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Chair Rowland: Ladies and gentlemen, please take a seat. Any seat that you like, since we don't have a chart today. It's 1 o'clock, Tuesday, January 28, 2020. And the University Faculty Senate is now in session.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Rowland: Agenda item A-- Minutes of the Preceding Meeting. The December 3, 2019, Senate record was sent to the university archives and is posted on the Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions? Very good. Seeing none. May I have a motion to accept?

[INAUDIBLE]

Is there a second?

Unidentified Senator: Second.

Chair Rowland: All in favor, say aye.

Senators: Aye.

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

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Rowland: Next, communications to the Senate. The Senate curriculum report dated January 15, 2020, is posted on the Senate website and appears as Appendix A.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Rowland: Minutes from the January 14, 2020 meeting of Senate Council are available at the end of our agenda, which include those topics discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President on that very same day.

The next FAC meeting is scheduled for February 25, 2020. Please submit any topics for FAC consideration to any of the Senate officers or elected members of FAC, which include Bonj Szczygiel, Carrie Eckhardt, and Rosemary Jolly.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Rowland: First things first, we have a new addition in the Senate. Please join me in welcoming Emily Derr to the Senate office. Emily will generally be working with Kadi on curriculum, but as a member of our multi-talented senate office, she will also support our plenary sessions, too. So, where did-

Unidentified Senators: She's probably still [INAUDIBLE].

Chair Rowland: That's how hard she works, people. She is still out there. [LAUGHS] So please welcome Emily when you get the chance.
Second-- OK. This is an item that we need to take with some earnest seriousness. On January 20, 2020, a day devoted to the Honorable Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a report was circulated titled "More Rivers to Cross," with the subtitle, "A Report on the Status of African-American Professors at Penn State University, University Park." The report is authored by Dr. Gary King and Dr. Daryl Thomas, quote, "on behalf of concerned black faculty at Penn State University."

The resulting document, and nearly 100-page examination of faculty composition, the role of SRTE's in higher education, and much more, is something that every Senator should read. It's been circulating quite effectively over the last few days. It's my hope that this report is the start of many conversations regarding what it means about us as a community.

Senate leadership is forming a working group to analyze the report, meet with its authors, and then report back to the Senate concrete options for the future. Feedback or reactions on the report can be sent to the Senate office, and we will see that the working group receives them. And it will be featured, of course, in their report back.

Also, this report, perhaps more than any other in recent memory, is a reminder of how important it is to participate in the institution's first University-wide community survey, which is an opportunity for all students, faculty, and staff members at Penn State's campuses to provide confidential feedback on their experiences and perspectives related to community, diversity, and inclusion. Emails with unique survey links will be sent to students, faculty, and staff coming right up. It's February 3, so there will be more on that to come.

Item number three-- as we enter into the spring semester and plan for the fall, one would be remiss not to pause and reflect on the value and importance of the work that we do in the Senate. Especially how and when to communicate that value outward to your divisional or departmental leadership when it comes time for your annual review.

In addition to underscoring the institutional value of our service contributions, it is essential for those individuals at the University responsible for scheduling the course calendar to provide faculty with teaching schedules that do not conflict with their service commitment. Senate leadership recognizes that exceptions must be made. So, we understand that, but go back and please do what you can to get a schedule that matches your service commitment.

According to Roger Egolf, our Senate Historian, the Senate has been holding their plenary sessions on Tuesdays for more than 50 years, dating back to 1966. So, the idea that we meet on Tuesday is a mystery to no one. So please take that into account as we move forward.

Fourth, last item-- the census. I'm a social scientist at heart, so I do like this one. April 1 is National Census Day, which means the 2020 census is a mere 63 days away. But who's counting? No. Kidding. Kidding, kidding, kidding. The results of this once-in-a-decade account determine congressional representation, inform hundreds of billions of dollars in federal funding, and provide data that will impact communities for the next decade. In short, it is important.

As such, our first report today, unsurprisingly sponsored by the Senate Committee on University Planning, has been moved up to the top of the agenda by Senate Council to underscore the significance of the contributions made thus far by the University's Complete Count Committee. The report, "Census 2020, Penn State You Count!" is something to bring back to your units and participate on there.
So that's all from the Senate right now. Moving on, we have comments by the President of the University. We respectfully invite Dr. Barron to take the floor.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

President Barron: I'm glad I wasn't any later.

Chair Rowland: Well, we try to run a tight ship around here.

President Barron: That's good. Well, hello. I'd like to start by talking about a report that I got Friday called "More Rivers to Cross," which I thought was very worthwhile reading. Important to remind us of challenges that we face, and very clearly are national issues. And there was a lot of content and research there in terms of a number of the topics.

But you look at it, and the report reminds us of four challenges that were also enumerated in 2013, one of which was the stagnation in terms of numbers of underrepresented minorities that are at Penn State. One was the challenge of finding opportunity in senior leadership for underrepresented minorities and what this meant for faculty and administrators who wish to move up in the ranks. Now, this is one for which I think the last couple of years, there have been some rather dramatic changes at Penn State.

One issue that was presented was based on transparency. We have lots and lots of data about this University. And the interesting thing about it is the stagnation in numbers contributes to less transparency because, as we delve into data, the sad part is that it becomes more likely that you can identify an individual, for which we are loath to do. So, it is interesting, in my mind, that stagnation in numbers also contributes to an issue which is a different type of transparency, and it comes off as trust us. We wouldn't tell you something that was not truthful about the data.

And the fourth part of the challenge was in terms of bias. All important issues. And I will tell you right now, I believe all four of those are challenges. I believe all four of those are a national challenge. I believe that's not an excuse for us not to be thinking about these issues at Penn State. We absolutely have to be thinking about these issues at Penn State.

And there is also embedded in this report, and a part of the scholarship of this report, a number of specific areas that are focused on. So, one is a labor issue, which many, many years ago I also described as diversity fatigue. And that is that every time we have a search committee, we want the search committee to be diverse. And if you have this tyranny of small numbers, that means we pick on the same people over and over again to be representative in a committee and have diversity to be there.

And so, a noble purpose, but it is literally a tax for those that are underrepresented in this University, where they have to do more, and a different type of job. It is actually more profound than a tax, and that's because if I, as a white male, join a search committee, I represent my scholarship. I represent my capabilities in looking at a candidate. Whereas, in many cases, a woman is asked to represent her entire gender, or an African American is looked at to represent their entire race.

We're all individuals. And just the notion of having to represent a whole community that extends beyond yourself is, quite frankly, absurd. And it creates this diversity fatigue, which is a problem, and which is why many, many times we say this is all of our jobs, not just a job that we assign to someone based on
their gender or their religion or their race. So an important issue that is with us and doesn't seem to go away, and, frankly, can't go away until we have a more diverse community.

Stagnation is an interesting issue from the viewpoint of the data, and the data that was presented in the "More Rivers to Cross." And I want to make sure that you know that I am not interested in challenging the conclusion that comes from that analysis.

We do know that something is not quite right in the last year that's done as a comparison. So, for instance, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences appears to have hired 50 faculty members last year. As a former dean, I can assure you that they have no place to put 50 people if they were added to that particular faculty. So, there is something in the transition here that is not quite right. But, fine. That something can be dealt with. This isn't something to be challenged on the data side because the numbers, and the growth of the numbers, are small. And they're too small.

We've seen some exciting things in terms of the number of students, underrepresented students, which went up dramatically last year, appear to be going up again dramatically. This is a good thing. But if you're going to count faculty numbers, we all should worry about what those outcomes are. And incidentally, it's one of the reasons why Millennium Scholars is so important to the University because this is a view that we need to grow our own in many, many cases. We need to have people starting from the beginning that aren't expected, in some cases go to college, but have the expectation that they will go on and get a Ph.D. and join the professoriate.

SRTE's are an important element of this particular report. Teaching effectiveness, in general, because there is a suggestion that the SRTE's have a level of bias. And I suspect that level of bias goes across a broad set of diversity factors in this University, and every university. And there's also the suggestion that is there that even a peer-to-peer review may have an element of bias.

There is no doubt in my mind that some level of bias exists. And sometimes, with some people, it's extreme. And a deeper question is probably, is that level of bias preventing people from reaching that next level in their advancement in this University. That's a different type of question than whether there is bias there.

OK. There are other areas, All In as an example. If you look at All In, the entire intent of All In was to address bias and being a more inclusive community. Taking the We Are, We Play All or We Play None, We Are Penn State, as this notion that everybody is a part of Penn State. This notion of, you look at someone, they deserve to be here. There's nobody on this campus that doesn't deserve to be here. And our first thought when we see that individual is you must be smart. You must have high value, or otherwise you couldn't be at Penn State University. Because we're a selective part University.

But interestingly, within a year and a half, All In appeared to be a PR campaign, some way to pat ourselves on the back and say We Are. We're Penn State. This is what our attitude is, while the issues of bias and everything else still reside there. And so, it had kind of a short lifespan here.

OK. Well, I look at all these issues and go back to those challenges. And the more I started to think about it, because there aren't answers that are there, and we have been working at this for a long time, with progress that's very slow. And in looking at this report, it really occurred to me that this is a shared governance issue. This is not my issue. It's not an issue that I kick to you. It's not an issue that I kick to a particular office. This is a shared governance issue.
If we're concerned about teaching effectiveness and the level of bias, then we collectively should be doing a better job of analyzing what makes a strong teaching effectiveness evaluation, because it's essential that we promote good teaching and good scholarship of teaching because that's what we're about in terms of educating people.

If there are issues that are related to the taxation of faculty and diversity fatigue, then it seems to me that, together, we need to be deliberately addressing these.

Transparency is an interesting issue. My suspicion is that many of you would feel much better if all that data was sitting there and you could see for yourself what the range of SRTE scores are like and what the level of, perhaps, bias might be with all the complexities that are inserted in there in that particular process. Or, in many other cases, if we're looking at salaries and other things, you would feel comforted by that. But again, with some of the numbers and some of the programs, you end up just being able to identify an individual. And that's something that we've protected. We've worked to avoid that level of identification.

And in the midst of all these things going on in Washington, DC, I all of a sudden thought about the fact that in Washington, DC there is a Gang of Eight that have higher security clearances. And they're individuals from the House and the Senate, four each, that can sit down and supposedly see all data. And so, part of this shared governance notion might be that we should have our own gang of six, or gang of eight, for which we have trusted partners that can give you more confidence, and the student body more confidence, that we're not trying to hide anything in here and this transparency issue isn't something that's deliberate to hide something.

So this institution must have a commitment to diversity. And more importantly, it must have a commitment to inclusion. And I read this report, and I think about those challenges. And those challenges could be two decades ago, or three decades ago, or yesterday. And the progress is slow. But I really am serious about inviting the notion of looking at some of these underlying issues. What an All In should look like so that it's not viewed as a PR campaign. What we might be able to do on the transparency side so we have individuals that can assure others of what the administration is looking like. How it is that you addressed teaching effectiveness. How it is that you make sure that you have balance workload issues.

And so I just want you to know that I was very happy to receive that report. Not all of it makes me happy. And there may be a data thing or two there that would improve upon it. But my feeling is the only way we can deal with this is not to assign the problem to someone, or to take that responsibility, but instead for us to work together on this particular issue.

I have one other topic that I would like to address, but it might be good to answer questions on this particular topic if you so desire.

Chair Rowland: I'm comfortable with that. Following up on your comments, actually, in terms of bias in teacher effectiveness ratings, it turns out that, in fact, just this morning Ann Clements, the Chair of Educational Equity and Campus Environment, brought an expert in to look at this very idea. So, it is firmly on our radar. And so, we are--

President Barron: Good.
Chair Rowland: --doing what we can to make progress on that. The concept of a trusted group of partners to look at confidential data with a level of transparency that is otherwise unprecedented is something that I will come right over, and we will talk about that for sure.

President Barron: Good.

Chair Rowland: Absolutely. Are there questions for the president? Please. Wait for the microphone, though, and make sure to announce your name and location.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

Tai-Yin Huang, Penn State Lehigh Valley: I just have a comment. I think-- I'm [INAUDIBLE]. I'm a woman scientist. So, we do experience a lot of biases in things that we experience. So, one of the things-- so I talk to other minority faculty, and one of the things that we're thinking is that Penn State is highly committed to diversity, inclusion, and to remove biases. But I think that is actually being-- we feel that that is, at the top administrator, they are very committed to that, but it does not trickle down to the campus level. It does not trickle down to the person-to-person level.

So hopefully there will be things that can be done to address that. And also, we want to see more actions taken so that instead of just saying that, oh, we want to increase the diversity and remove biases, we hope that there's actionable actions that can be done to remove that. Thank you.

President Barron: I appreciate that. And you do see a lot of these things in terms of-- I think it's-- we forget the numbers. AC-21, perhaps. Is it AC-21 that is for search committees and setting up rules?

Chair Rowland: It's 13.

President Barron: Rules and regulations-- what? 13? Which one's 21?

[INAUDIBLE]

Yeah. So, at some point I'm going to get a quiz on what all these numbers are. And then I'll quickly resign because I hate to get failing grades on anything. But at any rate-- but All In was actually designed to do that. Fascinating thing about it is, especially in the campuses, there are dozens and dozens of things that were reported on that were done. But somehow that doesn't connect. And I don't know how it does connect. So, then you start announcing things, and then it appears self-serving. And so, I haven't figured out exactly the best way to deal with those type of issues. But I take what you said very seriously in terms of how this message goes up and down in the University.

Another question before I do this next topic?

Alok Sinha, College of Engineering: Yeah. I'm Alok Sinha, College of Engineering. There is a report by Angela Lindsey from Schreyer Institute of Learning Excellence about SRTEs, which clearly says that SRTEs are not faculty evaluation, nor is it a measure of student learning. But still, I see that it is being treated as if it is a faculty evaluation or is a measure of student learning.

President Barron: Yeah. The SRTE-- and I think are our opinion is there's lots of room for bias in many
different characteristics, which is why it's so hard to analyze it. And I'd say there are two parts of this question and issue. One is the bias that enters into that preventing someone from advancing is a very different question than saying whether there is bias.

And two, what's the effort to try to systematically, and using modern practices, remove some of those levels of bias. Because we ought to be capable of actually sitting down with it, with enough people and their expertise, to be able to design a better instrument. So that's really the two things there that I--

Chair Rowland: Other questions?

John Liechty, Smeal College of Business, Eberly College of Science: Hi. John Liechty, Smeal and Eberly. White male, but also a statistician. I like, really, the point that you raised last. I'd like to maybe encourage that within the University, that I do think we have a lot of expertise in-house at the University. And this trusted group, and this group of experts to come together to try to address, to try to build-- I would love to see that come out of the Penn State community, as opposed to maybe from some external source. I think we do have an ability to do that, and I'd encourage you to consider that as a way forward.

President Barron: I agree. OK, the other issue that-- oh, sorry. There's a hand up back there.

Christopher Byrne, Eberly College of Science: Yes. Thank you. Chris Byrne, College of Science here at University Park. I'm just wondering if there's any possibility-- certainly Penn State is probably not alone with these problems. Is it possible to merge any of this data, maybe with other Big 10 schools, and deal with the small number of transparency? Maybe that could be another helpful approach.

President Barron: Yeah. So, I think one of the things that you appreciate about the "More Rivers to Cross" report is it's full of studies on a lot of these different issues. And they're national studies. They're not Penn State studies. So, there's no doubt that this is an issue that is one for which all of us could look at, and look at together.

And I'm sort of struck. And I don't know whether this would work or not. But just following up on your thought, as an AAU member, AAU has all these sets of criteria by which they define whether you belong in this 61, now 64, group of elite universities. And they put all the data together, and they give you the data that allows you to see how you stand in it.

So nobody else sees that part. But I get to see here's Penn State's total research dollars compared to the 64. Here is Penn State's research dollars per faculty member compared to the other 64. And it's actually a very useful kind of data set to be able to look at.

And so I could see something like that, where the Big 10 might look at this collectively and have this opportunity for us to compare because then, not only are you working towards a particular solution, or seeing common problems, but you also see if we are excelling in an area or failing in an area, which is valuable as well. It's always good to have those levels of benchmark. OK?

Christopher Byrne: Yeah.

President Barron: OK. So, I wanted to let you know that-- and Nicholas has been helping me with a representative from the Faculty Senate. But we know that food and housing security are a growing issue on campuses around the US. And there's lots of different attention to the issue. And part of the attention
to the issue is noting that individuals pay their tuition in order to go to school. And at some point, they run out of money, and what do they skimp on? Well, if it's really bad they skimp on housing and food. But an awful lot of people might skimp on food. So they go hungry or have poor choices because they simply don't have the resources to be able to eat.

I'm sort of reminded by the fact that when I first got my first apartment, and I was told my parents I don't need a meal plan anymore. I can save a lot of money. I can cook. I know how to make tuna casserole. I'm probably good. And my parents turned around and bought me a one-meal-a-day meal plan. And they told me-- I thought they were wasting their money, but they said we don't want there to be any day where you run out of money and don't have food security.

So it is interesting because we have a lot of students that run out of money and don't have food security, and they don't have a parent that bought them a one-meal-a-day plan. So, we have initiatives focused on access and affordability. We are sitting there saying that in the process of this, we're looking at the total cost of attendance when we're looking at a student. We know the total cost of attendance at Penn State can actually deter some people from coming to Penn State. All issues that are worth addressing.

And now we have all of these cost-saving measures that we're doing. One of them is to buy down the unfunded liability for individuals that are on the state retirement system at Penn State University. And if you look at that savings, a large chunk of it is in the education and general budget. But some portion of the savings are also in food and housing services.

I have an agreement with the board that we will look at these savings. And for the next two years half of it will go into innovation, and half of it will go into access and affordability. So now, if different segments not related to tuition in this University are having savings, what should I do with those savings? Because my commitment is access and affordability, and innovation-- to be looking at these as dual tracks.

We started to think more about the potential for food grants from those savings, and housing grants from those savings, none of these things that we have ever done before. And so, I must admit I was also focused on this because I've looked at the class gifts for the last four years, which were for mental health. They were for food bank. They were to have textbooks and digital material in the libraries for those who couldn't afford them. Our students are sending a message about their concerns about the welfare of their fellow students, as opposed to having a class gift that builds a gate, or has some other plaque, or a monument. I think it's an important message in it, and I'm taking it as this is what our students are doing. What are we going to do?

And then here's UPUA with their things that they're proposed. And what they're proposing is directly related to student poverty and issues related to student poverty. Or you look at CCSG and some of the things that they were doing. It falls in the same category. So, I think that we actually have an obligation--just like with Open Doors getting people to the finish line as opposed to here's a scholarship-- to start thinking in innovative ways on food security and housing security.

So I'm standing up a task force on this. I'm basically asking them can you sense how big the problem is. Do we have any way to do it? What are all the things that we're already doing? Where are the gaps that are included in these particular areas? And I'm asking them to come up with innovative approaches. I'm telling them not to be deterred by policy, current policy, because maybe current policy needs to change.
I'm actually asking them not to be deterred by state law. I've already had conversation with a key legislator about whether or not Good Samaritan laws should be adjusted so that perhaps we don't throw away so much food. I think there's a lot of possibility in this particular space.

And I've said be innovative. Let's be creative. Let's have an opportunity where Penn State is not just talking about scholarships. We're talking about making sure that those students aren't in their final exam week without anything to eat, or not living in their cars.

So this will be announced by the end of the week, along with the membership of the committee. And I just wanted to make sure you understood what I was doing and why. And I'm happy to answer any other questions. I realize I've taken a lot of your time.

Chair Rowland: That's all right. Questions for the president?

Ira Saltz, Penn State Shenango: Saltz, Shenango. First, I just want to say that I applaud you, Dr. Barron, for you have certainly devoted a lot of your efforts to low income and accessibility for our students. So, you should be applauded for that. Yeah, OK. Go. Go ahead.

[APPLAUSE]

Just to let you know, at Shenango, we have-- what do we call it?

Unidentified Senator: The Nittany Nook.

Ira Saltz: The Nittany Nook. Thank you. There's a room where faculty, staff, and anyone can donate food products forward so that some of our students who absolutely do not have funds for food can at least get something. It's small, and it's not perfect. But, yeah. It is definitely an issue, I know, at our campus, and I'm sure at other campuses. So, thank you.

President Barron: There's a lot of different activity. That's part of the reason why what are all the things that we're doing. One other element is the potential for philanthropy. At three different venues in New York, and in Naples, and in Fort Lauderdale, I have pitched this idea as could you imagine creating an endowment that was a food grant that fills someone's meal card, one meal a day, every day. It didn't allow you to spend all the points at once, but always made sure that you-- and I got a lot of positive impact.

So I think there's even a philanthropic part of this where people are thinking about helping a student to be successful, but they're not thinking in their head that they're not eating. Or what they're eating is not what they should be eating because of what they can afford.

We have a big food desert issue in this state in terms of fresh fruit and fresh produce. And you look at a food bank-- no refrigeration-- you can get a box of cereal, but you can't get milk to go with it. So, there's a lot here that we might be able to do that could be transformative. So that's what I'm hoping for.

Brian King, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Brian King, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences. I applaud our dean, Dean Kump, who brought this up in a faculty meeting in December with geography. In addition to food, I just wanted to very quickly emphasize a point on housing. The way that we would think about procuracy for our students and vulnerability is multifaceted, as we know. It's not
just in terms of how much money they have.

**President Barron:** Yeah.

**Brian King:** And so for folks in the room, I mean, even in Geography, we've had cases in recent years where we've been trying to support students who can't go home. They might be transitioning in terms of identity. There might be abuse situations.

And so I know at Global Programs we talk about international students who might be afraid to leave the country. And so, I know this is on the radar screen. But as we think about this, as we think about housing and food, to continue to take a holistic view on this. Because when we think about how our students are vulnerable, there's many ways that that plays out.

**President Barron:** I completely agree. I completely agree. And sadly, we don't even know the magnitude of the problem, so.

**Timothy Robicheaux, College of the Liberal Arts:** Robicheaux, Liberal Arts. I just wanted to add to that that it may-- I don't know what the task force is going to look like, but a social worker, a community social worker or one in here would be a really big deal on a group like this. Because a lot of this is going to be social work-related issues, both in terms of mental health, but also just in terms of social workers being really good people to sort of bring this together. So--

**President Barron:** I agree.

**Timothy Robicheaux:** When you're thinking about who ought to be on it, I'm sure faculty, but other people as well, so.

**President Barron:** Who did you nominate?

**Chair Rowland:** I think it was one Timothy Robicheaux.

**President Barron:** Yeah, I think it was, too.

[LAUGHTER]

**Timothy Robicheaux:** I'm not a social worker, though. [LAUGHS] I mean, I'm not [INAUDIBLE].

**President Barron:** Well, thank you very much, and-- oh, sorry. Go ahead.

**Janet Hughes, University Libraries:** Hughes, Libraries. I have three things to say. First, I just came back from a conference in which there was a whole session on cross-campus partnerships to make education accessible. And they talked about OERs and things like that. But a lot of it was about food banks, and on-campus food banks, and making them in a way that there is not a stigma to go to it.

**President Barron:** Yep.

**Janet Hughes:** The second thing I want to do is to thank you for mentioning the fatigue from being on diversity groups. Because when I first got to the Libraries I was on a lot of committees, and I kept
thinking am I here because they want me or because I am the token non-white librarian? And so, I stopped going to them, very simply.

Third question has nothing to do with anything you said today. But back in December, you gave a synopsis of the Board of the Board of Trustees presentation on the looming enrollment crisis. And you mentioned how important the campuses are to enrollment and retention and things like that. And when I gave my report to my faculty, this question came up.

It was written, "During times of enrollment flux, there's a perception that enrollment management practices create an internal competition between University Park and Commonwealth Campuses. So, what roles do campuses play in UP enrollment management? And what consideration is given to enrollment impacts, including student retention and recruitment at campuses in enrollment management and practices?"

President Barron: There's probably a lot of factors there. And it may be that Rob Pangborn would prefer to answer the question. But this is what I would say. We very much care about first choice. And we have advanced considerably, in time, the acceptance of students so that we promote acceptances at University Park, but at campuses. So that's a significant part of it.

And then there's a second part that's referral if University Park is not an option because it's full. And in doing this and moving the schedule up considerably, this enables us to do those referrals in a more effective way.

The third part of it, I would say is we've started now to really change what the marketing of the University is, so that people are seeing their campus, and seeing that as part of advertisements and more deliberate recruiting techniques. We also have things, if you haven't heard, about the discovery awards that the provost has set up that allows someone to come from out of state and get a substantial discount.

And interestingly, it becomes a possibility then, as well, that if you have underutilized housing, that you would rather have someone paying something than paying nothing. And so, housing grants, if that's something that becomes a possibility out of the task force also has the potential to work to change enrollments and enrich the group by pulling them from a broader catchment area.

So I would say we care deeply about the success of the enrollments of the campus. Of course, the other element about this is whatever you do for retention is a student that you don't have to recruit. All of these things are factors in this particular equation.

I really think one of the unfortunate things about what we saw in the aftermath in the press about that was this notion that we're experiencing this dramatic headcount decline. But at the campuses, we've had a deliberate effort to remove associate degrees-- not compete with community colleges. That's not who we compete with. This is a Penn State degree-- and move more towards the full-time student aiming for four years. That changes the credit-hour count.

The other thing is we don't report by campus, [inaudible] Campus numbers. We report them as a single number. But a lot of our campuses are generating a lot of credit hours for which they get resources.

So the bottom line actually is you have the state system that has a structural deficit. And you have our Commonwealth Campus system for which the revenues have been increasing and a considerable effort to
control costs. The campuses are far too important to us to think any part of an enrollment, or any other part of it, should be competition. There should be full-up support for every single entity in making sure that they're successful. And I believe that's what we're trying to do.

Rob, I don't know whether I did all right there? OK. I don't mind being corrected in public. I would rather be corrected in public than have something I say be wrong.

Chair Rowland: There's a question on MediaSite.

Anna Butler, Senate Office Staff: This comment is from Andrew Miles, Penn State Harrisburg. "I think that working to make Penn State more affordable in terms of housing and food is a great opportunity to help our students. As a student who goes through financial aid allocation each year, often the FAFSA and the student's parents' financial information does not showcase personal circumstances. Allowing those personal circumstances to be brought to the attention of financial aid through scholarships and grants is amazing. Thank you."

President Barron: Thanks. I agree.

Chair Rowland: Final questions? Very good. Thank you, President Barron.

President Barron: Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Rowland: Next, comments by the executive vice president and provost. We respectfully invite Provost Jones to the floor. Dr. Jones, please address the Senate.

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

Provost Jones: Thank you very much. Well, first, I think Eric addressed very effectively the "More Rivers to Cross" report. But I would be remiss if I didn't personally just share a few thoughts as well. So, I will do that.

And I'm going to begin with a slightly different approach from both Nicholas and Eric, and I'm going to say that I took it personally. I didn't take it personally because I was offended. I didn't take it personally because I was affronted by anything that was in the report. I took it personally because I was hurt by the notion that in our community there are people who are feeling the way that that report described. And I took that deeply personally.

I think "More Rivers to Cross" was a very appropriate choice of title for the report. We do have more rivers to cross. We have more rivers to cross. I think we have made progress. I don't think we've made enough progress. I would be the first to admit that despite many, many efforts, we have a lot more, a lot farther, to go.

I'm not going to stand here and talk about all of those things, or run through a list of well, we've done this and we've done that and so on. Some of them have been alluded to already. But there are more things that we can and should be doing. And I can tell you that we are absolutely committed to doing so, and hopefully in a way that we all can be proud in a few years of what we have achieved together.
There are issues to address at this institution. While we've made progress, there are some fundamental and systemic issues at this institution that we need to grapple with. I won't go into the gory details here, but they are there. And we need to address them. And I think Eric touched on some of those. And we will take those issues on, always striving to be better.

We have some great partners and leadership in this effort. And I don't want to call out a lot of people who are committed, but just four who are with us. Kathy Bieschke as Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, of course. Suzanne Adair, our Associate Vice President for Affirmative Action. Marcus Whitehurst, Vice Provost for Educational Equity. And of course, primarily on the staff side, Lorraine Goffe, our Vice President for Human Resources. This is a team effort at the leadership level. But we're only at the leadership level, and we will succeed or fail based on whether we can fully engage all of you in this process.

I actually like the question that you asked a few moments ago. I didn't want to leap up in front of Eric and answer it. But I will react. And I'm very sensitive to this issue about the degree of penetration within the organization we're able to get. And I think there's a key word that applies here, and one that I take very seriously. And its accountability.

I expect Eric, my boss, to hold me accountable for what I'm doing and for what I'm doing in this space. In turn, I hold the deans accountable for what—and the chancellors— for what they are doing in their units. And I expect the deans and the chancellors to hold their department heads and division directors accountable. And I expect those heads and directors to hold their troops or faculty accountable for what's going on in those units. This has to be there.

But the one most important accountability issue is all of us have to hold ourselves accountable. And I can certainly assure you that that is what I am and will continue to do. And I think many of my colleagues share that. We are holding ourselves accountable to do better in this space.

So I'll stop there. And maybe I should just pause, too, to see if there are any questions. I think we've had a good discussion about this, but I just wanted to make sure that you knew that I am 100% with the president on this issue.

Chair Rowland: Questions for the provost please?

Tai-Yin Huang: I like that you're saying that the leadership on each campus or unit should take it very seriously. Because the leaders, how they react to these biases or lack of inclusion really set the tone for the campus, or for the units. So, what I'm saying here is that at campus level—I made a list of what they are from the people that I talk to. It seems that the campus leadership, they tend not to address this kind of issue that is brought to their attention. Maybe they just think that this kind of thing may not be dealt with. It's best just to put it under the rug.

So I think how to address, look at the issue, and not just try to turn away from the issue would be very important, especially for the campus leadership. And also, for the other leadership.

Provost Jones: Yes. Thank you. And I would just say that it's my expectation that we all hold ourselves accountable. And if we have people in our organization who are not doing that, we can facilitate.

Julia Bryan, College of Education: Provost, I appreciate what you've said. But we know that we live in a society where it seems systemic inequities are perpetuated so easily, even without trying. Even with good intentions. And, yes, it's great to say we should hold ourselves accountable. In fact, that's something I tell my kids. It doesn't work very well.

So what are some strategic policies that you and your leadership are putting in place to address this issue? Because it concerns me that there are only three black female professors in an institution like this-- full professors in an institution like this.

It also concerns me that in the last 30 years the numbers have changed by three. The numbers of African American or black faculty have changed by three. And even with good intentions, and all the strategic plans over the years, and all the things that you all have done, this is the situation. And it seems to me that you have to be really intentional. So, what are some of the policies that you have put in place, and are going to put in place, to address this issue? Because nothing will change otherwise, even with good intentions.

Provost Jones: Right. Well, first thank you. And I 100% agree with you. Good intentions are just talk. They need to be translated into deeds and actions. So, I think of the-- and I'm not making excuses for why the numbers have not changed as we would have hoped that they would have over the last several years. But I think we have shifted some of our focus to the fundamentals, and policy, and practice, and procedures, and guidelines.

Eric mentioned AC13. There's also AC22. These are guidelines for hiring. These, I think, are just with the Senate now. Right?

Unidentified Senator: AC13 just came to the Senate.

Provost Jones: AC13 just came to the Senate. This represents the result of at least a year of very, very hard work to ensure that the expectations that we have as an institution relative to inclusive hiring practices are not just sort of in the preamble section, but are in the core of the guideline itself.

There are other examples I could give. I don't want to take too much time. But the focus is on building robust, sustainable infrastructure that, when implemented, will help us over a sustained period to really bend the curve in the direction that it needs to go. As opposed to just looking for a win here, a win there, maybe a quick win somewhere else, really focusing on the fundamental way that we are doing business and addressing some of those systemic challenges that are really ingrained in parts of the institution.

I know that may be not quite specific enough, but I think it's sort of an example of what we're trying to get at here. If we don't go more fundamentally and more deeply into the way that we do business, we're always going to be stuck with numbers that are stagnant. So that's where we're really trying to get in and fundamentally change the approach.

Chair Rowland: Further questions?

Greg Shearer, College of Health and Human Development: Yeah. Greg Shearer, College of Health and Human Development. I just wanted to share some of my frustrations, or some of my confusion.
When I serve on hiring committees and stuff, I feel like I have asked the chair, the dean-- I've asked some of the diversity people in our college and stuff. And I never get a straight answer in terms of where's our obligation.

When we create a hiring committee, are we obligated to hire proportionately from the field that applies? Or are we obligated to-- and what is our specific role? Because if we talk about this, it's one thing to recognize this as a problem at the University-wide level. But where it actually gets solved is at the level of actually doing the work.

And if you don't know, if you're not clear, if the administration is just telling you, we'll solve the problem, and be fair, and all that, it becomes-- if you could give me, on that committee, all right, well, this is what we want you to focus on. Either try and reach out to places where you could have more inclusion and more diversity-- all right. I can do that. Or look. We'll take care of that part, but you just take care of the part of being fair and equitable in the decisions that you make as a committee. I can do that. But I can't be the solution to everything. So, if we could just kind of narrow that down a little bit for us, I think it'd be helpful.

**Provost Jones:** Yeah. I think certainly at a high level, these are the sorts of things we're going into with AC13 and AC22. But can I just shout out to Suzanne Adair here, who-- I want this back.

**Suzanne Adair: Associate Vice President for Affirmative Action:** You can have it back.

[LAUGHTER]

Suzanne Adair, He can have it back. So, a couple things. Sorry, Marcus. Don't want to put my back to you. So, from the affirmative action office's standpoint, that's exactly the right question to ask. It is exactly the work that we're doing. And actually, I have a couple of things to address.

But one, we have not done the best job walking through our affirmative action plans for our colleges and our campuses. That's a primary management tool. It looks at how we monitor our hiring practices. It tells us where we need to go, tells us what we look like. It specifically talks with us and tells us about what the availability is for particular groups of folks that we need to be looking for.

In the last, probably, six months I have walked through the affirmative action plans with all of your deans. Although we've had four new deans, so I have to do those colleges all over again. But with your deans and your HR strategic partners, we have sat for an hour, 90 minutes a pop, to go through those plans to make sure the deans know what those plans are, what they're used for, what each component is, and then how to think about best practices to address exactly what you're addressing.

Just started doing that with all of your campus chancellors. So, we're on about number seven of your campuses. And we'll move to the non-academic units, so basically President's Council folks. Moving to do that same kind of deep-level review with all of our non-academic units. So that's one piece.

Somebody had another comment I was going to address, and I've lost it that quickly.

[INAUDIBLE]

So AC13. So, we have gone through that. There was not a lot in AC13 about diversity, equity, and
inclusion. There was almost nothing in there. It's clear to us that we needed to add that. So Kathy and I've been hard at work for that almost a year, about a year to really work through that policy and make things a lot more clear about what our expectation is, as Nick said, and then what some of the best practices are.

As I listened to Eric talk about the diversity fatigue, it occurs to me that part of what we talked about in that policy, in the revision, is that we do need to have diverse search committees. How we're going to balance that with not overtaxing folks, I think is an issue. And a lot of questions came to us. But we made sure to get feedback from a number of folks, a number of groups of folks. Some of you in here gave feedback on that.

Same thing with AC-22 around academic administrative hiring. So, we just didn't say a lot. It's time for us to say a lot. And it's time for us to put that into action and figure out how to do that.

Secondly, in terms of the campuses, I took my AAO team to every single campus last spring and summer. I met with all of your chancellors and leadership teams, specifically to talk about your climate. Specifically, to talk about what are the challenges. What are the things you all struggle with? What do you need to work on? Where can we be supportive? What do we need to do to provide resources? A lot of that was around hiring, and folks feeling like they didn't necessarily have the resources, or the know-how, and figure out where you create some of those pipelines.

So there's a lot of work happening behind the scenes, some of which you probably have not heard. So, we wanted to make sure that you heard that from me today. There's more, but I'll give the mic back.

Provost Jones: And if I could just add to Suzanne's comments that this is what the affirmative action office at the Pennsylvania State University now looks like. There was a time not too long ago where the affirmative action office was a place to which you complained if there was an issue that needed to be addressed. I think you can tell from Suzanne's comments and her approach to sort of re-envisioning this office, she is taking a much more active stance to reach out and-- to your question, specifically-- provide help, not only guidance, but help and assistance across the institution to folks to do better in this space.

Karyn McKinney, Penn State Altoona: Karyn McKinney, Altoona. Just thought that there was another element that has to be considered in all of this. And that is something I've heard from various committees I've served on, Core Ed and other committees interested in diversity and inclusion. And that is the communities that we all live in.

I know in Altoona it's not a very diverse community. And I've heard repeatedly from diverse faculty, faculty of color, that, even if we can recruit candidates here to be interviewed, they don't want to live in a non-diverse community. So, I'm not sure what the answer to that is. I've heard it repeatedly over the years. But we have to do something in our communities to make them work with the community to make it a more welcoming place for diverse faculty, I think.

Provost Jones: Yes. Agreed 100%. We do work with our community, but of course we can work with them as constructively as we can. But that is an issue that we need to address as well, for sure.

Chair Rowland: Kadi, on your right again. Could you remind us of your name and unit, please?

Kadi: Go ahead. Your name and campus.
Julia Bryan: Julia Bryan, College of Education, UP. So, yeah. Yeah, there are lots of university locations that are not diverse. I've lived in a few of them. And there's challenges for anyone you're going to hire. If you're going to hire someone with kids, they're looking at the schools. There will always be challenges.

And yes, I appreciate what leadership have done so far, and appreciate what the affirmative action has done so far. But be clear. We need to understand what the best practices are in our field. What are other provosts and presidents doing? I just read an article the other day about University of Massachusetts Boston and how they diversify. They talked about the fact that often we're highly specialized in the faculty we're looking for. So we're looking for faculty that are doing these little things.

What the provost did at UM Boston is to put aside a fund that every time there were going to hire, if they were going to hire someone highly specialized in one of these little areas that we all have in our fields, they would also do an additional hire for someone who qualified or met the diversity criteria.

We got to put our money where our mouths are. And, yes, affirmative action and all these things are great. In the College of Ed, what I've seen work when I sit on search committees is our dean coming and charging us. Dean Monk would come and charge us-- if you find a faculty of color who is qualified, there is no reason that you should not be interviewing them.

Our new dean does the same. And in addition, she requires us to have a diversity recruitment plan. How are we making our pool, or expanding our pool, so that it's diverse? If it is not diverse enough, she sends it back to us. More work to do.

Provost Jones: Good.

Julia Bryan: So there's things that we have to do beyond the affirmative action training because sometimes your dean-- if your dean isn't on board and the search committee-- I've been in search committees where I've had to challenge people who said, well, we're going to focus on excellence, not diversity. Well, excuse me. Diverse candidates are excellent. I'm one of them. There are many. So that is no excuse.

But also, we are not aware of our biases. They slip into the conversation. Well, let's not focus on diversity. Let's focus on excellence. Well, they can be one and the same. Just like you can have a white candidate who is not excellent, and you can have one who is excellent, they can be one and the same.

So I think-- sometimes I get frustrated because we have all these wonderful strategic plans, and diversity initiatives, and so on, but we need to go a step further and put some will behind it so that when we are searching, everyone's on the same page and saying, yeah, I am going to look for candidates of color. Otherwise, we're going to be stuck in the same place 10 years from now.

Provost Jones: Yeah. I agree 100%. That is our expectation. And I'm very pleased to hear that Kim is taking perhaps an even more aggressive approach than David did before her.

I will point out that, in terms of the first part of your comments about putting our money where our mouth is, part of the reason David was able to make a statement like that to committees is that the president's office provides resources to deans and chancellors to support hiring of folks from traditionally underrepresented groups. And we've expanded the scope of that program over the last several years, and
it works very well. In fact, I approved a request this morning for one of our campuses, actually.

So we are putting resources into that. We've expanded the scope of the program. And we can certainly look at-- it's our intention to continue that investment, and if there are opportunities to invest further, we certainly will. So, I'm 100% with you on that. We need to put our money where our mouth is.

Christopher Byrne: Hello? Ah. Chris Byrne, College of Science. On that theme of putting your money where your mouth is, what I've always noticed-- and I've been here for a long time, over 30 years. And I can't be critical of-- I'm not in the right position. It's easy to be a critic from the outside. But I'm not sitting in your place.

I know that there tends to be-- you make policies, and you want the deans to carry them out. And the deans make policies. They want department heads to carry them out. But if there aren't hard incentives attached to that, then when push comes to shove, people are going to make sure-- it's my outlook, you could say, that people follow local incentives, right?

When push comes to shove, just like the theory of the firm had to be corrected many years ago because they realized that the managers of the firms were not necessarily optimizing the profit of the firm. They were optimizing their own salary-benefit package, et cetera. And the same thing with the deans. You can have a great policy, and when you make money available, like you just said, you are removing an obstacle, and that's good. But that money doesn't go in their pocket. So, you are removing an obstacle, but it's not quite the same as a direct incentive to the dean to make sure they diversify the faculty.

Now, when you put too much strong incentives in place, then you could be accused of micromanaging. And there's a philosophy that says you can't go too far with micromanaging, and I respect that, and that's what you guys have to figure out. But I am just noting that without real incentives, you can have all the guidelines you want and it still comes down to the individual deans, the individual hiring committees. And if there's bias, or if there's someone who doesn't care, then nothing's going to happen.

And having been here over 30 years, I kind of attribute a lot of the problem to the fact that there is so much delegation, that there's great ideas coming from Old Main, and where the rubber meets the road-- as my colleague over here was saying-- action isn't taken, for whatever reason.

And there's two kinds of incentives, right? There are carrots and there are sticks. And again, that's all that you guys are the expert decision-makers to figure that out. But without tangible incentives for people, if the only thing they get a raise or promotion based on is the academic glory of their department, then things are going to continue to change really slowly. There need to be some actual incentives to overcome this diversity situation, I think.

Provost Jones: So, two quick reactions. One, I think in talking about holding people accountable, clearly, tied up with that is the notion of incentives, or carrots and sticks. If you're not being accountable, then we will hold you accountable. If you are being accountable, then you will be appropriately rewarded. I don't want to degenerate this to make it sound too crass, or about money, but accountability is important.

Second, I would just say, personally-- and call me Pollyanna, but the greatest incentive of all is doing the right thing. That has to be an incentive and a way of thinking that permeates the institution. That has to be. If that doesn't drive our decisions and our actions, then we have a problem.
Chris Byrne: Could I-- just a quick follow-up on that last point? I used to do a lot of work for the Marine Corps. And they had a process analysis and so on. And they had a firm philosophy that they wanted policies in place so that the job getting done right did not depend on the person doing the job. If whoever did that job followed the rules of the job, the job would get done right.

I mean, I agree with you. Doing the right thing is a great reward to those who have that level of enlightenment, or whatever you want to call it to appreciate that. But it's just not the case that everybody does. I mean, I would love it if everybody-- if everybody shared that view, we probably wouldn't have this problem.

So I do believe that we should encourage great attitudes, of course. But it's another thing to completely rely on them.

Provost Jones: We don't completely rely on it. I think that's why we hold people accountable.

Chair Rowland: OK. Last question for the provost. David, it looks like you already have--

David Smith, Associate Dean for Advising and Executive Director, Division of Undergraduate Studies: This is not really a question, but really just a comp--

Chair Rowland: Could you remind us who you are?

David Smith: I'm sorry. David Smith, Division of Undergraduate Studies. I really appreciate the comments that have been made, both President Barron and Provost Jones. One of the things that I think is really important that we-- both of you really spoke to the idea that we're responsible for this in terms of finding solutions.

And so really in the fact as a privileged white male, one of the things that I haven't heard, really, are the words race or racism. And I think we need to really face that and own that race and racism, among other forms of stratification, are factors at our institution, as well as within society. And so, I think we really need to own that piece of it and address that head on. I don't think that you're not, but I think that's the--

Provost Jones: Thank you.

David Smith: --comment that we have to--

Provost Jones: Absolutely.

[APPLAUSE]

Provost Jones: Thank you, David.

Chair Rowland: Do you have anything further to say?

Provost Jones: I do.

Chair Rowland: OK.
Provost Jones: As a matter of fact.

[LAUGHTER]

I know everybody's shocked. But just some quick updates on other matters. I promised to keep you all updated on the progress of the Strategic Budget Task Force implementation. So, here’s the latest on that. Each of the four working groups have convened and are scheduled to meet regularly through the end of the calendar year. The working group membership includes Faculty Senate representation. On the Budget Approach working group, Roger Egolf. Salary and Job Classification, Michael Bérubé. Capital Planning, Laura Pauley. And Multi-year Planning, Josh Kirby.

The Budget Approach Working Group has the most ambitious timeline for deliverables that are driven by SIMBA, go-live on July 1, 2020. Remember July 1, 2020, SIMBA.

The Salary and Job Classification Working Group is delivering its timeline and identifying deliverables resulting from the SIMBA go-live on July 1. Both the Capital Planning Working Group and the Multi-year Working Group timelines are actually not impacted by SIMBA go-live and are developing their timelines based on other factors. For example, planning beyond the current 2018 to 2023 capital plan.

We are also co-hiring a communications specialist to help manage effective communications about the progress of each of these working groups to the Senate, to the leadership of the institution, and beyond.

Update on searches-- we are off and running with the search for the dean of the Eberly College of Science to replace Doug Kavanaugh. The chair of that search committee is Lee Kump, Dean of Earth and Mineral Sciences. We have a search firm assisting us, Russell Reynolds. And the charge meeting is Friday of this week.

Dean of University Libraries and Scholarly Communications to replace Barbara Dewey. Peggy Johnson, Dean of the Schreyer Honors College is chairing that search. Our search firm is Isaacson Miller. And the scoping meetings and committee charged meeting is scheduled for February 11.

And then finally, our Vice President for IT and CIO, Clive Randall, Director of the Materials Research Institute, is chairing that search. Search firm is WiffKieffer. The job ad is submitted today. And zoom interviews are tentatively scheduled for mid-April. I'm not sure if we have any candidates yet, given that the ad was placed today, but tentatively scheduled for mid-April.

Our task forces-- just a reminder of the three that I have out there. One is the Tuition Task Force. The second is the Foreign Influence Task Force. And the third is the task force that is focused on international student recruitment. Those are all off and running and doing their work.

And then finally, strategic plan. We are in the review and refresh cycle for the strategic plan. The revised strategic plan institutional-level draft assessment and resources to kick off unit planning have been posted to the strategic planning website. The strategic planning website also has been updated with all-new information. This work is a combination of activities from our assessment of the plan to-date. We took what we learned about our planned progress since 2016 and used that to iterate the institutional plan moving forward.
I can tell you that over the break I spent some time editing that plan, and it is substantially tighter than the plan we had before. So, I think some really good changes there. I encourage you to take a look at it.

The unit planning process is beginning. We're looking forward to high energy and good thinking about shaping the way in which Penn State will move forward through the work of the unit plans to 2025. And at that juncture, I'd better stop, I think.

Chair Rowland: Yes. Thank you very much, Provost Jones.

[APPLAUSE]

OK. Agenda items for January 28, 2020. First item in our reordered agenda today is an informational report, "Penn State You Count," report on the work of the Complete Count Committee, sponsored by the Senate Committee on University Planning. Charima Young, Director of Local Government and Community Relations, and Mike Stefan, Director of State Relations, will present this report. Please take the podium. The floor is yours.

**Special Informational Report**

**Census 2020: Penn State You Count!**

**Report on the Work of the Complete Count Committee**

Mike Stefan, Director of State Relations: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for allowing us to come and brief you all on Census 2020. It was nice to hear your remarks at the beginning, an expression of support for the census.

Basically, what Charima and I are doing is a bit of an education and awareness campaign. What we're finding now, as we've been talking with a lot of folks, is that our students were likely around the age of eight to 12 years old the last census took place. And for faculty and staff, we've all kind of compartmentalized that as something that happened 10 years ago, and not something that we deal with on a normal basis.

So thank you again for having us. For those that have heard this presentation previous, I apologize. But we'll try to keep it moving for everybody.

So if I may, I'll start with some brief Census 101, what it is for, how we use it, and so forth. It happens every 10 years. It started in 1790. The results of the census are generally for reapportionment in the U.S. House, the State House, and State Senate, as well as determining how many seats we have. So not just the maps, but the numbers.

Filling out the census, like voting, is part of our participation in democracy. It means the distribution of about $675 billion across the nation. That money is being spent on schools, hospitals, roads, public works, and other vital programs.

Residents use the census to support their community initiatives, involving legislation, quality of life, consumer advocacy. Businesses use data to decide where to build factories, offices, stores. Government uses the data for education planning, procurement, and services, infrastructure planning, allocating resources, and much more. And then major stakeholders such as higher ed institutions use the data for research, planning, educational curricula, and statistics and metrics.
College campuses, as we will note in a little bit, are also considered a hard-to-count population, something that often is overlooked and not really considered.

And then finally, the data we all provide is protected, something that I think, at least in this census, is brought to question. And it is protected. It is federal law that even the Census Bureau cannot share the information they collect with other federal agencies.

So the importance of Census 2020 to Pennsylvania. You've heard the figure $675 billion. But more locally, that equates to $26.8 billion annually to fund programs in Pennsylvania. Looking at our population, that is actually just a little more than $2,000 dollars per citizen per year. So when we respond to the census, we're not only impacting how, perhaps, politics may play in Pennsylvania, but we're also impacting how we're helping Pennsylvania schools, communities, and others who maybe receive medical programs like Medicaid, and Medicare, and SNAP, and CHIP.

I think most often, though, we think about political representation, right? So, we think of our maps. Pennsylvania is predicted to lose a congressional seat, so we will be going likely from 18 seats to 17.

And then in 2016-- even more local. I'll talk on state college here for a moment. The borough even uses these programs. So, when we talk about community development block grants, these types of things have an impact when we all complete the census.

We even additionally just heard just this past week that they even sometimes will look at population centers. So, State College, for example, under the census in the borough, may say 47,000, but that puts us in a different category compared to, perhaps, towns and townships that maybe measure from 50,000 to 100,000, or 150,000 in population. So it can impact even just how we are measured upon peers.

This slide is actually from a previous presentation, but Steven Shope is our regional individual that has been helping us with a lot of this effort, and had the opportunity to come in and brief President's Council about what we were doing. So, I wanted to also take a moment to just inform people about a topic called Group Quarters. This impacts colleges, nursing homes, prisons, other large areas where we would have, essentially, responsibility over certain people that perhaps live on our property, i.e., dorms.

Group quarters is a perfect way to help improve how we do census. Group quarters is something that already is basically starting. So, in February, they will start reaching out to universities, Penn State included, on how we want to approach our group quarters. And then, starting Census Day, they will conduct the Group Quarters enumeration.

These are the methods by which-- so just a good example of how things are changing from census to census. Last census, there were actually individuals that were sworn by the Census Bureau to sit in dormitory halls and basically just interact with everybody walking in or out. Well, now that census is now online, where most people will likely do their census online or via phone, we can now-- and we've just received a letter from US Department of Education that will allow us to do the-- can I do this? No. It doesn't work. The electronic response data transfer. So what we're hoping to do as a university is be able to already apply or deliver a lot of that information without having to go individually and dorm-by-dorm, which will be, hopefully, a very large help to the area.

Lastly, before I hand this off to Charima, this, I think, is a nice reminder and visually what this can mean
to Pennsylvania. $16 billion in medical assistance programs, $2.7 in supplemental nutrition, highway and planning, $1.6, and so forth. And these are just, I think, some of the more top-line examples that we don't always think about of having impact. But I think for this audience, too, the research side is obviously a really large component to why this is so important.

So before I hand it to Charima, we often like to point out that Penn State Harrisburg and some of the research faculty there, through the Pennsylvania State Data Center, have a really large role in not only what we do with the Penn State Complete Count Committee as a partner, but they are also a partner of the state's efforts statewide. So working on the Group Quarters and other groups and enumerators, they're a pivotal role, and have been since, I believe, the first Bob Casey was governor, who, through executive order, appointed them as the state's data center.

So with that, I will pass this off to Charima.

Charima Young, Director of Local Government and Community Relations: Thank you, Mike. And it is so pivotal that we were just talking about food security and social service support resources that are here in our community and many others. And a lot of the aid and funding that they receive is a trickle down from the moneys that we receive from census, so I think that's important to note, even when we are educating our students.

I'm going to talk to you a little bit about why we are a target audience for census. And 2010 Census reported that our response rate was pretty low. In comparison to the State of Pennsylvania, who had 81.8% response rate, we had a 40% response rate at University Park and at State College Borough, 30%. So, pretty low. We have to get those numbers up for a lot of reasons.

Of course, we need that funding. But some of the barriers that we faced was a lot of students did not know that they were supposed to be counted here in Centre County. Also, apathy and a whole bunch of other barriers that we have addressed, and you'll see in another slide. But education was the foundation, I think, and the lack of response rate.

And what we mean by response rate is the fact that census did not have to come out to actually report. There is a first segment of this, which you'll receive your forms to fill out, either via mail, or maybe you'll get an email or something like that. But if you do not complete it, enumerators come out, and they actually take the count. So, this is before enumerators come out to take the count.

I want to talk to you a little bit about what happens locally and what we are doing here locally. Of course, it has to be a collective effort. That town-and-gown relationship is very pivotal when it comes to census and many other things that we do.

So a little bit about the Complete Count Committee. You see State College Borough, and they have a number of different organizations throughout the community that are represented on their Complete Count Committee, including other townships. So, we have the borough, who is leading the charge, but you have the surrounding townships within the Centre region. We're also on their Complete Count Committee, working together.

We know that a lot of our students live off campus, and those are the ones that we're really most concerned about are the off-campus students. As Mike mentioned, group quarters I think we have mostly under control because those dormitories are within our property. But for the students who live off
campus, those are going to be the really hard-to-reach populations.

We also have Centre County that has their own Complete Count Committee. And we also sit on theirs and Bellefonte. Bellefonte Borough has their own Complete Count Committee. So, you'll hear information coming out from the county, as well as some other areas throughout the county. And then Mike probably mentioned the State of Pennsylvania, which he sits on their Complete Count Committee as well.

So Penn State being as large as it is, covering the state of Pennsylvania, we are a strategic focus, not only for the state, but actually nationally. We are getting some national U.S. Census Bureau folks coming here to visit us. And the reason why is because of our reach. They know that we have students all throughout the Commonwealth. And how we reach out to the community and our relationship in town and gown, not just at UP, but also Commonwealth campuses is very important.

So who sits on our Complete Count Committee? You see a number of different internal departments, including the Commonwealth Campuses that sit on our committee. And we're all working together to determine what the marketing strategy is, what type of messaging we need to put out, what kind of frequently asked question material do we need to put out to you, as well as some of your colleagues on staff, and, of course, the students.

So these are the things that we are working on together. We know that some of our international students probably don't know a lot about census, so that is going to be a big focus. So, you see global programs up there. Languages-- so we want to translate marketing materials in different languages. And we have a Student Organization Subcommittee. So, we have the students working to see what type of tactics are going to reach their peers.

I talked a little bit before about those challenges and barriers. We're not the only ones that have them. And a lot of that consists with a lot of the discussion that you probably heard in the news, which really kind of boils down to government mistrust, which I can totally understand. Apathy, also. Unawareness. Too busy. Doesn't impact me, or don't understand how it impacts me. My parents will complete the form for me. I think that's going to be a big hurdle for us. Inconvenient. And a lot of misinformation, a lot of rumors going around.

And I'm glad that Mike mentioned the privacy issue. We want people to know that your information is private. The Census Bureau cannot share it with any other entity. So, we want that to be addressed and make sure people are aware of that.

The timeline-- you should start receiving some information about Census 2020 at your household around March 12. So, a reminder that it is coming. You can actually fill out your census form on that date. So, you can go online. You can go by telephone. You can fill it out via mail. Most likely, you'll probably do it online. But it is going to ask you where you are going to be living come April 1. So, it's all about where you will reside on April 1. So, April 1 being Census Day, and after that, the enumerators will come out to each household.

There is a little bit more detail about our timeline. I want to mention two things, one event that we are holding because this is so important to the State of Pennsylvania. As Mike mentioned, we are probably going to lose a seat or two within our House. And so, we want to make sure that Pennsylvania gets counted accurately. Second Lady Gisele Fetterman is coming, and she's doing a tour of Pennsylvania.
She's coming to the UP campus on February 19. She's coming to the HUB auditorium from 6:00 to 8:00 PM.

And she's really going to talk about the importance of census, but her undocumented resident experience. She just became a citizen recently, so she's going to talk about some of those-- probably misinformation and frequently asked questions about what it means to be an undocumented resident and being counted with the census. So, we hope that you can come out and advertise.

So how can you help us with census? Of course, number one, completing the form yourself. But sharing the importance with your students, whether it's you incorporate it in your curriculum about the history, the statistics around census, how census has been used throughout the decades. But they really need to know and understand why we do what we do when it comes to the census.

And also, sharing any information, holding campus events, attending campus events like the one I just mentioned to you. And any questions that you have about census, please send it our way so we can dispel any myths that may come up in your classrooms, or just even in daily conversation. We want to make sure the message is right, and we get all your questions answered.

So to contact us, you see our information there on the screen. You'll hear a lot more. You'll see a lot more visually about Census 2020. And once again, that event with Second Lady Gisele Fetterman is February 19 from 6:00 to 8:00 PM, HUB Freeman Auditorium, and we hope to see you there. Any questions that I can answer?

**Chair Rowland:** Briefly. Sure.

**Gary Thomas, College of Medicine:** Hi. I'm Gary Thomas from Hershey Medical Center. I was an undergrad years ago here, and I just think back, this may be an education issue. I paid my taxes in my home address. My census was filled out by my parents in my home address. My FAFSA form, my financial aid was filled out the home address. I voted absentee in my home address.

So as a student, when you're living-- especially in a dorm that's closed in the wintertime, different in the summer, may be different next year, a different room-- you're talking about your permanent mail, we think of our home address as our permanent residence. And so, I wouldn't have even thought to do the census at State College or University Park. I just did it all at home. And I'm not sure what the right thing is.

**Charima Young:** Right. So, the right thing is to fill it out where you live on April 1. So, wherever that student lives on April 1 is where you are to be counted. So, one of the things that we're trying to do-- and Student Affairs is playing a big role in a lot of our education-- is to educate the parents. Our parents program-- we are sending out a lot of information to parents about how the students are to be counted here at University Park, or whatever campus that they reside. So very important.

A lot of their support of programs and other things that they utilize within the area that they're living in for four years, the funding is coming here. So, they are to be counted here. So, you're right. We need to continue to get that education out amongst the students, as well as the parents. Thank you for that.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. Thank you, Mike. Thank you, Charima.
Charima Young: Thank you. Thank you for having us.

Chair Rowland: Very good.

[APPLAUSE]

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Encouraging Use of Affordable Course Materials

Moving on. Forensic business. We have one forensic report today from the Senate Committee on Education entitled "Encouraging Use of Affordable Course Materials." 15 minutes is allotted for the presentation and discussion. Questions for discussion can also be found in addition to on the screen here in Appendix C, I believe. Yes. Appendix C. Chair Stine is-- oh, Chair Stine is going to be joined today by Chelsey Wood, it looks like, on the floor, to facilitate the exchange. So, the floor is yours. Take it away. 

Michele Stine, College of Health and Human Development: Thank you. So, first of all, please forgive my voice. My son plays hockey and he played two games this weekend and turns out these hockey games are incredibly loud.

So this is an issue that has been charged to a number of committees in the Senate. And we wanted to really broaden the scope of this and think about this issue more broadly instead of just looking at-- traditionally, what we think about is open and affordable educational resources-- broaden the scope to think about this in terms of affordable course materials in general. How do we make our courses more affordable? And I think it's really timely that we're discussing this in light of Dr. Barron's comments about affordability and access to education, writ broadly.

This is an issue that was really spearheaded by our student senators. And so, two of them today, Chelsey Wood and Diego Santos, are really going to lead this discussion. So, I'm going to turn the discussion over to them. I do want to say that you all should have this lovely pistachio-colored piece of paper. I had the giant box of crayons when I was growing up, so. [LAUGHS]

The questions are on here. If you do not get a chance to make your comments from the floor or do not want to make your comments from the floor, please list your comments to the questions, respond to the questions on this paper. Turn them in on your way out, and we will get those. We will include your feedback, as well. Thank you. I'm going to turn this over to Chelsey and Diego.

Chelsey Wood, Student Senator, College of Education: Hi, everybody. My name is Chelsea Wood. I'm a senior majoring in Education and Public Policy. It's my third year in the Senate, so it's cool to be addressing you guys from up here for the first time.

My experience at UPUA, I was the Academic Affairs chair last year, which means I'm in charge of all of the college representatives in our student government. We tackle all of the academic issues on campus. And a lot of the feedback that when we would go out to students and ask what do you want to see changed or what do you want to see fixed on campus was my textbook prices. Why am I paying for my Pearson Lab when I'm paying tuition for a Penn State education? Why do I need Pearson to teach me? So that's kind of the issue that we keep hearing over and over.

And instead of trying to find a solution on our own, we need help. Because we're not choosing these
services, and we don't know what faculty see as the benefits and why they're the best options. So that's really why we're here today, is to get feedback from you all so that we can take it back to our constituents and sort of work with the faculty to come up with the best possible solution that is affordable.

**Diego Santos, Student Senator, Eberly College of Science:** Awesome. So, my name's Diego Santos. I'm the current Academic Affairs chair. I'm a junior majoring in Biochemistry. So, I want to just point out a few data points that we collected from our surveys. Eighty-five percent of students reported that they do not feel that the price of their service was justified by the use in the course. Also, 57% of students reported having been in at least one course where the professor failed to utilize the service that they paid for.

And also, some other data that is not on this report is that in the fall of 2019, 23 custom textbooks were utilized, mostly by the Smeal College of Business. Only five of these books were lower in price, but then two of them were four to eleven times more expensive than the generic version.

So to start off this discussion, I wanted to ask how we can ensure that all required and recommended course materials and their necessity are effectively communicated to students in a timely fashion.

**Chair Rowland:** So you can see the questions, or their responses. We'll start over here. Yeah. And then we'll--

**Jacob Moore, Penn State Mont Alto:** Jacob Moore, Mont Alto. I wanted to add a few more data points, three quick points. This is nationwide stuff. So number one, for the 2018-2019 academic year, the College Board recommended students set aside $1,290 per year for textbooks and course materials.

Number two, in 2014, Nathan Senek did a nationwide survey in which he found that, across the nation, 65% of students reported not buying a required course material for a course, even though 96% of those students felt that it hurt their performance in that course.

And finally, number three. There was a recent study by Nicholas Covart at University of Georgia, in which they were implementing OER across a number of general education and other introductory courses. And they found statistically significant results-- decreases in the DFW rates in those courses as OER was implemented. And that was most concentrated in the Pell-eligible students, which explained almost all of the significant results. So, this is a threat to access and affordability, and we need to treat it as such. [INAUDIBLE]

**John Liechty:** John Liechty. I'm in Smeal, where I teach, but I have a courtesy appointment in Eberly also. And I'm really glad you guys have brought this point up, because I've tracked this since I was an undergraduate student. And I've watched these prices go up, and I've watched paperback prices and digital prices go down. I mean, there are some classic textbooks I've still bought, on physics and all that, for my kids to go. And there's some very good pieces of work there. But I also feel like there's just, quite frankly, price gouging that's happening. Right?

And the dynamic is partly because faculty-- it's really hard to put a good course together. Takes a lot of work. So, if someone who's thoughtfully put a textbook together, it's useful. You adopt that. And then you want to be efficient for other reasons. So, it continues and perpetuates.

And I have thought that this is something that, as a broader institution, I would really welcome senior
leadership's thoughts, visions, and involvement on this. That we, as Penn State University, we, as part of the Big 10 Consortium, have all the expertise needed to put together the textbooks that would be of value and, for most of the courses, that are used. That's a competitive marketplace. You get a few faculty who write the books. They go into these private companies who then come around and charge the very high prices.

I would imagine there's a very appropriate role for a nonprofit structure which tries to have as its goal delivery of high quality. Not just an open source, oh, let's put a few courses together. There has to be real economics behind it. People who write the books have to be compensated. People who publish and promote the books have to be compensated. But not at the levels that give a nice profit back to the shareholders of Pearson and these other publishing companies, but at the level that makes sure that we can still competitively engage the faculty who would write a book like this and the people who'd be going around selling and promoting these things.

But I think it's a unique opportunity for an institution like Penn State to take a leadership role in creating, or trying to get a nonprofit like this together that would seriously compete in this arena at a level. Because the prices are so high, there's got to be a great opportunity for us to actually deliver something that would give you the value you want, not require you to pay double tuition, so to speak, and allow the faculty to have some resource that they feel is actually very good quality and delivering the same value back to the faculty who wrote the book, essentially cutting out the middleman.

So I'd encourage maybe a thought about a task force or something of that nature because it will take leadership beyond me, for example, to pull something like that together.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. More questions? Annie?

**Ann Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences:** Taylor, Earth and Mineral Sciences. Diego and I are—Chelsey—smiling at each other because we have one. Renata Engel and Yvonne Gaudelius charged the Open and Affordable Education Resources Working Group as part of the strategic plan. And you read our mind. I mean, that's exactly the kinds of things we're working on. And I'm so excited about the many initiatives going on across the University, that maybe we need an informational report about to the Senate that the University is already doing on open and affordable educational resources.

I think that these guys have hit the nail on the head, though, here. I think one of the issues— I have a son who graduated from Penn State a couple years ago, and another one who's a senior this year, so I live this student perspective a lot. And the frustration about buying materials and then finding out they're not even used is a real problem.

Here, my son, he's a senior. He just interviewed with Harvard the other day, I'd like to say, for grad school, so super smart. And he's telling me, oh, yeah. I didn't buy the textbook for this course I'm in right now. And I said, why? And he goes, because I have friends that took the course, and they all told me that the required textbook, you don't need. They got A's in the course, and they never even needed to open the textbook.

And it was an affordable textbook. It was an e-book. So, as things go, it wasn't that expensive. But there's still this issue of having materials required, or strongly recommended, for courses that students—rightfully, I think— get upset to learn they didn't really need to buy.
Chair Rowland: Very good. Greg?

Greg Shearer: Greg Shearer, College of Health and Human Development. I just want to respond to that perception that sometimes professors don't use the course material. I think you should pay attention to-- of course it's important that they ask the students to use the book. But also, when you give the students a book to use, that allows you to use the electronic material associated with the book. So you shouldn't discount the fact that the professor quote, "doesn't use," or-- he probably assigned reading from it, A, and B, he's now allowed to use the overheads and all the other electronic media associated with that. So just be careful about that when you think they don't use the course material.

Chair Rowland: Thank you, Greg. [INAUDIBLE]

Ira Saltz: Saltz, Shenango. You want to talk about what are some of the barriers to this. I'll tell you one barrier-- the bookstore. I've been using a free online textbook in my economics course now for years. And I cannot tell you how many times the bookstore keeps calling me and saying, well, what book are you using? And I tell them it's free online. They say, OK, that's all right. Just tell us what it is. Yeah. They go out, and they order it and sell it to our students. Yet it's free online.

Cindy Simmons, Bellisario College of Communications: Cindy Simmons, College of Communications, UP. I think in this discussion, students are very money sensitive. We want you here to learn, not just to get an A. I teach a class, Media Law. You probably could get a good grade in the class without cracking the textbook, but you couldn't deeply understand that material unless you read the book.

And what we need to do is destigmatize poverty. When I was your age, I was broke in college. I would go to the bookstore and read the book in the bookstore. Didn't enjoy doing it, but the bookstore owner knew that if he shamed me, over time, people would not buy their books there.

Look for ways to share books. In having this is an issue before students, please keep the eye on learning instead of saving. Because you can graduate with a very high GPA and not be qualified, and that is not what we want. And so, e-books are cheaper. A lot of your professors will help you find the information you need in another format if you really can't get the book. But share books. Nobody wants you to pay a hundred dollars or more for a book.

We don't have that much control in some subject areas. But what we really need to do is destigmatize poverty. Students are broke. It's the way it has been for a long, long time. Some portion of you are.

Chair Rowland: Other comments? Yeah, Laura in the back?

Laura Pauley, College of Engineering: Pauley, Engineering. Also, mother of three graduates from Engineering. And what I hear from my own children is that they've had classes where they were required to purchase the supplemental materials because the homework assignments were online, and they had to enter their solutions online. And that purchased material was only linked to their student identification for that book. And I find that very concerning, because that's a mandated taxation on taking that course. And I think we need to find some solution to avoid that.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you, Laura. Further questions? Yes, please.
Renee Borromeo, Penn State Mont Alto: Borromeo, Mont Alto. I've adopted using OER for, I guess, my second full year now. So, I don't have a lot of data. But what I can say is last year when I used it, [INAUDIBLE] to address the question about student learning. The cost was in my mind. But I also really wanted to develop materials that I really wanted to match the program that I was teaching, the course that I was teaching.

All I can say is, basically, the same exams I'd had before were higher. My students have a national licensure exam they take at the end of their program. The pass rate was higher. I don't know. I mean, it was a small class. It's for one year. But all I can say is I definitely didn't see the student learning go down.

The barrier, I would say-- and it was hard. It was hard to do. It forced me to really look at my course, spend a lot of time looking at all the available resources, write parts that I wanted to write, pull in videos. I mean, it's a much better learning experience for my students is what I'm hearing.

Again, I surveyed. They love it. And I think that it's better, but it does take a lot of time. And so, faculty may need release time if they really want to develop these kind of things, if we want to get a—if and when Penn State wants to do it. It does take time to do. But then I would see that as the biggest barrier in terms of faculty using it.

Chair Rowland: Thank you, Renee.

Chelsey Wood: Thank you.

Chair Rowland: Right up here.

Chelsey Wood: Just quickly, if I could just interject.

Chair Rowland: Go ahead, Chelsey. Yeah.

Chelsey Wood: Just to-- in light of the comments about learning, just to move on and make sure we're moving on to the second question. Also, in the interest of time. To what are the perceived barriers, but also, what can we do to mitigate those barriers? Because we do know they exist, and we do want to hear them, but what are your ideas about how we can mitigate that, as well?

Kim Blockett, Penn State Brandywine: Kim Blockett, Brandywine. To answer your question about what can students do to mitigate the barriers, I don't think that's your responsibility, honestly.

Chelsey Wood: I was thinking more of like we, as Faculty Senate.

Kim Blockett: As Faculty Senate.

Chelsey Wood: Yes.

Kim Blockett: OK. Thank you for that clarification. I think, as Faculty Senate, we need to, yes, destigmatize poverty, but also be very clear about who our students are and what we mean when we say poverty. And also recognize this is a systemic problem, and not put the responsibility back onto the students.
The vast majority of our first-- and particularly, our first-year students do not live in a residence hall. So, sharing books is not a reality. A good number of our students work. And so asking our students to take on the burden of expensive books, go to a bookstore and read the book or whatever, if you live in certain areas there is no bookstore where you can go and read the book.

So we really have to think about our students as a diverse body of people that oftentimes don't look or live in any way that is close to maybe the way that we experienced our undergraduate education. And figure out how we make things more affordable, particularly around books.

I love the idea of Penn State getting into the business of some kind of nonprofit way of creating good material, rewarding our faculty with that expertise, and it be affordable. And also, maybe educating our students around how and why we use the resources that we do in the sense that yeah, I'm sure that some of my students would say, oh, I didn't need to crack that book. But that doesn't mean that I didn't want the students to use the book. So, it's about us educating our students about why we do what we do, and us being thoughtful about why we do what we do.

Chair Rowland: Very good. All right. The time allocated for this discussion has come to a close, so we cannot take any more questions. Thank you Diego, Chelsey, and Shelli for that discussion. Next, agenda item 8.

[APPLAUSE]

Now we turn to unfinished business. Please note, we will use clickers for voting today. They provide a precise vote count, confidentiality for voters, and immediate results. Senators should have received a clicker before entering the auditorium. Please raise your hand if you need a clicker or your clicker doesn't work.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

We have two reports from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules that were presented in December and will be voted on today. Chair Brunsden, please come to the podium and introduce these reports. The first one is "Revisions, the Constitution, Article II, Membership Section 5." This is about including World Campus Student Government Association. This can be seen in Appendix-- oh, you don't see that everyday-- Appendix Q.

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

Victor Brunsden, Penn State Altoona: Thank you. This was presented at the December meeting, now that the World Campus Student Organization is a recognized student organization. World Campus students are a group of students that are not adequately represented by either the UPUA, or the CCSG. They have experiences that are not common with the students in either of those groups. And in fact, it is this lack of commonality that led to the formation of CCSG in the first place.

We should, in fact, recognize these. So, as this student association has now been formed, they need to have some official presence in the Senate. That is what this constitutional revision is to accomplish.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Are there questions for Chair Brunsden? Seeing none, are we ready to vote?
It seems so. Senators joining us by MediaSite, you may cast your vote on PollEverywhere.com.

Paula already has the voting screen up. Thank you very much. To accept the motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B.

Anna Butler: On PollEverywhere, I have 15 accept.

Chair Rowland: Very good. On the floor?

Paula Brown, Senate Office Manager: It passed. It was over a hundred. I don't know what happened. I clicked the wrong button. Should we vote again?

Chair Rowland: On the floor, it was over a hundred?

Paula Brown: Yeah.

Chair Rowland: All in favor? Excellent.

[LAUGHTER]

Chair Rowland: Wonderful! The motion has carried. Yes. Very good. OK, Chair Brunsden, we're moving on to report number 2. This is Appendix R, "Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article 1, Section 1," on officers. Do you have any commentary for us?

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

Victor Brunsden: As noted at the last meeting in December, this is about continuing the work of the Senate. I should note that, while we only mention the Chair Elect and the Secretary, this is for the entirety of their terms. So their replacements would continue on, in the case of the Chair Elect, while they are Chair and Immediate Past Chair.

Should the term expire while an officer is doing that, then the unit that they are from should feel free to also hold another election to send a replacement for that position as well. So please, have mercy on the poor committees.

Chair Rowland: Yes, Ira?

Ira Saltz: Just your very last point, I guess, brought up one complication there. If the officer is-- then their term expires and then their home committee is going to hold a new election, can that person run for re-election?

Victor Brunsden: Yes.

Ira Saltz: OK.

Chair Rowland: Other questions for Chair Brunsden? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? Very good. Senators joining us via MediaSite may cast your vote on PollEverywhere.com. For those of us here, to accept this motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B.
Anna Butler: On PollEverywhere, I have 16 accept.

Chair Rowland: OK. Floor?

Paula Brown: In-house we have 121 accept, 5 reject.

**LEGISLATIVE REPORTS**

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

Chair Rowland: Excellent. Motion carries. Next, legislative reports. Also, from the Senate Committee on Committee and Rules "Revisions to Senate Standing Rules, Article III, Section 3, Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits." Our beloved appendix D. So, Victor, any comments on this one?

Victor Brunsden: Thank you. The Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits is a committee that was formed quite some while ago. It has acted as a liaison between faculty, administration, and staff, who all have a common concern for the University's benefit package.

Legislation updating the membership of this committee has been slow in coming. And so, the committee, off its own bat, realized that it needed some updating. That is what this legislation is designed to accomplish.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Questions for Chair Brunsden? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? If you're joining us on MediaSite, you know what to do on PollEverywhere.com. Those of you here, to accept the motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B. We just need a simple majority for this one. Yeah. OK.

Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 17 accept.

Paula Brown: In-house, 116 accept, three reject.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Motion carries.

Victor Brunsden: Thank you very much.

Chair Rowland: You may rest. Next, from the Senate Committee on Education, "Changes to Policy 56-30 Withdrawal." Appearing as Appendix E. Chair Stine, the podium is yours. Please make any comments that you wish.

Changes to Senate Policy 56-30 Withdrawal

Michele Stine: Hello. The rationale for this policy came out of a phenomenon that happens with our military students where, if they are deployed, under current University policy, they have two choices--keep their classes or withdraw from the entire semester. And that policy worked before the advent of World Campus and the proliferation of online courses.

It is now possible that military students who are deployed may feel like they want to keep part of their
schedule. And they may be able to continue in one or two classes online that the work either from a campus may be a hybrid course where most of the work is done online, or they may be able to enroll in a World Campus course. So, they may be able to keep part of their schedule and still make progress toward finishing their degree without entirely withdrawing.

But there was no mechanism to do this other than late-dropping courses, which then incurs a cost for those students. And we have a commitment to our military students to not incur any additional cost as a result of their deployment, as a result of their military service. And so, the change to this policy is an attempt to correct that problem.

We ran into one small snag. And you realize that the language sounds a little bit strange, that the addition to the policy talks about a partial schedule cancellation. That's because calling it a partial withdrawal then triggers some things that happen electronically, and with record keeping in the University, that then may also incur some costs to those students. And we did not want the possibility of that happening.

And so changing the language to call it a partial schedule cancellation, similar to what we would think of an administrative course cancellation, eliminates that possibility. So it allows them to cancel the courses that they are not going to be able to continue in, and keep the parts of their schedule that they believe they will be able to successfully complete, and allow them to keep making progress toward finishing their degree in a timely manner while they're still able to fulfill their military service.

Chair Rowland: Questions? Yes. Right up here.

Gary Thomas: Gary Thomas, Hershey Medical Center. So, does this only cover military students? Or suppose somebody has a medical illness and they would ordinarily have to withdraw, but they feel like they could keep a partial schedule and complete some World Campus or whatever. Let's say a student was diagnosed with cancer midway through a semester. Could we broaden this to be other than just military service?

Michele Stine: The committee did discuss that possibility. And the reason that we limit it to military students is because this is a very specifically defined population and a very specifically defined event. You have active military who is now deployed somewhere else and cannot continue in at least some of your courses.

The reason that we didn't broaden this to include other students is because that got us into the weeds very quickly in defining what counts as a serious illness, how we are going to define that, which students would be eligible for that. And so, we wanted to limit this specifically to this population of students to whom we have a very specific responsibility.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Additional questions? Oh, in the back.

Nathan Allerheiligen, Military Sciences: Excuse me. I've got my laptop in front of me. Nate Allerheiligen, Air Force ROTC. Token guy wearing a uniform today.

Chair Rowland: [LAUGHS]

Nathan Allerheiligen: Deployment has a very specific context, but it may not be the only situation in which a military member may be called away for duty and no longer able to attend class. Does your
policy enact that? Case in point, I missed the last two set of meetings conducting an accident investigation in New Mexico. So will short-term deployment or duty outside of what the military would say is a military deployment has a specific context to us also be included in this policy?

Michele Stine: Yes. My understanding-- and I'm going to ask Renata to clarify this if I'm wrong-- but the policy addresses any kind of assignment by the military for that student. So, if the military assigns you to a duty that is incompatible with you continuing your education, then this policy would apply. Is that correct?

Nathan Allerheiligen: Here, here.

Chair Rowland: All right. A-plus. Excellent work. Yes. Last question up front.

Dena Lang, College of Engineering: Thank you. Dena Lang, Engineering. My question isn't completely related to this. But I had a student that was in the military, and I think he was on a GI Bill. And for whatever reasons-- I think they were personal-- he needed to withdraw. And it turned out he had to take all F's because something about the way the finances worked. The military wouldn't pay for it if he withdrew, but they would if he took F's. I don't know all the ins and outs.

Michele Stine: I don't know how that particular policy would apply. I don't know the specifics of that. But this would specifically apply only to students that were--

Dena Lang: Are deployed.

Michele Stine: --the military, triggered in action that prevented that student from being able to finish some of their courses.

Dena Lang: All right. So, I guess this is just something we should think about and consider if we're really trying to help the military students.

Michele Stine: Absolutely.

Dena Lang: I don't know where that loophole comes in.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you. Additional questions? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? Very good. Senators joining by MediaSite, you can cast your vote on Poll Everywhere.com. For those of us here, to accept this motion, please press A. To reject this motion, please press B.

Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 17 accept.

Paula Brown: In-house, 122 accept, 4 reject.

Chair Rowland: The motion carries. Thank you, Chair Stine. All right. Our next report is from the Committee on Student Life, 'Proposed Senate Policy 89-00, Student Privacy Regarding Letters of Recommendation.' The report can be seen in Appendix F. Chair Robicheaux is joined today-- he's probably going to make it.

Timothy Robicheaux: Yeah, I just saw him. There he is.
Chair Rowland: Hi, Bob. Chair Robicheaux is going to be joined by University Registrar Bob Kubat on the floor to present the recommendations and also to field questions.

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

Timothy Robicheaux: We do have an amendment. Do you want to do that now?

Chair Rowland: Did you hear that?

Keith Shapiro, Senate Parliamentarian: Yeah. The amendment will have to be proposed [INAUDIBLE].

Chair Rowland: OK. The amendment just needs to be proposed, so.

Keith Shapiro: Yes. You'll have to move that the amendment will be [INAUDIBLE].

Chair Rowland: Great. Can we see the amendment once we move for it? Do you have the amendment?

Timothy Robicheaux: We have to make a slight change to the end. So if you have the legislation, the last sentence just needed to add a part, which will come up right now.

Chair Rowland: As we do this, I would like everyone to note the rare specimen we are about to observe- - the truly friendly amendment. Since Tim wrote it, this may be the only time in our lifetimes that this is viewed--

Timothy Robicheaux: You're welcome.

Chair Rowland: --in the wild.

Timothy Robicheaux: I think my mom's watching right now. Like, really.

[LAUGHTER]

Chair Rowland: That's my boy!

Timothy Robicheaux: Yes. It's happening. My father was on Faculty Senate at LSU for a really long time, and didn't get fired, so.

Chair Rowland: OK. Last sentence. What does the last sentence read right now?

Timothy Robicheaux: The original is there. So, what's added is just clarifying authentication of the email address.

Chair Rowland: Oh, I see. OK. So, the current piece, as you saw it, just reads this. And then it is replaced, then, with "Electronic documentation satisfies the written documentation requirement so long as a signed and dated written consent by the student contains an electronic signature?"

[LAUGHTER]

Chair Rowland: That appropriately-- "that appropriately identifies and authenticates that particular student." So appropriate has just an -LY at the end.

[APPLAUSE]

Excellent! Let us please discuss this glorious amendment.

Timothy Robicheaux: All right!

Chair Rowland: Does Tim have any questions? Seeing none, are we're ready to vote?

Keith Shapiro: I recommend a voice vote.

Chair Rowland: Keith recommends we do a voice vote. I like his idea. All those in favor, please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Rowland: All those opposed? Good.

Timothy Robicheaux: All right.

Chair Rowland: Moving on.

Timothy Robicheaux: Sorry about that. I do have a quick speech. This year, one of the charges to our committee at the start of the year was to examine whether we should have a policy on the letter of recommendations, the charge that came to my committee. Rather than go haphazardly, we conducted a survey of Faculty Senators, which many of you completed. Ninety-six senators completed that. For the 96 faculty respondents, over 80% of you sought clarification on FERPA requirements. That was your direct request.

Fewer than one-fifth of responding Senators knew that the registrar's web page has a fillable, printable consent form for releasing records for the purpose of letter recommendation. And I did not. Fewer than 10% had ever used the form. I had not. Fellow senators, meet Senate Policy 89-00, Student Privacy Regarding Letters of Recommendation. This is the policy that over 80% of you carefully wished for.

FERPA is lengthy, detailed. It's complicated. We've condensed several parts of FERPA that refer to letters of recommendation into a paragraph, a newly amended paragraph. The proposed policy clarifies privacy rights of our students. It provides a simple way to abide by FERPA compliance. And it adds no new responsibilities. None. Zero. Nothing's new. Everything that you had to do before, this fallacy says, hey, still do that. And nothing else.

In brief, obtain written consent from students to release educational records such as grades, class
attendance, or student GPA prior to submitting letters of recommendation. And, if desired, obtain a waiver that the student will fill out. It will state that they do not need to see their letter.

The first two sentences of the policy explicitly spell out exactly who must do what, and in what order. The policy is clear in what ways faculty can satisfy the policy. Concerning some frequently asked questions when discussing this with my committee and with colleagues, implied consent does not fulfill the requirements of FERPA, or of AD11 by the way. Many faculty are under the impression that it did. Oral consent is not adequate.

This policy applies to graduate students, law students, medical students, World Campus students. Students who are older than 18, older than 21, older than 26, older than 76. They are students. Having to answer this question affirm my belief that this is a beneficial policy. People ask. Does this apply to adults was the question.

I had further questions about implementation. Implementation is not the domain of the Senate, and there's nothing new to implement here. We're already supposed to be doing this. However, when we pass this policy, I believe that it will affect change to make this policy more streamlined, to make it easier to do. We have the registrar here today. We have administrators here today. If this policy is passed, then I believe there will be steps moving forward to move this to an electronic form that has been updated in the past, oh, decade-ish is when the last one was, and should be all electronic to help us to do this, to modernize.

I've been asked about sanctions for this. I'm not proposing sanctions. I just learned that I'm supposed to do this when I was working on the policy. I doubt a lot of you have done it. I'm not proposing sanctions. What I would say is that we should be on board. And I'm letting you know what to do.

It's easy to follow this. It could be as simple as a student sending an email. "I, Tim Robicheaux, give permission to Dr. Roland to write a letter of recommendation on my behalf to the graduate school at National Champions, Louisiana State University."

[LAUGHTER]

"Boo.saban@lsu.edu, I give permission for Dr. Roland to include my grades, GPA, school activities, attendance, and other relevant information from my educational record. I waive my right to view this in the future. Sincerely, Tim Robicheaux." I would send this from my PSU account so that it's authenticated. He knows who it's coming from. I would point out that, in between votes a few minutes ago, I actually sent this very email to a student saying please do this. They just requested a letter of recommendation. It took me a minute.

I want to address concerns that policy had that this is another hoop to jump through. Most faculty I've talked to have been surprised that this was required. But they've otherwise been apathetic or uncomfortable with the policy. But a few people said they won't even write letters anymore. I hope this is hyperbole. And I want to assure the students who are here today that most of us are willing to take a few extra minutes to do this. I don't think this is going to change things. And I really hope it doesn't.

If you've been following FERPA requirements, then there is no hoop to jump through. Don't cry about new hoops, old faculty. The truth is the hoops have never left you.
[LAUGHTER]
The hoops have been calling from inside the house.

[LAUGHTER]
To paraphrase Miley Cyrus, the hoop has been here all along. This policy is only meant to light the way. A vote in favor of this policy demonstrates our faculty's strong commitment to the privacy of our students. A rejection is sure to get the attention of outside of the University.

I'll take your questions. I'll turn to Bob to answer them. And then I speak on the students' behalf when I say that they really appreciate faculty commitment to privacy. Thanks.

[APPLAUSE]
I probably had more fun writing that than I will with the questions.

[LAUGHTER]

Chair Rowland: All right. Who wants to ask Tim some questions? Victor, go ahead.

Victor Brunsden: Brunsden, Altoona. I speak in support of this for those of my colleagues who might be worried that this is going to involve additional work for them. No. It may not be more than 60 seconds to either add a sentence to an email with an instruction to the student. The work is pretty much all on the student. So, there is no reason for you to dread this. It is not a problem. I recently just did this myself in response to a student requesting a letter of recommendation. So please, don't think that this requires enormous amounts of work on your part. It really doesn't.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Other questions? Ira, in the back.

Ira Ropson, College of Medicine: Ropson, College of Medicine. Are the students aware of this in any handbook that goes for the students for any of the programs? Because I don't think they are.

Timothy Robicheaux: They will be. We are working with Career Services. And they have spread the word and will be continuing to spread the word. One part of this, too, is we will be adding an information sheet to Career Services for students to request letters of recommendation. Because there's things like a student saying I need a letter of recommendation tomorrow. We get those emails. So, kind of best practices. And one of the things in there will be this information. But more importantly, a link to the resource that a lot of students aren't aware of, to say it would be helpful if, when you request a letter, you send this with it to the faculty.

Chair Rowland: Anything else, Galen? Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

Dwight Davis, College of Medicine: Davis from Hershey. For students applying for, or sending in an application for a service-- I'm specifically talking about residency service, or residency applications after medical school. Each one of those students will have, or will need, several faculty recommendation letters. Is it possible that the student can do a single consent for the application? Or does it have to be individualized for each faculty member that's writing a letter for them?
Bob Kubat, University Registrar: If the individual faculty member is writing it, then it should be by faculty member because that's an instance. If it's a unit-- are you the department head for that unit?

Dwight Davis: No.

Bob Kubat: Then that would be OK.

Dwight Davis: No. So, in each case, for the 150 students that are applying to residency programs every year through a residency program service, each one of those students is required to have usually about three of four letters of recommendations from faculty.

Right. But I don't think-- so the student through the portal, then, gives consent to each faculty member.

Bob Kubat: That's what I would say is that if a student is doing this through the portal, that they're sending it to you, then that would be the--

Dwight Davis: Individualized.

Bob Kubat: Right.

Dwight Davis: OK.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Galen?

Galen Grimes, Penn State Greater Allegheny: Grimes, Greater Allegheny. Does this cover background checks by federal investigators? Because in IST over the years, I've had students apply for jobs at companies that do government contracts. And I'll have a federal investigator show up at my office and want to do a half hour interview as a background check on the student.

Timothy Robicheaux: The answer is yes. And I've actually asked them when they come in. They've been doing this for a while. State police, as well, will just send me an email out of the clear blue for my students. And the answer is yes.

Oral references, as well. Like a reference phone call would also be there, so.

Mari Pierce, Penn State Beaver: What if they just show up? I guess like he was saying. I'm in criminal justice. And [INAUDIBLE] will just show up at your door.

Timothy Robicheaux: They're going to make you ask again so that people can hear.

Mari Pierce: OK. So, yeah. I'm Mari Pierce, Beaver. I'm with criminal justice, so similar to what he was
saying, we often have federal agents just-- they don't make appointments. They just show up and want to
do a background check on somebody.

**Timothy Robicheaux:** I tell them now-- and I've told them in the past, even before this-- that I do need
the release from the student. They will include a release from the student, but the release from the student
very often does not contain mention of educational records.

I'm going to let Bob answer about education records because you are allowed to release directory
information. And you can even say things to the federal investigator like this person has never-- I know
one of the questions they ask is, do you have any reason to believe that this individual is not loyal to the
United States government. That is not an educational record at that point. But if you want to differentiate
that.

**Bob Kubat:** So, last night, I had a really good conversation with the Commonwealth Campus Caucus. It
was very engaging, and I appreciated that opportunity very much. And this was one of the conversations.

You can think of FERPA information, or student educational record, as directory information and non-
directory. Directory information would be name, address, whether they're sophomore or junior, whether
they've graduated, and those types of things. There's a list on our website of all those. If it's directory
information and the student does not have a confidentiality hold on their record, you can release that
information without the student's permission.

However, non-directory information, as Tim had mentioned-- GPA, grades, disciplinary action, those
types of things-- you would need the student's permission to release. We have investigators always
coming to our office. They have a form. They have an electronic signature from the student, and we talk
to them.

An observation, as Tim said, do you think this person is loyal to the United States. That's an observation.
That's not an educational record. So those things you would not need a release for.

**Mari Pierce:** So, if the student has given a form to the state police, that counts.

**Bob Kubat:** And if it's signed by the student, yes.

**Mari Pierce:** OK. So, I don't have to have them sign something for me if they have that.

**Bob Kubat:** Yeah, they should have that. Because we have them almost every day in our office.

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

**Christopher Zorn, College of the Liberal Arts:** Hi. I'm Chris Zorn. I'm in Liberal Arts. So, in the
example you gave, a student would send an email to me, say you're going to write a letter of
recommendation for me and waive those things. Some of my Ph.D. students might apply to 100 or 150
positions and post-docs. Do they have to send me 150 emails, or can they give me a sort of blanket
waiver?

**Timothy Robicheaux:** They cannot give you a blanket one. They can send you an email listing all of
those places on it. And again, this is under FERPA. So, if they are not applying-- let's say, the LSAC,
which is applying to law school, then that's one organization. Yeah, they technically need to list all of those.

I created a Google form to do this-- because it makes my life a lot easier-- that just includes all this information and stores it for me. So technically, yeah, they're supposed to go back and just enter that. So, yes.

**Chair Rowland:** Other questions? Please.

**Brianne Pragg, Graduate and Professional Student Association:** I just also want to speak from the student perspective. I'm Brianne Pragg, grad school. I think this is really good and important, even though I, frankly, didn't know this. And as somebody who has applied to about 60 jobs in the past couple of months, I'm not looking forward now to having to do that and send a thing with all the schools listed. But I do think that student privacy should be of a pretty top concern for us.

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

**Senator:** You have one in the back there.

**Chair Rowland:** Sure.

**Christopher Byrne:** Byrne, ECOS. I understand-- well, I'm just confused. It seems that it's the student's right to privacy that we're protecting. So, if the student writes a waiver saying you can share this with anybody for the purpose of a recommendation, it's their privacy. It seems to me they would have the right to give it away like that if they wanted to. Someone might give them some good advice and tell them not to, but I don't see why it's on us to require that, or why they would somehow-- why that would be illegal or something.

**Timothy Robicheaux:** I think that's a philosophical question at that point. I mean, really, because you're kind of going back to the nature of why FERPA is what it is. But I would say that what stops-- if a student gives me that blanket recommendation, I wouldn't, but I could just start sending letters to people at random, and say hey, I want this person. I mean, I believe that's where it comes down to. But I think that we're talking philosophy of the law versus letter of the law. And the letter of the law does require specificity.

**Chair Rowland:** All right. Are we ready to vote?

**Timothy Robicheaux:** Nope.

**Unidentified Senator:** Can you go over the retention policy for this? Because that was eye-opening.

**Timothy Robicheaux:** That's Bob's job.

**Bob Kubat:** [LAUGHS] So the question is asked about why-- we have, as a university, because we receive Title IV student aid, we do have to follow FERPA. It's a federal law. We don't really have a choice. And so, part of what FERPA does is it tells us how we can release student information, how we need to protect it, how we need to have access to students, to their records and such. And whenever we release this information, it's called a disclosure of student's educational record.
And as I said, if it's directory information, we can do it without the student's permission. But if it releases the GPA and such, we have to keep that, basically, forever. I went out and looked at the University policy for the retention, and it said 72 years there. So, we can work with the 72 years to make a little bit shorter. But we do have to keep this.

And we had conversations last night. I would recommend the following because an individual faculty member shouldn't be required to keep every single form on their laptop, or in a file drawer. What we talked about last night is those forms can be scanned. So, you can have a digital copy of those. And maybe the academic department, or the college, can have a Google Docs, or some other type of University approved storage database where all those letters, then, can be stored. That way, I don't think that the ownership should be put on the faculty member to have to keep all these letters of recommendation, either in their desk, or on their laptop, or anything such as that.

And I think what we talked about last night is that not recognizing what FERPA requirements are with this, it's not an intentional negative action by anybody. What I find almost every time is that it's not understanding FERPA. It's not knowing that there's a FERPA law requirement that we have to follow by. So I think that this may take some time, really, to implement what we should have been doing. But I think that now we're educating, and the communication, I think, is really good. So, I think it's going to take a little bit of time, really, to put this in place across the entire University.

[INAUDIBLE]

Caroline Eckhardt, College of the Liberal Arts: Eckhardt, Liberal Arts. Just a small follow-up to the last suggestion that there might perhaps be someone in the department who would be keeping all of these letters. That may be unrealistic. I don't think my department has a staff member who's going to have the time to be a records curator, whatever the right term would be, going forward indefinitely.

If there would be any way, as you work towards implementation, that you could create somehow a link so we can all upload these things automatically, and somebody centrally, or the machine centrally, will just put them all somewhere. Because otherwise, we're taking the workload away from the individual faculty member.

You just said you didn't think faculty should be expected necessarily to keep all the records. I don't know of any other person who can now absorb that workload. So maybe there's a way of automating it, in other words.

Timothy Robicheaux: So, the move to the online form is going to fix a lot of that by itself because that's going to be preserved naturally. I do think that, as part of the online form, though, as that moves forward, one thing would be worth having an upload feature there, as well, to actually upload a written file, especially for someone who doesn't have access.

I don't know all the technical issues about storage space and stuff. I'm imagining that that's out of my pay grade for sure. But to have some place to store that more centrally, I believe, would be something that could certainly be included in such things.

Chair Rowland: Ira, last question.
Ira Saltz: Yeah, Saltz, Shenango. It hasn't changed. Just a quick question. How long is this waiver that they're giving us good for? I mean, do we need one every year? Ten years? I mean, is there an expiration date on they're giving us permission to disclose? Because I could see a case where a student asked for a letter of recommendation, and then suddenly they have a really bad semester and their GPA changes, and suddenly they don't want anyone disclosing that, but.

Timothy Robicheaux: They can withdraw consent.

Ira Saltz: OK.

Timothy Robicheaux: I mean, there's no reason not to.

Bob Kubat: The recommendation letters that we're talking about is for that one purpose. So, a student doesn't give you-- I would recommend this, and I wouldn't support the student just gives you a letter and saying you can give all this information to anybody that you want. That's not the intent here.

The intent here is that if a student is applying to a college or university for a graduate program, that letter is for that program. It's not a letter that can be used for 50 different programs. If the student is applying for a job, it's for that job. It's not for any of the 30 jobs that the student might be applying for. So, it's on that instance. It's not a blanket. I would not recommend that at all.

And we did talk about this a little bit. And the reason is because many of these require different information. And you need it to be specific. So, the student really needs to give approval of what, specifically, you can be releasing in that recommendation.

Chair Rowland: Are we ready to vote? Yes. Very good. Senators joining us on MediaSite, you can cast your vote on PollEverywhere.com. Those of us here now, to accept the motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B.

Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 10 accept, and 7 reject.

Paula Brown: In-house, 105 accept. 11 reject.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Chair Rowland: The motion carries. OK, moving forward. Advisory/Consultative reports. We do not have any, thankfully.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded to Undergraduates

Chair Rowland: Informational reports, we have a number. The first report, Appendix G, is "The Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid, Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded to Undergraduates." This report will be presented on the web only.
Next, in Appendix H, the "Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs General Education Assessment 2015-2019." Senate Council has allotted 10 minutes for the presentation and discussion of this report. The floor is yours.

**General Education Assessment 2015-2019**

Mary Beth Williams, Eberly College of Science: Thank you all for sticking around for this part of the program. I want to begin by recognizing and thanking Suzanne Weinstein, who worked on this report and co-chaired the Committee for General Education Assessment. She retired in December, so she's not here to present the report for you today. But I did want to recognize her contribution.

Joining me today to present this report is Jeff Mamaro from OPAIR, from now Suzanne's former office, and Maggie Slattery. So, I'll turn the floor over to Jeff. Thank you.

Jeff Mamaro, OPAIR: Thank you. So, as Mary Beth said, I'm Jeff Mamaro from OPAIR, and I'm here to represent the Joint Senate Committee on General Education Assessment. To give you a summary of the informational report, and which is itself a summary of general education assessment activity since about 2013. Oh, here's the clicker. There we go. Thank you.

So back in 2013, the then-interim Provost and the Faculty Senate charged a general education task force to review and revise the Gen Ed curriculum and assessment. In 2015, you all passed the newly revised general education curriculum.

Shortly after that, we had a successful re-accreditation. But, as often happens, the accreditors-- well, actually always happens-- the accreditors have a few things they want us to do. And they wanted us to further implement Gen Ed assessment.

In mid-2016, the Provost and the Faculty Senate charged a special Joint Committee for Gen Ed Assessment. That was converted into a standing committee. And then in early 2017, we developed a plan-- 2016-2017-- developed a plan that was then submitted in a monitoring report that was successfully accepted by middle states. And it outlined a plan to address some of the assessment concerns.

Since then, since about early 2017-- we used to be OPA and is now OPAIR, along with the Gen Ed Senate committee, has been working on the goals and the tasks that are outlined in the plan, and specific tasks that were outlined in the charge.

What were we asked to do? There are four basic areas. One was the development of data sets that could be used to set Gen Ed policy. So think, do we have enough courses that are meeting the needs for students, and in different locations, and so on.

They asked us for curriculum maps that could show how the different general education learning objectives are expressed in the curriculum, both in academic programs, but also in the Gen Ed courses. They asked us to conduct surveys of students and alumni to ensure that students' perceptions of Gen Ed were, again, meeting what we thought they should be.

And then finally, they asked us to assess student performance with respect to the Gen Ed objectives, the foundational course objectives, and the domain objectives directly from Gen Ed courses. Now, I'll say that that last component is kind of the meatiest component. And the previous three are things that our office has really been able to do without too much collaboration and work from people like faculty.
So what have we accomplished so far? Well, we've developed a lot of these data sets. For example—where's my-- there we go. Excuse me. Patterns and course offerings, student enrollment. Patterns in grades that are assigned in different Gen Ed courses. The prescriptiveness of different types of academic programs. So, if you're an engineering major versus if you're a history major, the amount of choice you have in the Gen Ed courses available to you is very different. We've completed many of those. We still have an additional data set in the works.

With respect to curriculum mapping, we've begun that task, completed one data set, or one map. The other one, we're waiting on the completion of the general education course recertification process. Then we have the full set of courses available to us.

With respect to surveys, last spring we conducted a significant student survey of students who were nearing graduation so that they were looking back at their general education experiences. We have a report on that. Some of the report findings are highlighted in the informational report, but there is a standalone report on that.

We've held off on the alumni survey until we have sort of more alumni in the pipeline to work with. And those two surveys will provide a baseline for us, in future years, to be able to redo those surveys and see if we've seen changes.

Finally, with respect to the big, meaty thing I mentioned, the assessment of student performance. We began with the integrative thinking learning objective, in part because of the newness of it and the fact that we had seed grants, faculty were developing new integrative thinking courses. So, we designed and piloted a process which we designed to be transferable. So, we could use it with integrative thinking, but then we could use it on creative thinking, perhaps, or some of the other learning objectives. We piloted that with roughly 70 faculty, and then we solicited their feedback. And then we tweaked the process and made changes based on their recommendations.

This last fall, we administered the real study. And that analysis currently underway. We actually just closed data collection just a couple of weeks ago after the semester ended and the year turned over.

But what do we have left to do? Well, there are quite a few other Gen Ed learning objectives to go. Obviously, there are the foundation courses in the domains, and there are learning objectives associated with all of those. So, we have a lot of work to do, and we've still done quite a bit.

And I just want to take a moment to show you what that integrative thinking process looked like. Because this process could be something that-- maybe not in integrative thinking, but we may ask you. You might get an email from me or some of my colleagues to invite you to participate in a Gen Ed assessment.

So what we did in our office, we identified all the integrative thinking courses, the faculty teaching them. We developed a rubric in conjunction with the Gen Ed scholars from the Gen Ed office. We took input from the committee, a lot of Faculty Senators on that committee. We developed that rubric as aligned with the integrative thinking learning objectives.

We created an online forum in Qualtrics that collects the data. So, you can imagine you're a faculty member. You're teaching a course. Your students are engaging in integrative thinking. They produce a presentation, an essay, a piece of artwork. And then you can use that rubric to score that with respect to
integrative thinking. And then you can enter the rubric scores into the form online.

So after we developed that, then we contacted all the faculty. We instructed them how to use the rubric. We taught them numerous ways with written instructions, in the form itself. We credit videos. We had Zoom workshops, and so on. We were even talking to people on the phone as late as a couple weeks ago to help people go through that process. We collected submissions, and as I said, the analysis is underway. So, we're looking forward to seeing what we learned there.

The bottom line, though, is that Gen Ed assessment needs you. And as I said, we've more or less exhausted the low-hanging fruit in terms of what the committee is supposed to do, given the tasks and the charge, and then of course what Middle States requires of us.

So the future of Gen Ed assessment will require collection of student performance data from courses, within courses. It's going to need engagement with a wider range of Gen Ed courses. We've focused on certain ones for the piloting and so on, but we need to broaden that significantly.

We need your participation. We need collaboration and input. As I said, we created a transferable process, but that's not necessarily going to work for every one of the different learning objectives in the Gen Ed curriculum. So, if you have good ideas, we want to hear from you. And we're hearing good ideas from the committee, but if you have them, please share them. So just to underline that, Gen Ed assessment needs you.

So I think I'm probably getting close on the time. I refer you to the informational report if you have more questions. If you have any questions for me now about assessment or about Gen Ed in general, we have Maggie Slattery here from the Gen Ed office. Questions?

Chair Rowland: Questions? Yes, go right ahead.

Rosemarie Petrilla, Penn State Hazleton: Petrilla, Hazleton. I might just make a suggestion. And I would consider faculty part of your stakeholders. So, you're surveying students, and you're surveying the graduates, but one of the challenges at the Commonwealth Campuses is having enough Gen Ed courses being offered. So, it's difficult to advise students. And we have to be really strategic how we offer those courses. So, it would be good to hear from the faculty, as well.

Jeff Mamaro: That's a good idea. Thank you.

Chair Rowland: Any other questions? Very good. Moving on. Thank you. Also, from Curricular Affairs is--

[APPLAUSE]

Also from Curricular Affairs is an "Interim Report Senate Feedback on One Penn State 2025's Goal of Curricular Coherence." It can be found in Appendix I. Fifteen minutes have been set aside. Mary Beth?

Interim Report Senate Feedback on One Penn State 2025’s Goal of Curricular Coherence

Mary Beth Williams: Sure. And my co-vice chair-- one of our co-vice chairs is up here. Mike Bartolacci is joining me for a presentation of this.
The Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs this year was charged to look at our processes and procedures, and to consider how these align, or may not, with One Penn State 2025. We're committed to having an open dialogue with our community, with our Faculty Senators, our students, faculty, and staff, about curriculum and curricular processes. And so we're here today, again, to continue that conversation with you, and to welcome your input and comments.

The informational report that you have is the input we collected from you in December during a forensic report session, where we invited you to think about Penn State 2025 and what a coherent curriculum mean to you. Today, you have another form-- this one's white. It is not pistachio-colored, Shelli. Ours is white-- to invite continued dialogue and input from you on, in this case, consultation. I'll come back to that later on in the presentation.

The report that you have, the informational report, contains all of the input that we received from you in December in the appendix. I want to highlight a couple of the themes that were emerging from that report. I have no idea which button I'm pushing. I don't know. Yeah, let's try that one. OK.

So there are three general themes that emerged from the comments that you submitted. These are student-focused, faculty-focused, and curriculum-focused. Again, they're all in the appendix. I'm just highlighting a couple here to draw your attention to them.

The ability of students to move from one campus to another and to have some assurance that the curriculum that they take in a course aligns with the courses that they take at another campus is an underlying theme that we've seen. I will not read to you. I promise. You are fully capable. But a coherent curriculum is one-- I'm reading the last one-- is one. "When I take a course at one location, it should count at all other Penn State locations."

We also have curriculum-focused comments that we received. And we received quite a lot of these. I encourage you to read all of them. Faculty, you all commented on both course coherence and program coherence, and we differentiate between the two of them here. So course coherence, some of you said a coherent curriculum means that assessments are connected meaningfully to the goals and objectives that faculty say the experiences that we want students to have in our classrooms.

But we also care about-- I do have a-- oh, I do. Coherence across a program means that courses are not redundant, that they echo each other's themes and interleave with each other. And we see that in a few of our comments that we avoid circular references, but we also do not want a shrunken curriculum that consists only of courses that can be offered everywhere.

And this final comment-- this curricular coherence means forward-moving, not circular, with clear endpoints. We mean graduation, completion of degrees, goals accomplished, but not dead ends, of course, save, of course, the final degree. It's with minimal repetition. But we also need to enable faculty creativity. Coherence is not uniformity.

Our final major theme to really think about here and to acknowledge is faculty-focused comments that were made. And I will say there were many comments, when you read through them, that talked about relationships between faculty and faculty trust across disciplines, across campuses.

And the first one here is an example that "I'm more concerned about what that concept means in actual
practice. I first see this as an opportunity for University Park colleges and schools to exert control at the expense of Commonwealth campuses. And we need to acknowledge that that is part of the culture when we talk about sharing and working together that we need to address."
We also have comments that allude to the amount of work that it takes to do difficult curriculum work, and to collaborate with each other. The smaller details can differ between campuses. We have a need for our faculty members to have the freedom to focus on different topics related to their interests or research.

In the last point, we have-- in the last comment, an urgency to require that University Park and campus faculty work together. The process should be faculty-inclusive, and driven, and transparent. An assessment is key and needs to be at the forefront.

So these are, I think, very valuable comments that you all shared. We also received some additional comments that not in the report because they came in through separate venues, through email. I share two of them here. And I actually will read these because you don't have them in the report.

"Research on teaching and learning in higher education exposes a missing issue that is essential to any conversation around curriculum-- learning facilitation. The mission of an educational institution is guided by objectives and competencies, not program lists and requirements. A focus on learning competencies puts the student front and center, while also providing for the desired transferability."

The second comment received by email that I wanted to share with you is, "The people working on school reform in the 1980s and '90s looked at Xerox and LL Bean business models. They didn't know curriculum, and they focused on gaining efficiencies rather than creating space for learning, which is messy and takes time."

And so as we open this conversation, we know that it will be messy and it will take time. And we invite you to participate in that conversation as we go forward, including today.

The last thing that we wanted to show you in this report is this really atrocious schematic. I'm not a graphic designer, as you can tell. But this is a super over-simplified version of curriculum at Penn State. I'm also a chemist, and so there are double-pointed arrows, implying two-way directionality, not equilibrium, OK? Two-way directionality here.

Our point here is that the curriculum process has many, many, many layers. Faculty we've put at the top of this because ideas about curriculum-- what we want students to learn in our courses in our program--starts with the faculty. Faculty Senators and Curricular Affairs, as I started working with Curricular Affairs this fall, wanted to remind you all that sometimes we are seen as the bad guys who say no. But, really, we are elected representatives of the faculty, here to work with you to help define what it is you want, what we want, as faculty, for students to learn.

We are aware that there are lots of processes owned by Faculty Senate in our policies and our procedures that could use some streamlining. And so, your input on those here and elsewhere, we are open to and we'd like to hear about. We'd also like to hear about, from you, how to better support faculty in the initial steps of idea generation, consultation, and collaboration on curriculum. And so today is one way to do that, but we invite that much more in the future.

As you know, new curricula require administrative approval. And they require implementation by lots of offices and hardworking people who are entering things in the bulletin, and in LionPATH, and in course
Schedulers, and in audits, and in all kinds of software systems. And so, we are all working together to try and implement these as quickly as possible.

A look ahead. I will tell you Curricular Affairs continues to gather feedback. And we thank you for that. The committee has received a report from the Math Placement Task Force which asks us to think about the use of Aleks placement testing as prerequisites on a number of courses.

We're a liaison to the Curricular Process Reform task force, with a report that is coming that we're looking forward to working on. And we're also working very closely with implementation teams who implement the curricular changes that are approved by Curricular Affairs, whether it's the registrar's office, or the folks who program the bulletin, or the new curriculum management system. And so, updates on all of those will be forthcoming.

Anything you would like to add?

**Mike Bartolacci, Penn State Berks:** No.

**Mary Beth Williams:** OK. So, thank you for your time on your long day. I'd be happy to take questions.

**Chair Rowland:** Do we have any questions? Well, thank you, Mary Beth.

**Mary Beth Williams:** All right.

[APPLAUSE]

**Chair Rowland:** Our next report is from the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. It is titled "Annual Report for 2018-2019." Faculty Rights and Responsibilities chair Greg Ziegler will give us a brief overview of the committee and its work.

**Annual Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Report for 2018-2019**

**Greg Ziegler, College of Agricultural Sciences:** Good afternoon, for all of you who have sat in there. University policy AC-76, "Faculty Rights and Responsibilities," establishes the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and defines the committee's scope and its operation.

The committee may review petitions from a faculty member who asserts that he or she has suffered a substantial injustice resulting from a violation of academic freedom, procedural fairness, or professional ethics, and any situation in which an administrator seeks a committee judgment as to the appropriate action toward a faculty member who, in his or her opinion, may be failing to meet their responsibilities.

FR&R comprises nine members elected by the Senate, six faculty members and three members of the Academic Leadership Council. Two of the faculty members are from academic voting units other than University Park. Six faculty members and three deans are elected as alternates, with two of the faculty alternates from academic voting units other than UP.

After a petitioner has consulted their unit or the University Ombudsperson, they may submit a petition for review of a complaint to FR&R. The whole committee reviews the petition. And if the complaint is found to be within the scope of AC-76, selects a three-member subcommittee to conduct a more in-depth
investigation. The subcommittee then reports back to the whole committee to draft our recommendation
to the Office of the Provost, who will forward these on to the petitioner with his or her decision in the
matter. The process is conducted in strict confidence.
I want to personally 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 towards 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 for Faculty Affairs, Kathleen
Bieschke, and Dawn Blasko, the Executive Director of Senate, and the staff of the Faculty Senate.

From my experience, it appears that quite a few faculty don't know of the existence of FR&R or our role
on campus. I do encourage all Senators to make our presence known to your colleagues. And if questions
about process do arise, they can contact the Senate office for any guidance they may need. And I stand
for any questions.

Chair Rowland: Any questions for Greg? Very good. Thank you, Greg, for joining us. We are very
appreciative.

[APPLAUSE]
Chair Rowland: Senate Committee on Global Programs is our next report, entitled "Family Travel
Approval Rates." This is Appendix K. Five minutes has been allocated for presentation and discussion.

Family Travel Approval Rates

Brian King, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Thank you.

Chair Rowland: Have at it, Chair King.

Brian King: Thanks, also, everyone, for being here. I'll make this quick and to have time for questions if
folks have it. This is moderately related to a presentation you might remember from the September
meeting regarding the TSN, the Travel Safety Network. In the same time period, July of 2016, this
particular policy concerns family travel approval rates. This is also a collaboration between the Office of
Global Programs and Office of Risk Management. It specifically concerns study abroad programs.

There's language that's articulated in the report here I won't read for you. But it specifically says that
spouses, partners, and others are not allowed to go as guests on these programs. There is then a language
in TR01, which is called International Travel Requirements, that says rare exceptions can be made.

We were asked to, basically, look at the last three years of data to get a better sense of this policy in terms
of how it's being administered, much like we did with TSN in September. The numbers that we were able
to get from Global Programs-- we appreciate their support on this-- is that there have been, over the past
three-plus years, 45 documented requests for exemption for, again, partners, spouses, family members to
attend an EA program, of which 42 were given approval for a 93.33% approval rate.
We did have a discussion last night amongst the committee chairs. And it was brought to my attention out of the Council meeting the previous week that we should emphasize that these are individuals who've gone through the whole process. So, these are not complete data. We anticipate there are probably other cases where exemptions have been requested, perhaps denied, or alternatively, people have begun the process of initiating a study abroad experience and perhaps did not choose to continue requesting this kind of exemption.

This was basically the first attempt to provide some data for you on this as a diagnosis. TR01 is being revised so, as we were drafting this report, Global Programs Committee was cautious to move into any direction of suggesting recommendations. That having been said, I have been in touch with Jennifer Santiago, who is the Assistant Vice President, and also University Risk Officer, so she's assumed Gary Langsdale's position. She's aware of the fact that we're interested in the revision of this policy and has indicated that she will keep me posted. She's not been able to move on that as of yet.

We wanted to dedicate maybe five minutes to this because, in the Council meeting, and then the meeting last night, some Senators had expressed an interest in this particular process. I am happy to take questions, if anyone has any.

**Chair Rowland:** Questions for Chair King? In the front.

**Julie Gallagher, Penn State Brandywine:** Thank you. Julie Gallagher, Penn State Brandywine. One of the things when you said the initial policy, that when it came out, said it was rare that there was a very high bar. And then there--

**Brian King:** Says technically not allowed.

**Julie Gallagher:** Not allowed.

**Brian King:** And then says rare exemptions. And then it begins to open up a little bit of daylight as you read TR01. But I'm sorry to interrupt.

**Julie Gallagher:** What happened on my campus was that people really took that to heart. So now that there is an exemption policy-- and we've seen a strong support for those exemptions when the [INAUDIBLE] of applications. We're finding that the message has not also gotten out as effectively as it should that there is a process for applying for exemptions. And so, people are self-censoring about even going.

And so the exception rate is high, but how many people have not even begun to consider having a family member apply for this? I think that's the messaging that needs to go out in your revision, because so many people say I had no idea I could even apply to have my family members go.

**Brian King:** I appreciate that very much. I do think that was part of why Nicholas wanted this, to make sure that this is one of our charges for the year, now that we're three years out of the implementation of this in July of 2016. To be clear, this is not our policy. Our committee works with Global Programs. And just like with TSN, there is, essentially, a kind of a partnership between Global Programs and Risk Management on this.
But we do want to continue to dialogue, to see if-- we were told explicitly there may be was some loosening of this that was going on, much like when we saw in September that the TSN was kind of being revisited a bit, based on some faculty feedback. And so, we do want that to be a dialogue. And I'm happy to keep this body updated as Global Programs Committee of Faculty Senate follows this. Thank you.

Chair Rowland: Deirdre? This will be our last question.

Deirdre Folkers, Penn State York: This is actually just a comment. Folkers from York. And I'm not challenging the policy. But there has been a bit of an unintended consequence, I think, at some of the smaller campuses. In the past, it used to be that faculty, staff, and their spouses were allowed to accompany trips. And frankly, one of the reasons that the people who then ran the trips encouraged that was because it actually lowered the overall cost for the trip.

On the campus we have students who have difficulty coming up with the money to be able, for example, to go on an embedded trip within a course. Allowing faculty, staff, and spouses, actually, by increasing the numbers it took the individual costs down, and it actually made the trip more affordable for students.

We used to routinely run three trips per semester associated with our culture courses. We no longer run any trips. And so, kind of an unintended consequence of the change in policy is that we solved the problem by not offering any global experiences for our students. And I think that's been a real loss, quite frankly.

Brian King: I would agree. Thanks for sharing that.

Chair Rowland: All right. Time allocated has expired. Thank you, Chair King.

[APPLAUSE]

Next, we have two reports from Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology. These are appendix L, "Google Suite for Education," as well as Appendix M, which is "Penn State GO Mobile App."

Penn State GO Mobile App

Jennifer Sparrow, Associate Vice President for Teaching and Learning with Technology: Thank you. Hi, everyone.

Chair Rowland: This is Jennifer Sparrow. Please take it away.

Jennifer Sparrow: We're actually going to do the Penn State GO app first. First of all, how many of you have downloaded the Penn State GO app? Nice numbers! Thank you very much. Glad to see Dr. Jones has done that, as well. Thank you.

I am here to talk to you about sort of the process we went through to get the Penn State GO app launched and give you some good news about student feedback, and then some numbers as well as what we've had for downloads in the past week. And none of this would not be possible without the team within TLT, and the folks within IT, and their broad reach across the institution to figure out what we needed to do to
get to this point. With the understanding that, very clearly, our first app day is not our best app day, so we want to make sure we're aware of this, and how this is going forward, and how it continues to improve.

So Penn State GO is the app. If you haven't downloaded it, these are a couple of screenshots. Very beautiful. It's taking a look at the things that our students wanted first. So, we are looking at a student-facing app, with the understanding that we'll be evolving into a faculty- and staff-facing app, as well. So, there'll be more features to come. Let me see if we can get this one to play here. Oops. My apologies.

About nine months ago, we started this process. Back in May, we did a student survey. We put that student survey into Canvas. This is the first time we had actually done this. And we were wildly surprised at the response. So, this is the end of the semester, right? Students are getting ready for final exams. And I think we had about 6,000 responses within about 48 hours.

And what was great about this is students said, yes, we want an app. And these are the kinds of things that we wanted in the app. We want access to LionPATH. We want access to Canvas. We'd love maps in here. We'd like to know about security and safety.

And the beauty of this is we had about 3,000 students that offered to beta test for us. And those were evenly divided between World Campus-- you can see 36.6% from World Campus. Twenty-eight percent from University Park, and 34% from our Commonwealth Campuses. So, we were really pleased at both the student responses and the offer to be beta testers for us. And those students gave us amazing feedback. They were positive. They were saying what they needed. They were saying what didn't work. And lots of things didn't work when we first launched the beta.

We had a Name the App contest in June of 2019. I can tell you that we offered several names and then a writing category. Ohio State Sucks was the number one written-in name for the app. That was vetoed by Lawrence Lockman's group. So, we've got Penn State GO.

We did usability testing in July of 2019, a second round in August of 2019. And again, you can imagine this is the summertime, and you think, oh, gosh. We're not going to get much feedback back. But we were doing a lot of the usability testing was done digitally. So, download the app. Give us your feedback. There is actually a button at the bottom that says Feedback. And we encourage the students to utilize it to get there.

We did some face-to-face usability testing. We had students over to the Dreamery. We asked them to go through it and show us where they were clicking, where they were getting hung up. We did the full beta release in October of 2019. So, there were some practice stuff up to there, and then the full beta release. Again, beta testers gave us lots of great feedback.

We had an iterative released in November, and then we released on the app store just a few weeks ago. And so, the exciting stuff here is-- there you can see the student involvement. Just some quick pictures there.

Why did we go mobile, and why now? We heard last meeting about One Penn State 2025. We're talking with Renata and Yvonne about this guiding principle of providing a seamless student experience. So, this was part of that vision and part of how we start to get there.

[LOUD MUSIC PLAYING]
Sorry. Turn that down just a little bit. Wake up! [LAUGHS]

[MUSIC PLAYING]

A nice promotional video here.

We've had great media coverage. In fact, we invited our favorite students from the Collegian, from Onward State over to download the app the first day it was available. Some good feedback there. My 14-year-old took the time in the car the other night to read me all of the feedback students had provided on the iTunes store. There were some I just told her to skip, but lots of good feedback from our end users on how we're going there.

We're going to continue to evolve this. And again, I mentioned our first app day is not our best app day. We know that right now we have three personas that are available, so when you download the app you can be University Park, World Campus, or Commonwealth Campuses. It'll know where you are geographically if you've enabled the location sharing. At some point. It doesn't do that yet. So, we're not there yet. But you can choose Maps. When you go to Maps you can choose Greater Allegheny Campus, for example. So, this is one opportunity for you to do some customization.

Tony Anderson and his team are working with the Commonwealth Campus IT folks. They'll be presenting to the chancellors, I think, next week, next Monday-- he's shaking his head yes-- to work on what the liaisons will look like as we start to develop those personas. At some point, we'll be able to do these at a college level as well. So, there's an opportunity to tailor communications to those specific groups. So, you could say I'm a Greater Allegheny student, or I'm a Bellisario College of Communications student.

We'll also have prospective students. Parents-- I heard we were going to push parents to be aware of this census and where students should complete the census. This is one opportunity where we may be able to do that as well. Alumni, visitors, obviously, donors. We want to have them be there as well.

You can download the app at the app store, either the Google store or the Apple store. Just so you have some numbers that take with you in your back pocket, if folks are wondering how successful has this been. So, between January 15 and January 25-- so, 10 days-- we had 26,000 downloads, 21,000 on iOS and about 5,000 on the Android platform. 59,000 of those were from University Park, in terms of the persona that they're choosing. 27,000 from Commonwealth Campuses and 14,000 from World Campus. So those are folks choosing that persona. So, they may bobble back and forth just to see what those differences are.

So good stuff there. Questions about the mobile app before I proceed on? Yes.

Chair Rowland: Take the microphone.

Unidentified Senator: Are you able to synchronize this with the census? Given the importance of that presentation we had, this seems like a tremendous opportunity, given those downloads.

Jennifer Sparrow: See this guy? Wave, Tony, please. Tony Anderson would be the one to talk to.
Unidentified Senator: I'll just throw it out there. If it's at all possible to use this platform to emphasize April 1 to really push out the census, it could address that issue that we heard at the very beginning of our meeting seven hours ago about—

[LAUGHTER]

Jennifer Sparrow: Whew. I thought it was only eight. [LAUGHS] His email address is ADA9, if you want to just reach out to him directly, Tony Anderson.

Chair Rowland: Excellent. Shelley?

Jennifer Sparrow: Others? We have one more. Sorry.

Michele Stine: Stine, College of Health and Human Development. I'm asking this question on behalf of one of my committee members, who could not be here. Is the University collecting information from this app? Given the concerns about digital privacy and surveillance, for lack of a better word, what kind of information is the University collecting from this? And what's being done with it, if anything?

Jennifer Sparrow: Sure. We're not collecting any data other than what platform folks are using and what personas they are choosing right at this point. There will be an opportunity for folks to opt in on geolocation services. So if, for example, we wanted to have Student Engagement Network-- I'm looking to the back of the room there, Mike-- and there were some activities that, as I was walking by the HUB, I'm a student and I've elected to receive that. There's something called geofencing, which will allow us to say if I'm within a certain number of feet of this location, it will say, hey, Jennifer, did you know that there's this cool thing happening with the Student Engagement Network? Why don't you stop by?

And so those opportunities will be coming, but all of that will be opt in at this point. Our team has worked closely with Don in his previous role as Chief Information Security Officer (CISO) and with Holly Swires, in the privacy office, in terms of what should we and what shouldn't we be collecting, and what should we and shouldn't be looking at. It's nothing right now, and we'll continue to keep those folks apprised of what we're working on and what the capabilities are.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Further questions? Now we can pivot to the next one.

Google Suite for Education

Jennifer Sparrow: Thank you. The next piece of this is the Google Suite for Education, or G Suite for Education. If you're not familiar with this, we adopted Office 365. And I know for many people those tools are phenomenal.

We have the opportunity to do a lot of great things with this. In fact, [Inaudible] who's also in the back row here-- could you wave, [Inaudible] said that we can absolutely create a workflow that will take those informational letters that say yes, you can release my information to this letter of recommendation. We can create a flow that will actually take care of that for faculty. So, she'll be the one to talk to on that.

But we have, in addition to Office 365, which includes Word and Excel, and if you haven't utilized those tools online, they have the same type of tools. So you can use Word Online and collaborate on documents.
What we heard about three years ago when we started this process from the faculty, staff, and students that we surveyed as we were thinking about what's next for Penn State was that the Word suite-- Word, Excel, PowerPoint-- are the industry leaders. And we know that's what our students are going to be using when they leave here.

But what we also heard was that, when we are collaborating with each other, and we're collaborating across institutions on research projects, when students are collaborating, when they're coming into the University, they're actually using the G Suite for Education. So, they're using Google Docs, Google Pages, Google Sheets. So, we wanted to make that offering available as well.

And we talked to a lot of our colleagues, our peers at other institutions. We wanted to have an understanding of what does this look like. What does this mean for security purposes? What does this mean for logging in? Is there confusion associated with this? And what we found was that many of our peers have done the same thing. They have chosen one of these platforms, which we did-- Office 365-- for their email and calendaring university-wide solution. They were able to provide the suite of tools that goes along with that, and then the suite of tools that complements that from a Google Suite perspective.

What's great about this is email and calendaring is still all on Office 365, widely available to you all, and is the University's official email and calendaring tool. But now you will be able to utilize your Penn State email address. So jls997@psu.edu gets me into Google Drive, and I'm able to collaborate with my peers across the institution, with students, or at other institutions.

We've been able to integrate the G Suite for Education into Canvas. So, if that is your preferred method of collaborating, or you want that to be your students' preferred method of collaboration, you can include those tools within Canvas as well.

So who is this available to? All of you all. So, students, faculty, and staff. Again, all of the suite of tools minus email and calendar. You can go to G Suite. You all got these little cards today. GSuite.psu.edu. On the flip side is the mobile app. I expect those app download numbers to go way up after today. And you'll be able to see there the suite of tools that are available for you.

So we want to, again, share and collaborate. We wanted to provide the most opportunity for faculty, and students, and staff to be able to collaborate in seamless ways.

Now, this question came up at LIST. And I fully appreciate this. How do we know when to use which tools? And that's a really great question. And I think the answer is what tools are you most comfortable with, and what tools will you be working on with your colleagues at other institutions, or what tools would your students be most comfortable using, or what do you want them to be using within the coursework.

And so this gives you some options. A flow chart is available on the website. Right, [Inaudible]? So, you can take a look on the website to make those decisions, as well. Questions about G Suite for Education?

**Timothy Robicheaux**: Robicheaux, Liberal Arts. Quick question. Google Forms allows you to write quizzes, which is awesome. Canvas Quizzes-- I'm not even going to into it, but I've rewritten my exams because it takes so long to grade Canvas Quizzes. But I use Pollock Testing Center. Do you know if there would be a way to override Pollock Testing Center security to use a Google Form version of a quiz rather
than Canvas?

**Jennifer Sparrow:** Sure. I don't have that answer in my back pocket. I don't have back pockets today, so. Thank you, Angela. We have our resident testing center expert here. So, thank you.

**Angela Linse, Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence:** Thanks. There we go. The Pollock Testing Center-- I think it's as close as it's getting.

[LAUGHTER]

I know kiss the mic is what we do, but no. [LAUGHS] All right. The Pollock Testing Center has an initiative to work on how we could offer other kinds of testing. But don't expect it soon because there just aren't that many other kinds of tests. And they're all very expensive and don't have the level of security that we have. So, we work with folks in Jennifer's office, which runs the hardware and the software. And we run the people, and we're working on it, but.

**Timothy Robicheaux:** Thank you.

**Angela Linse:** Overriding, ah.

**Jennifer Sparrow:** Thanks.

**Chair Rowland:** Any other questions?

**Jennifer Sparrow:** Oh. Do we have one more question? Sorry.

**Chair Rowland:** Right over there.

**Diego Santos:** Diego Santos, Eberly College of Science. Does this Google Drive have unlimited storage?

**Jennifer Sparrow:** I'm sorry, what?

**Diego Santos:** Does the Google Drive have unlimited storage for us?

**Jennifer Sparrow:** [Inaudible] is shaking her head yes, so I'm going to take the resident expert's word on that one.

**Diego Santos:** Two more follow up questions. Does that also include Google Photos?

[INAUDIBLE]

**Jennifer Sparrow:** Wait, we've got a mic right there, [Inaudible]

**Diego Santos:** Oh, sorry.

**Jennifer Sparrow:** Thank you.

**Susan [Inaudible]:** There are a number of ancillary apps that are included as part of the Google Suite for Education that we are able to turn on. We've been exploring them. There is one caveat in the contract that
addresses students. It has to be students 18 and older only. So, we're trying to figure out some method to make these options available while still meeting the compliance needs. Because we can't really reach out to all the parents and ask them to sign off on different pieces of it. So, we may do something with separating out into different organizational units to allow that.

But we have had requests coming in for folks who want to make use of the Google Custom Search, or Google Photos, or Google Earth, and those kinds of things in class. So that is being done.

Jennifer Sparrow: So, stay tuned.

Diego Santos: Thank you. And one more question. Does this mean that Box is gone, where we have to move things off of Box onto Google Drive or Suite?

Jennifer Sparrow: Box is not gone yet. But I will tell you, just for [INAUDIBLE] yeah. So, Box, like many of our vendor partners or vendors that we have worked with in the past, have seen the opportunity to get us in at a particularly low level and then come back and jack up the prices enormously for the second or third iteration of the contract. To a point where, with other storage tools available to us--OneDrive and Google Drive--that we're looking at what those options are and what might a Box exit strategy look like. And we are just in the initial phases of this, so please don't tweet out that Box is going away, OK? It's not yet, but we are looking at our options. Good question.

Chair Rowland: I'm sorry. The time has expired for this presentation. Thank you, Jennifer.

[APPLAUSE]

Moving on, Senate Committee on Outreach is sponsoring a presentation of the Student Engagement Network. This appears in Appendix N. Our guest, Mike Zeman, will give the presentation.

Student Engagement Network

Andy Freiburg, College of Medicine: I'm Andy Freiburg, College of Medicine, current chair of the Senate Committee on Outreach. Just out of curiosity, for those of you who remain, how many of you have a good understanding of the Student Engagement Network? More than me. This was a charge for Outreach a year ago, and I had no idea what it was.

We were supposed to present a report on it, so we had Mike come in and talk to us. And after he talked, we thought we don't need a report. We just need Mike. So here he is.

[LAUGHTER]

Michael Zeman, Director, Student Engagement Network: All right. Good afternoon. Thanks for sticking around. I teach 200 students in here in 75 minutes, so I'm going to move forward here so I can start my class on time.

So first of all, really quick history. The Council on Engaged Scholarship that ran from 2012 to 2016 informed the creation of the Student Engagement Network. And that, as you can see, has the executive sponsors of Rob Pangborn, Damon Sims, and Tracey Huston, so it has a wide berth. That's been an impressive collection of folks within those offices to work with and network with. So that's really made this first three years an amazing experience for me, just kind of growing with this office and these
The mission is something that was discerned, I think, from that council, almost, that we're really trying to connect students with the right engagement opportunities, the right experiences that, I think, create good citizens leaving the University as grads. This mission actually connects directly now to the strategic plan and is a key foundation, so we're excited about that. So, if you are partnering with us in any way, shape, or form, you're directly moving into the next strategic plan's mission, foundationally.

And so what we've done with that is broken that down into essentially three areas. Just connecting students and empowering them to be resilient, to learn the skills that I'll show you here in a second, to gain and gather personal growth and professional skills.

To enhance the institutional values, the institutional goals and mission. So we have entities that help foster the scholarship of engagement so we're doing good scholarly work and improving the quality of those experiences, the depth of those opportunities presented to students.

And then, of course, connecting and collaborating with community entities, alumni, I think, in a sense of reciprocity that we're not just putting our students into opportunities for the sake of learning, but rather reciprocally for impact on community and improving the world around us.

So what that means is that we've used our programs to start to do that. Still being relatively young, we have several programs that were kicked off three years ago and just have been evolving ever since. The grant program, the internship program, there's a Faculty Academy we have. If you've been at the HUB, we have the engagement space. We've been working on a portal, and we have some special projects. So, I'm just going to run through some notes on those things, particularly.

Maybe my favorite is the grant program. It is where the rubber meets the road for student engagement. This is really reducing barriers for students, increasing access for those inoculated or marginalized from such opportunities.

The money does fund different things. It funds a first experience, full access to experiences, and deeper experiences. So, it does all those things. Our review committee of faculty and staff that looks at those hundreds of applications a year, we have trainings, and meetings, and rubrics to work through, and choose and select the right students.

So you can see the numbers here. It's quite popular. The demand is very high. We're able to fund about a quarter of the applicants. That just marches on each-- we have three cycles a year now that fund fall and winter, spring and some Maymester, and then some May and summer cycles.

We pilot something new each year. This year, we've piloted the fact that each student is required to have a supervising coach or faculty/staff mentor. And so that is bringing forth some interesting concepts as students are also required to articulate the growth after each experience. We do ask that they provide a picture and a profile, and we add that to our website. And they are asked to articulate and process what has happened during that experience, whether it's ladling soup, or chairing a finance committee of THON, or doing international research, volunteerism, study abroad, anything you can think of.

As a matter of fact, those engagement types are something that we worked on adding to the Penn State system, which is the framework, or the organizational structure of engagement for folks.
There's 10 different engagement buckets, and you can probably argue just about any experience into these. You can see that this student is actually in the engagement space, searching through the repository of student stories that we've collected hundreds and hundreds of over the last three years. So recently, as we designed the portal, we've really been considering the power of this storytelling process—our social media campaign, marketing, messaging, the actual space in the HUB, and then the portal creation, which will be accessible to all campuses and all 90,000 students worldwide.

These are the components that we've been working on. And as we've started to ask students to reflect, we look back on the work of the council. And some of you in here were on that council and those committees. These growth areas are what really came of that and have added some structural and conceptual entities when students do reflect on their experiences. So, you have things like citizenship, decision-making, respect for others, interdisciplinarianism, the professional skill set like teamwork, communication. Communication, and then skills of the trade, I guess you could say, and leadership, as well, I meant to add in there.

So these five growth areas are a driver for students when they're out and about. And when they apply for that grant program, they tell us about how they intend to work these things into an experience. So, it's not necessarily, hey, look back on your four years and talk about a collection of experiences. We're looking at the intentionality and, I think, challenging students to design and plan for being engaged.

And that's this graphic that we had-- just go back-- on this cycle here. We have Find your why, Start your journey, Complete an experience, and then Tell your story. This seems to be resonating with students quite well. And what we do with that is we utilized our interns in the HUB to design workshops. They've been co-facilitating first-year seminar sessions. And they've also been co-writing something very special, a Canvas course that is something that we believe is going to be very useful, something that we can insert into any course, actually, let alone first-year seminars.

But the internship program, this is meeting and making real relationships with people. This enables students to find a way to talk or speak with a peer who might be able to coach them and talk to them about what their journey was like. So, when they do the design journey plan activity, we see that there's real resonance with our student interns.

In fact, we've been speaking with Starfish about the idea of having students be able to create appointments through Starfish to connect with their peers in the engagement space. A goal of ours is to have a SEN intern at every campus, including World Campus, which we have piloted a few. So, we want to come back to that and continue to scale that.

And-- I was hitting the laser pointer. Sorry if I poked anybody. The Faculty Academy is one of the other components. We have Scholars and Fellows. The applications are usually due in early January. This is a wonderful opportunity for us to build the network with your peers.

We've got folks-- let's see. Sasha Meinrath, Susan Russell, Pete Ashbacker. Dr. Roland was one of them. Ann Clements, Keir Hammon, Haley Sankey, Jen Urey. Folks who have proposed projects, and they've been funded or had time to work on those things and increase and improve the scholarship, build resources, and inform the SEN on these projects and programs. So, this has been a powerful mechanism for us to work directly with faculty and staff.
And then the final component, before I finish with just the last couple slides, is the engagement space and the portal. So, if you're in the HUB, I can't remember the numbers. Somewhere like 10,000 students, at least, walk right by this engagement space. It has been a pilot program, a prototype of a marketing beacon for students to consider their engaged learning journey that walks alongside, or in tandem with, their curricular journey.

And the focus groups that we've had-- students want it to be social, visible, fun, interactive, and they want to connect with their peers. And so that all tethers to the portal design project. And that portal is-- we're in the midst of discovery phase on that. Our timeline looks to-- I hope in over a year from now, 2021, to be launching V1 of that.

That would be something that connects directly with Penn State GO as a dot on that screen. So, they solved a lot of our student interface issues with having a broad reach. So, students could connect and then start searching for a one-stop repository for student engagement activities. It's an AI model, which means we have a company building, recommender models that would bring to students the right next best experience. And there's a lot of amazing conversations happening around that. And it would also help them process and reflect, track and record those experiences.

The last thing I'll mention about the context of our office is just this Canvas course. It's actually officially a book in print for our grant awardees, but it is on Canvas. A couple modules that are essentially insertable into any curriculum. And you can use the context of your class to introduce them. It's not difficult to do in terms of logistically. It really is a matter of having the students think intentionally about finding their why and starting their journey. So, I am seeking pilot partners for that in the summer and next academic year, if you're interested in talking about that.

And I think I'm out of time, so I'll just say we're expanding all of these elements. We're excited to continue to work with campus partners. And we're also mindful of the sense of Engage Penn State initiative coming forward with President Barron's initiative there. And I guess I'll stop there. Thank you.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you, Mike.

[APPLAUSE]

The next report is from University Planning, and is found as Appendix O. This is the Annual Capital Construction Report. Our guest, Bill Sitzabee, Associate Vice President of Penn State's Office of Physical Plant will present this report.

Annual Capital Construction Report 2019-2020

William Sitzabee, Associate Vice President, Office of Physical Plant: Did he take the-- nope. Here we go. Good afternoon. Congratulations for getting this far. So, I'm going to try to move through this pretty quickly, considering that we're a few hours behind.

[LAUGHTER]

First up, is this slide you've seen before. I presented it on the Senate floor last year. This is the overall philosophy behind the strategic plan. It organizes the plan in terms of how we prioritize our investments. Primarily, we combine the programmatic needs with the facility conditions and formulate a priorities plan
based on that. You can see, and I've presented this before, so I won't go into detail, but some of the
guiding principles that are up there.

This slide you've also seen, too, but updated from last year. You'll notice up on the top line we've
scratched out the 750, the 720, the 640, and now we're down to 610 in borrowing. Those are in reaction
to the tuition freezes we've had and the need to lower the borrowing capacity on the plan. Keep in mind
that the borrowing capacity is supported through debt service from the operating budget.

What we have done is we picked up several years of extra funding from the Commonwealth of
Pennsylvania, who we typically plan on a $40 million per year capital investment. And the last two years
they've given us $70 million, so that sort of counterbalances some of that.

This slide here, you'll see the overall capital plan was originally pitched at $4.7 billion. The plan is right
around $4 billion now. It's not that the plan got lower, but we did pull out the Penn State Health
borrowing capacity and moved that over to a separate credit line. And so, the College of Medicine, while
not a self-supported unit, is currently fenced apart from the rest of the E&G but is in that mix. And that's
going to develop a little bit further over time.

So I've kind of gone through those pretty quickly. And I can take some questions at the end. But those are
mostly just a reminder of what we looked at last year.

This slide here basically shows you the organization of the capital plan. The Catch Up and New Building
buckets is really the buy down for the existing backlog. Recall that are our backlog on our physical plant
is right around $1.4, $1.5 billion. And so, we have an obligation to buy out our past sins.

The keep-up work is how we organize around maintaining steady state. If you think about that, the catch
up is really our large major investments, where we recycle entire facilities. It gives us an opportunity to
modernize them and fix the functional obsolescence. Whereas the keep-up are those smaller projects that
are keeping the facilities moving, small investments in new programs.

The system upgrades are a way that we organize around a system. So, this might be a roof program or a
payment program where we can get best value in organizing around that. And whereas the major
maintenance-- we have over 100 major maintenance projects per year. These are projects typically under
a million dollars that are really fixing things like our air handlers, and roof patching, and stuff like that.

So the Energy Savings Program really is not bucket more so than it is a funding source. That's where we
borrow money against our internal bank to fund energy savings projects that we then put into those
facilities with a payback on the utility bill. So those pay for themselves in a 10-year or less payback.

Information technology is probably the only non-facility-related capital investment that's in the plan.
There's some small equipment in there under $25 million total spread out over a lot of different units, but
the information technology is really the SIMBA project. And then I'll give a little briefing about self-
supporting units.

I'm going to walk through first. This is the catch-up/new building. These are the major projects for
University Park. I have a similar slide for the Commonwealth Campuses. And these are the major
projects that we are investing in this five-year plan. You will see the top three are in construction. And I'll
walk through those real briefly to give you a status update on what those are. Recall that this represents
almost half of the education and general investment at $970 million dollars.

So first project up is the new Animal, Veterinary, and Biomedical Science building. This replaces the Henning Building. Again, I'll walk through this quickly. That was demolished over the summer, and we started construction this past October. The project is on time and on budget. Looking to complete construction in December of ’21.

The next one is the James Building. If you recall, that was a three-story building. It no longer exists. It's been demolished. This building had floors on it that we couldn't use because it had been in such poor repair. And so, we are replacing that facility with the new James Building, which is actually a larger building and will house the LaunchBox 2.0 and the Event Penn State programs, as well as two of the dean suites will move to this facility. It's surprisingly close to core campus, even though it's on the other side of West College. It's about four to five minutes, depending on how you walked to Old Main.

Next is the Willard project. This was a project that moved up on the list because of a generous gift from Donald P. Bellisario. And it invests in the College of Communications. It builds a new media center. It fixes the old Willard side of Willard with a major investment of close to $50 million.

This project is the College of Engineering Research Teaching Space. If you recall back, I think about a year ago, I presented a comprehensive master plan for the College of Engineering which includes construction of the West I, the West II, and the parking deck. So, several of those projects are now in motion. This project is the larger of the two College of Engineering buildings at estimated 275,000 square feet. It's the larger building that enables us to demolish Hammond and the engineering units, and makes way for us to renovate Sackett Building.

I know I'm moving through these pretty quickly, and I'll take questions at the end, if that's OK.

Next up, we are in design, working through the final stages of the programming aspects of the Osmond renovation. If you remember, this is a multifaceted project where we do some renovation on the east wing. We construct some new aspects to the facility, and we handle some significant drainage and utility issues in the area.

This project, the Liberal Arts Research and Teaching Building, is sited over by Park Avenue. It actually looks, in the latest design, smaller than what it is there. That was actually just to show what we could build within the rights of the university by code. This project is in design and has moved off. Besides Liberal Arts, this will also accommodate some folks from the law school, or the law program, the SIA program, and is an exciting project.

This project allows us to demolish the Oswald Tower and will enable us to decant the Carpenter Building so that we can, in turn, renovate that in a subsequent capital plan.

This is the second of the two engineering buildings over on West Campus. This is West II. And it's really high base space and more industrial shop space. You can read some of the programs up there. This project will actually move faster because of where it's sited and its size, and will be the first of the two facilities that are finished.

This project laminates up against the West parking deck, which is another enabling project I have a slide for later in the presentation.
We have sited the proposed art museum over by the arboretum. We're excited about this project. Believe it or not, this project has picked up a fair amount of philanthropy. Our goal was a little over $13 million, and I think we've exceeded $14 million in donations. So that's an exciting piece of this. And this project will allow us to move the Palmer Art Museum, which then, in turn, makes way for that to be recycled as a core academic facility on campus.

The next project is the Sackett Building, and this actually gets some attention towards the back side of the plan. In our last year of the plan, the intention is to actually move the folks out of Hammond into the new West I and II buildings, move the folks from Sackett into Hammond as an interim swing space-- swing space is a very costly way to manage folks, so if we can manage that smartly that's what we've decided to do.

It leaves Hammond up a little bit longer, but allows us to then go and renovate the Sackett Building, an original Charles Klauder building designed with the original Penn State master plan. It allows us to take those old wings off and do the right thing while renovating the facility and bringing it up to code.

So I've moved through those pretty quickly. We also have a fair amount of investment in the Commonwealth Campuses at the large scale. About one eighth of the Education and General Plan is invested in these larger facilities at the Commonwealth Campuses. And I'll walk through a few of those pretty quickly.

The Beaver Community Center renovation is currently in design. You'll see the latest rendering up there. This basically doubles the size of the facility and enables to handle some significant academic kinesiology programs, as well as enabling them with their Division III sports programs, a significant improvement on what is a really bad facility currently.

Next is a major investment out at Erie Hall, which is out in Behrend campus. This is a working rendering of what that facility will look like. It allows us to demolish that existing facility that is far beyond its useful life. And again, this project is in design with a construction complete of 2022.

The last large Commonwealth Campus project I have is the Academic Learning Center out in Harrisburg. This is still in concept development. And it is on the back side of the plan. A lot of that has to do with when and how we can borrow and line up the DGS funds to go with this.

This slide basically summarizes the remaining of the plan. What we have in the small renovation projects, there are 24-- hopefully 25, if I can convince the Provost for one more-- that are roughly $99 million dollars. We have 11 projects out at the Commonwealth Campuses. These are the smaller $5 million level-ish projects that enable us to handle some labs, do some program spaces, and really hit some critical facilities that are behind in terms of maintenance.

The system upgrades. Remember, I mentioned that's a five-year program. So that $200 million, $188 million, something in that range, is really spread over 15 different system programs over five years. So, it doesn't really go as far as you would think.

Similarly, with the major maintenance-- like I said, we have about 100 major maintenance projects a year. And these are addressing those sort of more critical, dire things. This is also the bucket of money that I use when we have a major emergency and have to address it. For example, if we have a freeze or
something over a winter break, damaged pipes and stuff, then this is what we use to manage that.

I talked a little bit about the Energy Savings Program. And then I also mentioned the information technology, which is SIMBA. And I recall that you got an update on that at the last Faculty Senate meeting, so I won't go into that too much.

We do have one more slide on infrastructure. Flying through here. In the last capital plan, we made some major infrastructure investments in the water treatment plant, in the steam plants. And we continue with that. It's important that we maintain these utility systems. They are the bread and butter, or the lifeline, that keeps the electric, the heat, and everything running.

There are several major projects in this plan. The water reclamation facility really replaces the waste treatment plant that hasn't been touched in over 65 years. If you can see, this is under construction. Probably one of the most challenging projects we have because we're operating the plant while we're in the process of completely renovating and building a new plant.

The West Campus parking deck I mentioned with the engineering projects. That's currently under construction. We started construction in December. And that allows us to consolidate all the surface parking in West Campus and makes room for us to actually put the new facilities out there. So, this is a critical enabling project.

And then finally, of the projects I called out, the West Campus Steam Plant. This is really an upgrade to the combustion turbine engines. It removes Boiler 6 and renews, basically, Boiler 8. These are large industrial boilers. West Campus steam plant supplies about half of our heat for the campus. The good news on this is this process will allow us to lower our greenhouse gas emissions by over 16,000 tons of greenhouse gases each year. So, it's a big win, not only in our efficiency in saving some funds, but also in lowering our overall emissions.

I do have a slide up here on Hershey. And all I'll say is that this is sort of a work in progress. The Provost and I are traveling down there tomorrow to have some discussions. The Innovation Pavilion project you see up there at $321 million is actually on hold until we can review the program and make sure we've got the right picture and the right level of investment.

In the meantime, there's a couple smaller enabling projects that we're working through. There's a vivarium project that's coming forward on the order of magnitude of about $30 million. And that's actually in three different areas over on the campus that we want to do to help the ongoing research and make way for some more space for the PI's there.

The Children's Hospital overbuild is underway, well underway and almost complete. The parking deck down there is finished. And the emergency department expansion-- although a $50 million project, very complex because, again, here is a facility that remains open and is managing patient care all throughout. So, it's an incremental construction.

I do have a slide that summarizes the auxiliaries. First up was the Auxiliary and Business Services. Basically, the story here is that most of the investment is around the residence halls. We are almost to the last phase of the East Halls project. And we will be looking for procurement on how to go after the Pollock Halls.
All in, this is about a $750 million investment for the university, over a three capital plan program. It's going very well. We're actually quite pleased with how well it's going and think that we can do even better with the Pollock halls in terms of the quality, but also the efficiency in the dollars.

Again, these are self-supported. So, all of these halls that we take offline, the A&BS loses the revenue source for that. And that was accommodated through some new facilities that we built on the front end.

And then I think this is my last slide. Intercollegiate Athletics, basically the Division 1 side, has a fairly ambitious capital plan. It exceeds well beyond what they were authorized, but this is their plan, and it's very philanthropic based. And so each of these projects are moving forward as the philanthropy comes in and they get organized around that.

The first project up, the Holuba Hall, Lasch Building, and Nittany outdoor football fields are actually a collection of three projects that we designed together, was presented to the board and is moving forward. Again, these all have to come out of ICA funds and don't really inject with the Education and General.

And then the Applied Research Lab. We're actually in the process of updating that. The ARL is looking to do an expansion, or kind of a move, out towards Science Park, Cato Park. So, there are several large projects in there. This will also leave two facilities on campus that we need to address-- the existing ARL building and the water tunnel building.

I have flown through that pretty quickly, and I apologize for that. But I wanted to get you out of here at least before 5:00. And so, I'm happy to take any questions. Yes, sir.

**Raymond Najjar, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences:** Raymond Najjar from the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences. Thanks for mentioning the energy savings programs, and the CO2 reductions. And I'm aware of some other things that the University is doing in terms of purchasing renewable energy, which is great.

I'm just wondering has the university considered-- I mean, we're building-- where that facility is built we're supposed to get 25% of our electricity from this resource. And I'm wondering why don't we purchase electricity from a renewable source for the rest? I can do that as a homeowner. I give talks about climate change, and public talks, and I encourage people to do that for their homes. Is there some reason why the University doesn't do that? It's a tiny bit more. I don't know if it's a scale issue.

**William Sitzabee:** Sure, sure. So, it's really a great question. I'd love to talk about it in depth, but the reality is that most of our energy really comes from the thermal side. And so, the heat that we need to heat the campus comes from the steam plants. And so, there's a heavy investment there. And through co-gen, like the combustion turbine co-gen, we're able to take some electric off of that. So, there is a piece of that that we want to self-generate, just because we have to make the investment in that thermal energy.

We also just recently concluded a PPA down in Franklin County for the 25% solar. We were able to do that and be cost effective. So, in other words, we'll actually save money through that process. And we're pretty excited about it. And I really want to do more of those. But I want to make sure that we get this successfully launched first and run the traps before we actually jump right into the next one.

From a technology standpoint, there is renewable energy. And there's technology that can get us there for the electric production. The challenge really is on the thermal side. And as soon as we get this PPA,
which will be up and running this summer, and we can evaluate how that went and how the contractual agreements work, we'll pursue some more of those.

It's a changing landscape because some of the benefits, if you want to get the renewable energy credits, the cost of those, or the value of those have changed significantly. There's more of these programs coming online in Pennsylvania, which basically that the market demand is going down, which makes them less attractive to do. But it's on our radar to do the next step.

**Raymond Najjar:** Great. Thank you.

**Chair Rowland:** Thank you. There's a question on MediaSite.

**Kadi Corter, Senate Office Staff:** This is from Dennis Jett, School of International Affairs. It says, "The slide on the Liberal Arts Teaching and Research Building says nothing about housing the School of International Affairs. Why is that?"

**William Sitzabee:** It is in there. It just didn't make it to this slide.

**Unidentified Senator:** It was on the slide.

**William Sitzabee:** Oh, it was?

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

**William Sitzabee:** Yeah. OK.

**Chair Rowland:**
Very good. That seems resolved.

[LAUGHTER]

Thank you, bill. We appreciate your time.

**William Sitzabee:** Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Rowland: Our final informational report, and one well worth waiting for, is sponsored again by University Planning. This is the Biennial Development and Alumni Relations Report, our Appendix P. Our guest, Rich Bundy, Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations will present this report in 15 minutes or less.

**Biennial Development and Alumni Relations Report**

**Richard Bundy, Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations:** Less.

[LAUGHTER]
Bill wanted to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm going to have to go at light speed to do that. So, thank you for the introduction.

The Division of Development and Alumni Relations, if you're not familiar with us, is actually two main houses, if you will. One of them is the Office of University Development, which is the fundraising arm of the University. And the other is the Penn State Alumni Association, which is the friend-raising arm of the University. And I'm going to talk about both of them in turn.

What you should know-- I'm going to try to keep this brief. What you should know first and foremost about the Office of University Development is that we're the team that's responsible for all of the private gift fundraising at the University. Right now, we're in Penn State's fourth comprehensive campaign, A Greater Penn State for 21st Century Excellence.

And people often ask why do you do a campaign, and it's because of the focus that campaigns bring to our fundraising efforts. It's the ability for us to really clarify the objectives of the institution from a fundraising perspective, to engage volunteers and staff in exciting work about the philanthropic vision for the institution.

And in particular, with this campaign, it was an opportunity for us to directly link our fundraising to the University's strategic plan. So, the campaign has a series of imperatives. The imperatives should look very familiar to you because they align with the objectives of the strategic plan.

Open Doors is largely our scholarship, graduate fellowship, and programs to support student achievement. Create Transformative Experiences is the space where we have themes like global engagement and digital innovation, the types of activities that enrich the Penn State experience outside of the classroom. And Impact the World is where we take the breadth and depth of the institution and try to solve the problems of the world. And our themes there are water, food, and energy, human health, economic prosperity.

I mention the strategic plan because that was very important in a decision that we made earlier this year, or earlier this fiscal year, late last calendar year, that you've probably followed, which was our decision to extend the campaign by a year and increase the goal.

The campaign was originally tied to the five-year strategic plan. With the extension of the strategic plan, we very carefully evaluated where we were at with the donors we were working with and felt that we had a good chance to extend the campaign by an additional year, again, aligned with the strategic plan, and that we had the capacity to raise potentially another half a billion dollars in our goal. So, we now have a six-year, $2.1 billion campaign. And I'll tell you how we're doing there in a moment.

When we had the conversation last fall with our academic partners, our deans, the chancellors, program leaders, we asked them not only to comment on where they were with their fundraising progress and how deep their portfolios looked for potential donors, we also asked them to comment on which parts of the strategic plan do you still need to raise money for, which parts are unfinished business, and what new initiatives have evolved since we launched the campaign that are consistent with the strategic plan but that we weren't planning to raise money for at the start.

And what you can see here is that we had a very robust response. And you've heard a lot of these themes today, this afternoon, in various reports. So, the new museum was not on our radar screen when we
launched the campaign four years ago. The West Engineering Complex was not on our radar screen. But these are now important. The Consortium to Combat Substance Abuse is something that we think has tremendous fundraising potential, but it was not on our radar screen three years ago. So, these are new elements that we will append to our existing set of goals for the campaign in the time that we have remaining.

So let me first give you an update on how we're doing this year at December 31, new commitments. These are new gifts or new pledges of gifts. We're at $191.4 dollars. That's a little bit behind last year's record-setting pace, but ahead of the previous year's second-best year of fundraising. And so, we feel like we're in very solid shape.

Our goal for this year is to raise $407 million. If we do that, it will be the first time Penn State has ever gone over the $400 million mark. That's a new threshold level for us to achieve. And at $191, we actually feel like we're in pretty good shape to achieve that goal.

Receipts are very solid at $160.7 million. This is the best first six months of receipts in the history of the institution. So not only are we getting lots of donors to commit to the strategic plan, they're paying their pledges. And so, these dollars are actually going to work right away to advance the institution's mission.

High level, I mentioned the campaign now has a $2.1 billion goal. The three imperatives of the campaign are listed here. You can see that at December 31, we're at 58% of the chronology of the campaign having passed. And we were ahead of pace in Transformative Experiences. And Impact the World slightly behind pace in Open Doors.

In part, we're behind pace in Open Doors because when we asked the campus units and the campuses and the colleges to comment on where they still had unfinished business, the scholarship and graduate fellowship support came up in a big way. So, I'm actually quite pleased to see that support for our students continues to be the number one piece of the campaign.

Now, you're all smart. You've done the math already, and you see that the three imperatives don't add up to $2.1 billion. There is a piece of the campaign that we don't feature that we're calling Additional Philanthropy. And these are the things that are important to Penn State but maybe don't align quite perfectly with the strategic plan. And the example that I would give to you is athletics wants to build a new pool. Well, that doesn't really fit in Open Doors, or Transformative Experiences, or Impact the World. But they have to build that pool. It's about to fail. In fact, maybe Bill should have been here to comment on that in his physical plant presentation.

So the campaign is going gangbusters. Our volunteers are excited. Our deans and chancellors are enthusiastic. And the staff is more stable than it has been at any time since I've been here. So, we feel very, very positively about our prospects for success in the campaign with two and a half years left to go.

I'm going to switch topics to the Penn State Alumni Association. You should be very proud of the Penn State Alumni Association. We are the largest dues paying membership organization in the world, with just shy of 173,000 when we prepared these slides.

Just to put that in perspective, number two is the M That Shall Not Be Mentioned on the screen behind me, and they are about 45,000 paid members behind us. So, it's almost inconceivable that they would catch us anytime soon, and certainly not if we continue to offer the same kinds of engagement and
enrichment programs that we're offering through the Alumni Association.

Our members-- this slide is outdated as of this morning. I got a notice that the grad-to-alum process ran through, and we added about 5,000 December graduates to our totals. They get complimentary one-year membership in the Alumni Association, so this number is now closer to 177,000 until we kick out last year's December graduates, and then it'll go back down to some number that I don't know what it is. But this is inaccurate.

But I think it is important. And I put it here to show you that it's not just alumni who are members of the Alumni Association. We have a sizable paid membership of students, their parents, and friends of the University. So, this is an, again, important engagement platform for all of Penn State.

The Alumni Association prides itself on working very closely with our faculty. Just one example of that is in the fall, during football season, for every home game the association hosts Huddle with the Faculty, which is an opportunity for us to feature a faculty member from the University who is doing some really interesting, thought-provoking, extraordinary work. They hold it in the Nittany Lion Inn. You can see that it's live streamed, and then you can also see it in archive if you want to go back and check out some of last fall's program.

This has been a real draw for us. Alums who come to campus for the weekend will start their day here at the Nittany Lion Inn with a bite to eat and a lecture from one of our faculty experts. And it's really an exciting piece of their program.

The Alumni Association organizes a whole series of engagement opportunities. And a couple that I would point out to you-- February 18 is the annual President's Concert. This year it will be in New York City at Carnegie Hall. The Alumni Association co-hosts that with the Office of the President, and it tends to be a very big draw that features the artistic expertise of our student performing groups. And we're quite excited about that.

And then in March, at the State Theater, we'll celebrate our Alumni Achievement Awards, which is a group of young alumni, alumni under the age of 40, who have, early in their careers, distinguished themselves and brought great acclaim to Penn State. And we're very proud to introduce those award winners to you already.

Last thing that I'll say about the Alumni Association, and then I'm happy to take your questions or let you go home and get dinner. The Alumni Association this year celebrates its 150th anniversary in service to Penn State. And so you'll see throughout the year, starting with-- if you are a member of the Alumni Association-- the January/February issue of the Penn Stater Magazine, which was a celebration of 150 years of the Penn State Alumni Association.

This is their-- I'm not allowed to call it a logo. This is their branding mark, whatever you want to call it, for the course of the year. And you may see it pop up on things like Alumni Swirl at the Creamery, at the white t-shirts that will be unveiled at THON, for the white out at the midpoint of THON, and a bunch of other surprises coming for their 150th anniversary. And with that, I will be happy to take any questions if you have them.

Richard Bundy: I'm not going to be offended that 90% of the room left before I even got to the podium.

[LAUGHTER]

Chair Rowland: It's not you, Rich.

Richard Bundy: I know. Like I said, I'm not going to take it personally.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you, Rich.

[APPLAUSE]

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

OK. Is there any new legislative business? Seeing none.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Are there any comments or recommendations for the good of the University? Also none.

ADJOURNMENT

May I have a motion to adjourn?

Senators: So moved!

Chair Rowland: There had better be a second! All in favor!

Senators: Aye!

Chair Rowland: Very good. The Senate is adjourned, and the next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, March 17, 2020, at 1:00 p.m.
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Prescod, Diandra
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wede, Joshua</td>
<td>Elected 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitcomb, Tiffany</td>
<td>Students 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehurst, Marcus</td>
<td>Ex Officio 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Mary Beth</td>
<td>Appointed 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Nicole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong, Jeffrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Chelsey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaffuto, Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambanini, Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang, Qiming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zorn, Christopher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 193