes Building
8:30 a.m.
   Committees and Rules – 201 Kern Graduate Building
   Educational Equity and Campus Environment – 315 Grange Building
   Faculty Affairs – 202 Hammond Building
   Faculty Benefits – 213 Business Building
   Intra-University Relations – 504 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building
   Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology–510A Paterno
   Outreach – 119 Outreach Building
   Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity – 502 Keller Building University Planning – 424 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building
9:00 a.m.
   Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid – 203 Shields Building
   Curricular Affairs – 102 Kern Graduate Building
   Education – 110C Chandlee Lab
   Global Programs – 412 Boucke Building
   Student Life – 613 Kern Building

11:00 a.m.
   Student Senator Caucus – 201 Kern Building

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

1:00 p.m.
   University Faculty Senate – 112 Kern Graduate Building
Date: January 21, 2020
To: Commonwealth Caucus Senators (includes all elected Campus Senators)
From: Rosemarie Petrilla and Michael Bartolacci, Caucus Co-Chairs

MONDAY, JANUARY 27 – 8:15 PM
102 KERN BUILDING
Guest Speaker:

Robert A. Kubat
Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education and University Registrar

Topic:
Reference letter requests from students: the do's and don'ts and University policies regarding these.

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

****************************************************
TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2020 – 11:15 AM
ASSEMBLY ROOM, NITTANY LION INN
A buffet luncheon will be provided at 12:00 p.m.

Agenda

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