# THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY 

The University Faculty Senate
AGENDA

Tuesday, April 26, 2022
1:30 p.m.
112 Kern Building

## Via ZOOM at 1:30 p.m

ZOOM LINK https://psu.zoom.us/j/97759044937
Or iPhone one-tap (US Toll): +16468769923,97759044937\# or +13017158592,97759044937\#
Or Telephone:
Dial:
+1 6468769923 (US Toll)
+1 3017158592 (US Toll)
+1 3126266799 (US Toll)
+1 6699006833 (US Toll)
+1 2532158782 (US Toll)
+1 3462487799 (US Toll)
Meeting ID: 97759044937
International numbers available: $\mathrm{https}: / / \mathrm{psu} . z 00 \mathrm{~m} . \mathrm{us} / \mathrm{u} / \mathrm{acf4Yq} 6 \mathrm{mPh}$

We will use TallySpace to vote during this meeting. Senators who have voting rights should have their
Penn State 9 -digit ID number ready and follow the instructions found here:
https://senate.psu.edu/senators/tallyspace-voting-instructions/; Senators are reminded to bring their
laptop or smartphone for the purpose of logging into TallySpace to vote.

## A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Minutes of the March 15, 2022 Meeting in The Senate Record

## B. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report of March 29, 2022
Appendix A
C. REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL - Meeting of April 5, 2022
D. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

John W. White Graduate Fellowship

## E. COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

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

## G. FORENSIC BUSINESS

Senate Committee on Education
Making General Election Day a Non-Instructional Day
Appendix B
H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

## I. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Senate Committees on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid And Education

Revision to Policy 48-40: Deferred Grades - Clarifying Language
Appendix C
Senate Committee on Committees and Rules
Revisions to Bylaws, Article III, Election to Senate
Appendix D
(presentation at $4 / 26$ Plenary Meeting, vote will occur at next Plenary)

Revision to Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6(a)
Establishing Subcommittees
(presentation at $4 / 26$ Plenary Meeting; vote will occur at next
Plenary upon approval of the Bylaws revision above)
Revisions to Standing Rules, Article I, Section 12(e)
Tellers
Appendix F
(presentation at 4/26 Plenary Meeting; vote will occur at next Plenary upon approval of the Bylaws revision above)

Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and Curricular Affairs
Revision to Standing Rules, Article II - Senate Committee Structure
Section 6(c) - Addition of DEI to Curricular Affairs
Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and Self-Study Committee

On the Role of the Faculty Senate at the Pennsylvania State
University (presented at the 3/15 Plenary Meeting and voted on at the 4/26 Plenary Meeting)

Senate Committee on Education

Rescind Policy 44-40: Proctoring of Examinations

Senate Committee on Global Programs
Revision to Standing Rules, Article II - Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(h) - Committee on Global Programs

## J. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits
Guiding Principles for the Design of Health Care Plans
Appendix K

## K. POSITIONAL REPORTS

None
L. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Senate Committee on University Planning
PSU COVID Financial Impact Appendix L
[15 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]

College of Medicine Budget Report
Appendix M
[15 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]
Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid
*2021 Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program
*Annual Report on High School Students Enrolled Nondegree In Credit Courses

Appendix N

Appendix O
Senate Committee on Education
*Summary of Petitions by College 2020-2021

Tenure Flow Report
Appendix Q
[10 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]
Senate Committees on Faculty Affairs, Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, and Educational Equity and Campus Environment

Earning Tenure During COVID Appendix R
[10 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]
Senate Committees on Intra-University Relations and Faculty Affairs
Non-Tenure Line Promotion Flow Report
Appendix S
[10 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]
Senate Committee on Global Programs
Role of Sustainability in Penn State Global Appendix T
[5 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]
Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity
*Commonwealth Campuses Research Programs Appendix U

Senate Council
Report on Fall 2020 - Academic Unit Visits
Appendix W
[5 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]
Report on Spring 2021 - Academic Unit Visits
Appendix V
[5 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]
Elections Commission
*Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2022-2023
Appendix X
*Report of Senate Elections
Appendix Y
*Web-only reports.

## M. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

None

## N. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, September 13, 1:30 p.m. There is also a tentative Summer Plenary planned for Tuesday, July 12, 2022. An announcement regarding that meeting will come soon.

## COMMUNICATION TO THE SENATE

DATE: April 5, 2022
TO: Bonj Szczygiel, Chair, University Faculty Senate
FROM: Mary Beth Williams, Chair, Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs

The Senate Curriculum Report dated March 29, 2022 has been circulated throughout the University. Objections to any of the items in the report must be submitted to Kadi Corter, Curriculum Coordinator, 101 Kern Graduate Building, 814-863-0996, kkw2@psu.edu, on or before May 5, 2022.

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

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 

Making General Election Day a Non-Instructional Day

(Forensic)

## Introduction

The United States historically has abysmal voter turnout rates for general and midterm elections, severely debilitating the democratic process and citizen participation in civic institutions. According to Pew Research, $55.7 \%$ of the voting-age population voted in 2016. This research also found that when it comes to voter turnout, the United States is ranked 139 out of 172 developed countries. Some industrialized countries - such as South Korea, Germany, and France-- rank above the United States in voter participation, and these countries have one thing in common: they have Election Day off. Many countries recognize Election Day as a national holiday, or elections are held on weekends in order to increase voter turnout. When barriers are removed to make voting easier, more people vote.

Voting is habit-forming, and young voters will usually continue to vote in subsequent elections. It is imperative that as many students as possible vote while still in college, as studies have shown that voting at a young age increases the likelihood of forming life-long voting habits. Colleges have a responsibility to not only cultivate these voting habits, but also to more broadly center social responsibility and civic readiness as critical higher education outcomes. As remarked by former University System of Maryland Chancellor Robert Caret, "The imperative of infusing... an ethic of social responsibility across society at large is a duty higher education has not sufficiently prioritized in recent decades. Given that our comprehensive universities are the higher education institutions most on the frontlines of society... this is a responsibility they must embrace."

The Pennsylvania State University Faculty Senate previously supported initiatives to make voting more accessible to students. The legislative report from September 15, 2020, "Including Election Day Absences in Policy 42-27 Class Attendance" added the following paragraph to Policy 42-27:

[^0]Affording students who miss class to vote an excused absence removes some barriers to voting and is an important measure. However, students often report that missing class is detrimental to their academic success. Similar to how students come to class while sick, students might also come to class on Election Day out of concern of falling behind schedule. Students also might miss several classes if they decide to volunteer on Election Day, setting them even further behind schedule. While the current policy enables some more students to vote on Election Day, it falls short of its stated goals by simultaneously discouraging sustained civic engagement. It also does not account for the burden of stress placed upon students who must make up assignments or lectures because they took the time to vote.

## 2020 NSLVE Campus Report: Pennsylvania State University

Penn State is a participating university in the National Study of Learning, Voting, and Engagement (NSLVE). NSLVE offers colleges and universities an opportunity to learn their student registration and voting rates. The 2020 Campus Report for Penn State provides useful student and institutional data on student voting in the 2016, 2018, and 2020 General Elections.

## Voting, Registration and Yield Rates



VOTING RATE OF REGISTERED STUDENTS


The Voting Rate of Registered Students is the percent of registered students who voted on Election Day. We often refer to this as the "yield" rate.

VOTING RATE


The Voting Rate is the percentage of eligible students who voted on Election Day. The voting rate is also the product of the registration and yield rates.

Accessible Text Version: Voting, Registration, and Yield Rates
The 2020 voting rate at Penn State was $68.8 \%$, which is a $13 \%$ increase from 2016. The voting rate for 2020 across all institutions was $66 \%$. The 2020 election saw students registered to vote at $83.3 \%$ of the voting-eligible student population, $82 \%$ of registered students who voted on Election Day, and $68.8 \%$ of all eligible students who voted on Election Day. The 2020 election figures are the highest among the 2016, 2018, and 2020 election years.

| CAMPUS REPORT: Pennsylvania State University |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Looking Closer By Age Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Here, we provide the numbers of students in each age category and the voting rates for each group. These are based on the student's age on the day of the election, as calculated by the National Student Clearinghouse using data from student enrollment records. |  |  | 2016 |  |  | 2018 |  |  | 020 |  | 6-2020 |
|  |  | Enrolled | Voted | Rate | Enrolled | Voted | Rate | Enrolled | Voted | Rate | Change (p.p) |
|  | 18-21 | 55,550 | 27,074 | 49 | 54,122 | 14,784 | 27 | 53,266 | 33,616 | 63 | - 14 |
|  | 22-24 | 13,818 | 6,461 | 47 | 14,050 | 4,294 | 31 | 13,636 | 8,170 | 60 | + 13 |
|  | 25-29 | 8,857 | 4,329 | 49 | 9,110 | 3,401 | 37 | 8,885 | 4,903 | 55 | - 6 |
|  | 30-39 | 7,610 | 4,171 | 55 | 7,219 | 3,116 | 43 | 7,158 | 4,122 | 58 | - 3 |
|  | 40-49 | 2,759 | 1,866 | 68 | 2,759 | 1,523 | 55 | 2,649 | 1,822 | 69 | - 1 |
|  | 50+ | 1,070 | 815 | 76 | 972 | 652 | 67 | 990 | 782 | 79 | - 3 |
| Q2021 Institute for Democracy \& Higher Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |

Accessible Text Version: Looking Closer by Age Group
Here we provide the numbers of students in each age category and the voting rates for each group, based on the student's age on Election Day using data from student enrollment records. Focusing on ages 18-21, 22-24, and 25-29, each age category saw an increase in voting rate from 2016-2020. The voting rate for $18-21$ increased $14 \%$, from $49 \%$ in 2016 to $63 \%$ in 2020 . The voting rate for $22-24$ increased $13 \%$, from $47 \%$ in 2016 to $60 \%$ in 2020. The voting rate for 2529 increased $6 \%$, from $49 \%$ in 2016 to $55 \%$ in 2020.

©2021 Institute for Democracy \& Higher Education

Accessible Text Version: Looking Closer by Education Level/Undergraduate Class Year.
These are the estimated rates by Education Level (undergraduate/graduate), Class Year, and Enrollment Status (full-time/part-time). By educational level, voting rates from 2016-2020 improved for undergraduate and graduate students by $13 \%$ and $7 \%$ respectively. By Class Year, voting rates from 2016-2020 improved for first-year, second-year, and upper-level students by $12 \%, 14 \%$, and $14 \%$ respectively. By enrollment status, voting rates from 2016-2020 improved for full-time and part-time students by $13 \%$ and $6 \%$ respectively.

The NSLVE report shows that Penn State students are becoming increasingly engaged in the democratic process, seeing substantial jumps in student registration and turnout from 2016 to 2020. Despite the challenges of the 2020 election, the data show that students collectively showed an increase in voter participation. These figures-despite being at relative highsindicate that Penn State has room to grow. As there exists an enthusiasm amongst students about elections, the University must respond by enabling access to election participation and helping students develop a civic skill set.

## Student Voice

Students have expressed a sustained desire for Penn State to designate Election Day as a noninstructional day. Just recently, the University Park Undergraduate Association (UPUA) 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Assembly passed Resolution \#09-16, which supported the establishment of a university holiday
on every General Election Day. The $711^{\text {st }}$ Assembly of The Graduate and Professional Student Association (GPSA) passed Resolution \#71-10: Designating Election Days as University NonInstructional Days, supporting UPUA's initiative to designate election days as non-instructional days and launch a survey to assess students' opinions on the same. In previous years, the UPUA $14^{\text {th }}$ Assembly passed a resolution supporting class attendance leniency on Election Days. The UPUA $15^{\text {th }}$ Assembly passed Resolution \#29-15, again supporting Election Day attendance leniency and advocating for the creation of a university holiday on Election Day.

The UPUA also created a survey to hear from students on the question: "Would you support the establishment of a yearly university holiday on the November General Election Day?" Of the 247 respondents, 244 said yes to the question. Acknowledging that there are many limitations to this poll (e.g., small sample size, lack of campus-diverse respondents, and few graduate/professional student respondents), the open-ended responses fell into only a few buckets.

The UPUA, after releasing this survey, changed the scope of this initiative from advocating for a university holiday to advocating for a non-instructional class day. This change more directly serves student constituents without amending HR or other policies.

Here are some unique responses from students:

- "I believe students should have the unimpeded right to vote without worrying about their course schedules."
- "Graduate student schedules often don't allow time for voting."
- "Students are balancing their courses with their part-time jobs and other commitments. The university should help facilitate and encourage the right to vote by removing a major impediment to getting to the polls."
- "It is inconvenient to schedule voting in between courses and TA'ing."
- "Yes, because there is less of an excuse to skip voting and voting outcomes should increase."
- "In the past, I've had to request mail-in ballots in advance due to course schedules. This would eliminate that planning and allow students to exercise their right to vote without worrying about missing class or using their limited number of absences."
- "I believe this will encourage political participation which is essential to democracy. I support measures which make voting easier."
- "I would be willing to help with my polling location if I could vote and not have to worry about missing class."
- "Election Day should be treated as a holiday because of the long time it takes to vote."
- "To be honest, I find it alarming that General Election Day is not a national holiday. We should make it as easy as possible for every student to exercise this fundamental democratic right."
- "Last year, during the general election, there was no way I could have gotten to the polls due to having an hour-long commute and having to stay on campus all day. Luckily, a professor cancelled class that morning, so I found time to go vote."
- "I feel a specified holiday would encourage more young people to vote because it won't be an interruption in their busy schedules."
- "It is the university's responsibility to ensure the right to vote is protected, since that right is more imperative to the future of America than a single day of coursework."
- "Voting is our civic duty as members of this community. It is vitally important that we are given the best opportunity possible to fulfill that duty."
- "Elections are extremely important to me because I am a non-citizen of America. Every policy matters and if it is a big election like the presidential, it affects our daily lives."
- "I think teaching students to exercise their right to vote is a crucial part of preparing students to practice social awareness. I believe giving students an opportunity to exercise this right would encourage voting in this election and future elections"
- "I would love to work the polls at home, but since I have classes here, I am not able to do so."
- "As a member of a conservative student organization, I would use the day to campaign."

As evidenced by these responses, students have a variety of reasons for desiring a noninstructional day on Election Day. Many students cited busy course and job schedules that make voting difficult. Some students from Commonwealth Campuses shared their experiences of travelling to campus on Election Day and being geographically distanced from their polling location, making voting or volunteering difficult. Many students shared a desire to volunteer on Election Day, either at the polling location or for political campaigns-but classes preclude them from doing so. Even non-citizen students supported removing these barriers to voting for reasons that fellow students will vote in all students' best interests.

Another theme in responses, and separate from concerns about Election Day voting logistics, is the responsibility of universities in preserving democracy. Many students made claims that Penn State has an obligation to facilitate student voting by removing any and all barriers within the institution. Some students referenced the research showing the importance of developing early habits of voting, and they connected this research to the potential impacts of having off on Election Day by suggesting more students would vote and begin cultivating these habits.

## Non-Instructional Day

The 2020 NSLVE Data reported the reality of students' participation in elections at Penn State. The UPUA survey captured the attitudes of students toward barriers that prevent students from voting. One point of intervention that would serve to increase the student voter rate while attending to the advocacy and attitudes of the student body is to create a non-instructional day on Election Day. A non-instructional day is, in effect, an Election Day holiday for students. One research article concluded that "Unlike other measures instituted to increase turnout, making Election Day a holiday decreases the associated cost of voting and would be relatively easy to accomplish. Implementing [this] creation... would improve turnout dramatically." Applied to Penn State, this conclusion suggests that turnout could improve dramatically if our institutional factors fully facilitate-rather than ambivalently modulate- student voting. A non-instructional day would ultimately lead to more students voting. This aligns with the responsibility of higher education institutions to emphasize civic engagement and social responsibility in their desired learning outcomes.

## Questions to Be Answered

What do you see as the potential barriers to implementing a non-instructional day for the general election? What might reduce these barriers (e.g., exemptions for lab, studio, or once a week classes)?

What have you observed or noted regarding student participation in elections (both voting and volunteering)?

Could such a policy benefit students who may not be enrolled in course work but may have other responsibilities (e.g., research, teaching)? Could such a policy afford the same opportunity for participation to these students?

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

- Vinita Acharya
- Kelly Austin
- Patricia Birungi
- Victor Brunsden
- Penny Carlson
- Danielle Conway
- Renata Engel
- Tonya Evans
- Yvonne Gaudelius
- Vicki Hewitt
- Elizabeth King
- Charles Lang
- Katherine Masters
- Patrick Mather
- Rajen Mookerjee
- Jacob Moore
- Willie Ofosu
- Richard Page
- Karen Pollack
- Jay Precht
- Linda Rhen
- Paul Riccomini
- Michele Rice
- Lewis Richardson
- Kaitlyn Roberts
- Noah Robertson
- Noelle Schneider
- David Smith
- Michele Stine, Chair
- Stephen Van Hook, Vice Chair
- Michael Verderame
- Ken Vrana
- James Warren
- Tiffany Whitcomb
- Elizabeth Wright
- Suzanne Wright


# SENATE COMMITTEES ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID (ARSSA) \& EDUCATION 

Revisions to Policy 48-40: Deferred Grades - Clarifying Language

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

## Introduction and Rationale

The faculty and staff of Penn State work tirelessly to support students throughout their tenure at our institution. Part of this support encapsulates how students interact with their grades. The Deferred Grade Policy (48-40) allows for one such avenue of aid, but, in its current state, contains unclear and conflicting language.

A revision clarifying language to align with G3: Deferred Grades, will generate clear and consistent messages, providing continual student support and encouraging student success. Adding definition for No Grade and Deferred Grade further clarifies student options. And, lastly, adding both a requirement for the student to meet with the instructor to create a plan, and the recommendation that they meet with their adviser to discuss implications in academic progress align with other policy updates focused on student equity.

## Recommendation

We recommend that the Deferred Grade Policy 48-40 be revised as follows.
Please note that the following contains bold text for additions and strikeouts indicating deleted text. Deleted text is notated with [Delete] [End Delete]. Added text is notated with [Add] [End Add].

## 48-40 Deferred Grades

[Delete] If, for reasons beyond the student's control, [End Delete] [Add] A student who is prevented from completing a course within the prescribed time may request permission from their instructor to defer their grade. [End Add] [Delete] the grade in that course may be deferred with the concurrence of the instructor. [End Delete] [Add] If approved, the student and instructor should develop a course completion plan, stating expectations of required coursework, deadlines/due dates, and/or other necessary aspects of the outstanding requirements which need to be completed and met in order to satisfy the academic objectives of the course and comply with the student's major requirements. Students should also meet with their academic adviser to discuss potential implications on their
academic progress. Students will have up to ten weeks from the final grade reporting deadline to complete outstanding course requirements. [End add]

The symbol DF appears on the student's transcript until the course has been completed. Nonemergency permission for filing a deferred grade must be requested by the student before the beginning of the final examination period. In an emergency situation, an instructor can approve a deferred grade after the final exam period has started.

Under emergency conditions during which the instructor is unavailable, authorization [Add] from the academic unit which offered the course and assigned the instructor [End Add] is required from one of the following: the dean [Add], appropriate associate dean, [End Add] [Delete] of the college in which the eandidate is enrolled; the executive director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies if the student is enrolled in that division [End Delete]; [Delete] the eampus chancellor [End Delete] [Add] or academic officer [End add] of the student's commonwealth campus.

In certain courses where normal work of the course extends beyond the scheduled period, deferment may be granted routinely for all students in the course if prior approval of the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs has been obtained. [Add] If an entire course's work cannot be accomplished due to an emergency circumstance, such as a prolonged campus closure, and said work cannot be completed online, the instructor may opt to assign the entire class a deferred grade and create a completion plan. [End add]
[Delete] The period during which a grade may be deferred shall not extend beyond ten weeks following the grade reporting deadline. A deferred grade that is not changed to a quality grade by the instructor before the end of this period automatically becomes an F. A deferred grade that is automatically converted to an F can later be corrected in accordance with Senate Policy $48-30$. [End Delete] [Add] Ten weeks after the grade reporting deadline, a deferred grade that is not changed to a quality grade by the instructor is automatically changed to an $F$ by the Registrar's Office and is factored into the semester and cumulative GPA. A deferred grade that is automatically converted to an $F$ can later be corrected in accordance with Senate Policy 48-30. An instructor may request an extension of the DF deadline by submitting the Deferred Grade Extension form prior to the DF deadline. [End Add]
[Add] Students are strongly advised to research and discuss all implications that selection of the Deferred Grade option may have upon entrance to major requirements, major, minor, general education and other degree requirements, financial aid eligibility, international student visas, honor roll, scholarship and graduation distinctions, graduate school applications, job and internship applications, and any other scenarios in which academic records may impact future life scenarios. Students should always work with academic advisers (whether faculty or primary-role) within their respective college,
campus, or unit as well as with career and graduate school counselors and others student support professionals in considering use of the Deferred Grade option. [End Add]

Students with DF on their transcripts will not be allowed to graduate.
[Add] ACUE Policy: G-3: Deferred Grades [End Add]

## [Add] Definitions:

Deferred Grade - DF; assigned by instructor in place of course grade until outstanding work is completed; students have up to 10 weeks from the final grade reporting deadline to complete work

No Grade - NG; no official grade assigned by instructor; students have up to 5 weeks to complete work [End add]

## Clean Copy

## 48-40 Deferred Grades

A student who is prevented from completing a course within the prescribed time may request permission from their instructor to defer their grade. If approved, the student and instructor should develop a course completion plan, stating expectations of required coursework, deadlines/due dates, and/or other necessary aspects of the outstanding requirements which need to be completed and met in order to satisfy the academic objectives of the course and comply with the student's major requirements. Students should also meet with their academic adviser to discuss potential implications on their academic progress. Students will have up to ten weeks from the final grade reporting deadline to complete outstanding course requirements.

The symbol DF appears on the student's transcript until the course has been completed. Nonemergency permission for filing a deferred grade must be requested by the student before the beginning of the final examination period. In an emergency situation, an instructor can approve a deferred grade after the final exam period has started.

Under emergency conditions during which the instructor is unavailable, authorization from the academic unit which offered the course and assigned the instructor is required from one of the following: the dean, appropriate associate dean, or academic officer of the student's commonwealth campus.

In certain courses where normal work of the course extends beyond the scheduled period, deferment may be granted routinely for all students in the course if prior approval of the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs has been obtained. If an entire course's work cannot be accomplished due to an emergency circumstance, such as a prolonged campus closure, and said
work cannot be completed online, the instructor may opt to assign the entire class a deferred grade and create a completion plan.

Ten weeks after the grade reporting deadline, a deferred grade that is not changed to a quality grade by the instructor is automatically changed to an F by the Registrar's Office and factored into the semester and cumulative GPA. A deferred grade that is automatically converted to an F can later be corrected in accordance with Senate Policy 48-30. An instructor may request an extension of the DF deadline by submitting the Deferred Grade Extension form prior to the DF deadline.

Students are strongly advised to research and discuss all implications that the selection of the Deferred Grade option may have upon entrance to major requirements, major, minor, general education and other degree requirements, financial aid eligibility, international student visas, honor roll, scholarship and graduation distinctions, graduate school applications, job and internship applications, and any other scenarios in which academic records may impact future life scenarios. Students should always work with academic advisers (whether faculty or primaryrole) within their respective college, campus, or unit as well as with career and graduate school counselors and others student support professionals in considering use of the Deferred Grade option.

Students with DF on their transcripts will not be allowed to graduate.

## ACUE Policy: G-3: Deferred Grades

## Definitions:

Deferred Grade - DF; assigned by instructor in place of course grade until outstanding work is completed; students have up to 10 weeks from the final grade reporting deadline to complete work

No Grade - NG; no official grade assigned by instructor; students have up to 5 weeks to complete work
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## SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
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# SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES 

Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article III, Election to the Senate<br>(Legislative)<br>Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

## Introduction and Rationale

In the spring of 2021, the chair of Committees on Committees and Rules (CC\&R), Victor Brunsden, formed a subcommittee on Elections of that body to provide recommendations related to all elections and nominations where election processes are managed by the University Faculty Senate. The impetus for the formation of this subcommittee was confusion, complaints, and concerns that have been brought to $C C \& R$ and the Senate Officers over the past several years.

The Elections Subcommittee gathered these concerns and reviewed the Senate's governance documents, procedures, and forms for all references to elections and nominations processes. As a result of this analysis, this is the first in a series of the subcommittee's recommendations, focused in on the role and purview of the Senate's Elections Commission.

One of the issues uncovered by the Elections Subcommittee had to do with the role of the Senate's Election Commission and its duties, which is not clearly stated in our governance documents. To that end, this legislation recommends reordering the sections within our Bylaws, Article III (Election to the Senate) to be in a more logical order that better introduces the Elections Commission and explains its duties. Furthermore, to provide improved consistency, transparency, and clarity to all elections of senate-related positions and committees, we recommend that all elections overseen by the University Faculty Senate be supervised by the Elections Commission.

## Recommendation

This report recommends several changes to Bylaws, Article III (Elections to the Senate):

1. Rename Bylaws Article III "Election to the Senate" to "Elections" to reflect that this article will also address extra-Senatorial elections.
2. Add a new Section 1(d) to Bylaws Article III (Election to the Senate) that introduces the Elections Commission, its role, and its duties.
3. Delete the existing Bylaws Article III (Election to the Senate) Section 9 [Note: Subsequent legislation will recommend placing the membership composition in Standing Rules Article II, Section 6(a).]

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

Bylaws, Article III - Election[ADD]s [END ADD] [DELETE]to the Senate[END DELETE]
Section 1
Election to the Senate by members of the University faculty in each voting unit shall be as follows:
a) Nominations shall be made by members of the University faculty. The procedures shall provide that every member of the electorate shall have the opportunity to place names in nomination.
(b) While it is recommended that there be at least twice as many nominations as there are senators to be elected, there must be no fewer than one-and-one-half times the number of senators to be elected.
(c) Election shall be by secret ballot.
[ADD] (d) All elections of the Senate including extra-senatorial elections shall be supervised by an Elections Commission. The duties of the Elections Commission will be to ensure that the Senate's annual census occurs on a timely basis, help identify problematic issues that may arise during that census, recommend solutions to such issues, and ultimately ensure the legitimacy and accuracy of the Senate elections processes. [END ADD]

## Section 2

The Elections Commission shall review annually and adjust, if necessary, the number of senators to be elected from each voting unit, based on the distribution of the University faculty as of the preceding November 1.

## Section 3

Two retired faculty senators will be elected according to the following procedures. The Senate office will obtain from the Office of Human Resources a list of retired faculty members. That list will be cross-checked with lists of faculty who served on the University Faculty Senate prior to retirement. From the list of former senators, the Committee on Committees and Rules will develop a list of potential nominees, and the Executive Director will then contact the individuals to ask if they would stand for election to the Senate. A ballot will be established with the individual former senators (the order of names on the ballot will be determined by random selection) who have consented to serve. This ballot will also have a line marked "Other" for write-in votes so that other members of the retired population can be included in the voting. The ballot will be made available to all retired faculty. A simple plurality vote will determine the winner. In the case of a tie, the Committee on Committees and Rules will determine the winner by a coin toss. One Retired Senator will serve on the Committee on Faculty Benefits and one will serve on a standing Senate committee of the retired faculty senator's choosing. The term of
office will be four (4) years. If a retired senator cannot fulfill his/her term, the alternate from the last election will be appointed to do so. The elected retired faculty will be full voting members of the Senate.

## Section 4

Student senators shall be nominated and elected according to such procedures as the Elections Commission of the Senate may establish.

If a student senator is unable to attend a meeting of the University Faculty Senate, an alternate may substitute for the senator at the plenary meeting of the Faculty Senate. The alternate may also substitute for the senator at the senator's committee meeting being held on the same day. The Senate office must be provided with the name of the alternate senator prior to the first full meeting of the Senate year. The alternate senator must notify the Senate office prior to attending the meeting in order to receive the same voting privileges as the senator for whom he/she is substituting for the day.

## Section 5

The names of newly elected and newly appointed senators to serve during the following year shall be reported to the Senate office by the first Friday in February in order to be reported to the Senate at the last regular meeting of the academic year.

## Section 6

An elected senator who is engaged in any type of professional activity making it impossible to carry out Senate responsibilities for a period exceeding three consecutive months, excluding June, July and August, may resign if he or she wishes, but otherwise shall be replaced by an alternate to fill the period of time that the senator will be absent from the Senate.

## Section 7

In case an elected faculty senator is unable to fulfill the duties of their elected term, the University faculty of the senator's voting unit shall identify a replacement in the following manner: In addition to identifying an elected senator for each vacant seat, regular Senate elections shall identify at least the highest ranking alternate, that is, the candidate receiving the highest number of votes of those not elected. If more than one alternate is identified, the alternates' names should be submitted in order of rank, based on the number of votes. The names of the winner(s) and all of the alternate(s) shall be reported directly to the Senate office. First choice for replacement is to be the highest ranking alternate, as identified in the most recent regular Senate election; if the highest ranking alternate is not available, then the choice will move to all remaining alternates, in order of their rank by vote. If no alternates are available from the most recent regular Senate election, then the University faculty of the voting unit shall hold a special election to identify a new elected senator, who will complete the unfinished term. This same procedure shall be followed in the replacement of committee members elected at-large by the Senate.

## Section 8

Duties of Senators:
a) Attend the Senate plenary meetings.
b) Attend the assigned standing committee meetings.
c) Communicate with their unit faculty governance organization pertaining to the activities of the Senate.
d) Elected faculty senators are required to maintain a two-thirds attendance rate for both the plenary meetings and the assigned standing committee meetings. Should a senator drop below this level in either meeting category in each of two consecutive years, the senator may resign if he or she wishes, otherwise the Senate will remove the senator and require the unit to replace that senator with an alternative elected representative.

This provision does not pertain to sabbatical, medical, or other official leaves of absence, or absence related to professional responsibilities.
[DELETE]Section 9
All elections of the Senate shall be supervised by an Elections Commission consisting of the Secretary of the Senate and four other elected faculty senators selected by the Committee on Committees and Rules.[END DELETE]

## Section [DELETE] $10[$ END DELETE] [ADD]9[END ADD]

In cases in which a voting unit or geographic location has only one faculty senator, if that senator is unable to attend a meeting of the University Faculty Senate, an alternate may substitute for the senator at the plenary meeting of the Faculty Senate. The alternate may also substitute for the senator at the senator's committee meeting being held on the same day. The substitute must be identified on the Senate office's list as an alternate for the voting unit or geographic location and must notify the Senate office in order to receive the same voting privileges as the senator for whom he/she is substituting for the day.

## Revised Copy

Bylaws, Article III - Elections

## Section 1

Election to the Senate by members of the University faculty in each voting unit shall be as follows:
a) Nominations shall be made by members of the University faculty. The procedures shall provide that every member of the electorate shall have the opportunity to place names in nomination.
(b) While it is recommended that there be at least twice as many nominations as there are senators to be elected, there must be no fewer than one-and-one-half times the number of senators to be elected.
(c) Election shall be by secret ballot.
(d) All elections of the Senate including extra-senatorial elections shall be supervised by an Elections Commission. The duties of the Elections Commission will be to ensure that the Senate's annual census occurs on a timely basis, help identify problematic issues that may arise during that census, recommend solutions to such issues, and ultimately ensure the legitimacy and accuracy of the Senate elections processes.

## Section 2

The Elections Commission shall review annually and adjust, if necessary, the number of senators to be elected from each voting unit, based on the distribution of the University faculty as of the preceding November 1.

## Section 3

Two retired faculty senators will be elected according to the following procedures. The Senate office will obtain from the Office of Human Resources a list of retired faculty members. That list will be cross-checked with lists of faculty who served on the University Faculty Senate prior to retirement. From the list of former senators, the Committee on Committees and Rules will develop a list of potential nominees, and the Executive Director will then contact the individuals to ask if they would stand for election to the Senate. A ballot will be established with the individual former senators (the order of names on the ballot will be determined by random selection) who have consented to serve. This ballot will also have a line marked "Other" for write-in votes so that other members of the retired population can be included in the voting. The ballot will be made available to all retired faculty. A simple plurality vote will determine the winner. In the case of a tie, the Committee on Committees and Rules will determine the winner by a coin toss. One Retired Senator will serve on the Committee on Faculty Benefits and one will serve on a standing Senate committee of the retired faculty senator's choosing. The term of office will be four (4) years. If a retired senator cannot fulfill his/her term, the alternate from the last election will be appointed to do so. The elected retired faculty will be full voting members of the Senate.

## Section 4

Student senators shall be nominated and elected according to such procedures as the Elections Commission of the Senate may establish.

If a student senator is unable to attend a meeting of the University Faculty Senate, an alternate may substitute for the senator at the plenary meeting of the Faculty Senate. The alternate may also substitute for the senator at the senator's committee meeting being held on the same day. The Senate office must be provided with the name of the alternate senator prior to the first full meeting of the Senate year. The alternate senator must notify the Senate office prior to attending the meeting in order to receive the same voting privileges as the senator for whom he/she is substituting for the day.

## Section 5

The names of newly elected and newly appointed senators to serve during the following year shall be reported to the Senate office by the first Friday in February in order to be reported to the Senate at the last regular meeting of the academic year.

## Section 6

An elected senator who is engaged in any type of professional activity making it impossible to carry out Senate responsibilities for a period exceeding three consecutive months, excluding June, July and August, may resign if he or she wishes, but otherwise shall be replaced by an alternate to fill the period of time that the senator will be absent from the Senate.

## Section 7

In case an elected faculty senator is unable to fulfill the duties of their elected term, the University faculty of the senator's voting unit shall identify a replacement in the following manner: In addition to identifying an elected senator for each vacant seat, regular Senate elections shall identify at least the highest ranking alternate, that is, the candidate receiving the highest number of votes of those not elected. If more than one alternate is identified, the alternates' names should be submitted in order of rank, based on the number of votes. The names of the winner(s) and all of the alternate(s) shall be reported directly to the Senate office. First choice for replacement is to be the highest ranking alternate, as identified in the most recent regular Senate election; if the highest ranking alternate is not available, then the choice will move to all remaining alternates, in order of their rank by vote. If no alternates are available from the most recent regular Senate election, then the University faculty of the voting unit shall hold a special election to identify a new elected senator, who will complete the unfinished term. This same procedure shall be followed in the replacement of committee members elected at-large by the Senate.

## Section 8

## Duties of Senators:

a) Attend the Senate plenary meetings.
b) Attend the assigned standing committee meetings.
c) Communicate with their unit faculty governance organization pertaining to the activities of the Senate.
d) Elected faculty senators are required to maintain a two-thirds attendance rate for both the plenary meetings and the assigned standing committee meetings. Should a senator drop below this level in either meeting category in each of two consecutive years, the senator may resign if he or she wishes, otherwise the Senate will remove the senator and require the unit to replace that senator with an alternative elected representative.

This provision does not pertain to sabbatical, medical, or other official leaves of absence, or absence related to professional responsibilities.

Section 9

In cases in which a voting unit or geographic location has only one faculty senator, if that senator is unable to attend a meeting of the University Faculty Senate, an alternate may substitute for the senator at the plenary meeting of the Faculty Senate. The alternate may also substitute for the senator at the senator's committee meeting being held on the same day. The substitute must be identified on the Senate office's list as an alternate for the voting unit or geographic location and must notify the Senate office in order to receive the same voting privileges as the senator for whom he/she is substituting for the day.
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# SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES 

# Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article II Section 6 (a) 

(Legislative)
Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

## Introduction and Rationale

This report is one of a series of legislative reports from the Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on Committees and Rules. The charge of Elections subcommittee was to provide consistency, transparency, and clarity for all University Faculty Senate elections. To that end, this legislation seeks to reorganize the current standing rules for the Committee on Committees and Rules to reflect the creation of a permanent Elections Commission subcommittee and to place both it and the Constitution subcommittee in a new section titled "Subcommittees." Creating a standing subcommittee in the Committee on Committees and Rules for Elections Commission will functionally aid the parent committee in prioritizing this work. In addition, it will help make the work of both subcommittees more transparent to the Senate and the University.

## Recommendation

We recommend the creation of two standing subcommittees under the Committee on Committees and Rules titled "Elections Commission Subcommittee" and "Constitution Subcommittee." The Elections Commission Subcommittee would focus on the elections managed by the University Faculty Senate. The Constitution Subcommittee would focus on the work of the existing Unit Constitution subcommittee, simply giving that body a title that more accurately reflects its work. (In its meeting on November 30, 2021, the University Faculty Senate approved moving the direct oversight of the Constitution Subcommittee from Senate Council to the Committee on Committees and Rules.)

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

Standing Rules Article II Section 6 (a)
Section 6
Senate Committees:
(a) Committee on Committees and Rules

1. Membership:
(i) Ten (10) elected faculty senators
(ii) Chair-Elect of the Senate (non-voting)
(iii) Immediate Past Chair of the Senate (non-voting)
(iv) Secretary of the Senate (non-voting)
2. Election: By the Senate Council for a term of two years. Elected members of the Committee may serve no more than four consecutive years nor more than three consecutive years as its chair. Elected members of Senate Council may not serve on the Committee on Committees and Rules.

Duties
3. Duties: The Committee on Committees and Rules shall review and make recommendations on the Senate's committee structure. It shall appoint the members of all Standing Committees. It shall be responsible for proposing changes in the Constitution, Bylaws, and Standing Rules of the University Faculty Senate for action by the Senate. This committee shall serve as a Nominating Committee to the administrative officers of the University in the selection of University faculty to serve on University-wide committees. In addition, this committee has the investigative function in determining the constitutionality of acts of the Senate, failures to implement Senate legislation, problems resulting from conflicting legislation, and errors in the implementation of legislation. The Committee on Committees and Rules shall have the authority to interpret the Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Standing Rules subject to review by the Senate. [DELETE] It shall maintain a standing Constitution Subcommittee which shall consult with faculty governance organizations to ensure that their governance documents conform with Senate rules. These functions include review of Unit Constitutions, Bylaws, and Standing Rules. The subcommittee will consist of the Senate Parliamentarian and at least two elected Senators appointed by the Senate Chair and will be chaired by the Senate Secretary. Final vote of approval of the unit governance documents shall be by Senate Council. [END DELETE]

Each spring, the Committee on Committees and Rules shall select a pool of faculty members who will be available to serve as a member of all Division I Intercollegiate Head Coach athletics searches. The Committee on Committees and Rules will ask for nominations from faculty members who are currently participating in or have participated within the last four calendar years on the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, the Athletics Integrity Council, and/or the Faculty Partners Program. The assignment of faculty members to serve on a head coach search committee will be the prerogative of the Senate Chair but under most circumstances, it is expected that the faculty member will be drawn from the pool of candidates identified each year by the Committee on Committees and Rules.

Each year the Committee on Committees and Rules shall ask returning and new senators to rank their preferences for committee assignments. The Committee on Committees and Rules will then select the senatorial members of each Standing Committee, taking into consideration the
preferences of senators. Where a representative of an administrative office is to be an ex officio member of a committee, this member will be selected by the Committee on Committees and Rules in consultation with the appropriate administrative officer. Appointments to all committees should reflect the variety of disciplines, functions, and geographic locations of University units. Annually, the Committee on Committees and Rules shall elect its own Chair and Vice Chair. In consultation with the Senate Chair, the Committee shall designate the leadership of all other Standing Committees of the Senate.

While the Senate officers are the primary faculty representatives to the Big Ten Academic Alliance, the Committee on Committees and Rules shall be informed and consulted on faculty governance issues that arise in the CIC. Such items will be periodically reported to the Senate.
[ADD] 4. Subcommittees [END ADD]
[DELETE]-4. Mandated reports: Nomination report. The Committee on Committees and Rules shall have the authority to approve its mandated Informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council. [END DELETE]
[ADD] (i) [DELETE] It shall maintain a standing [END DELETE] Constitution Subcommittee [DELETE] which [END DELETE] shall consult with faculty governance organizations to ensure that their governance documents conform with Senate rules. These functions include review of Unit Constitutions, Bylaws, and Standing Rules. The subcommittee will consist of the Senate Parliamentarian and at least two elected Senators appointed by the Senate Chair and will be chaired by the Senate Secretary. Final vote of approval of the unit governance documents shall be by Senate Council.
(ii) Elections Commission Subcommittee: The subcommittee will have at least three members, including the chair of the Committee on Committees and Rules and the Senate Parliamentarian and will be chaired by the Senate Secretary. Membership of this subcommittee should not overlap with the Nominating Committee. The subcommittee shall have responsibility over the Senate Census and responsibility over all Senate run elections. [END ADD]
[ADD] 5. Mandated reports: Nomination report. The Committee on Committees and Rules shall have the authority to approve its mandated Informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council. [END ADD]

## Revised Copy

Standing Rules Article II Section 6 (a)
Section 6

Senate Committees:
(a) Committee on Committees and Rules

1. Membership:
(i) Ten (10) elected faculty senators
(ii) Chair-Elect of the Senate (non-voting)
(iii) Immediate Past Chair of the Senate (non-voting)
(iv) Secretary of the Senate (non-voting)
2. Election: By the Senate Council for a term of two years. Elected members of the Committee may serve no more than four consecutive years nor more than three consecutive years as its chair. Elected members of Senate Council may not serve on the Committee on Committees and Rules.

## Duties

3. Duties: The Committee on Committees and Rules shall review and make recommendations on the Senate's committee structure. It shall appoint the members of all Standing Committees. It shall be responsible for proposing changes in the Constitution, Bylaws, and Standing Rules of the University Faculty Senate for action by the Senate. This committee shall serve as a Nominating Committee to the administrative officers of the University in the selection of University faculty to serve on University-wide committees. In addition, this committee has the investigative function in determining the constitutionality of acts of the Senate, failures to implement Senate legislation, problems resulting from conflicting legislation, and errors in the implementation of legislation. The Committee on Committees and Rules shall have the authority to interpret the Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Standing Rules subject to review by the Senate.

Each spring, the Committee on Committees and Rules shall select a pool of faculty members who will be available to serve as a member of all Division I Intercollegiate Head Coach athletics searches. The Committee on Committees and Rules will ask for nominations from faculty members who are currently participating in or have participated within the last four calendar years on the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, the Athletics Integrity Council, and/or the Faculty Partners Program. The assignment of faculty members to serve on a head coach search committee will be the prerogative of the Senate Chair but under most circumstances, it is expected that the faculty member will be drawn from the pool of candidates identified each year by the Committee on Committees and Rules.

Each year the Committee on Committees and Rules shall ask returning and new senators to rank their preferences for committee assignments. The Committee on Committees and Rules will then select the senatorial members of each Standing Committee, taking into consideration the preferences of senators. Where a representative of an administrative office is to be an ex officio
member of a committee, this member will be selected by the Committee on Committees and Rules in consultation with the appropriate administrative officer. Appointments to all committees should reflect the variety of disciplines, functions, and geographic locations of University units. Annually, the Committee on Committees and Rules shall elect its own Chair and Vice Chair. In consultation with the Senate Chair, the Committee shall designate the leadership of all other Standing Committees of the Senate.

While the Senate officers are the primary faculty representatives to the Big Ten Academic Alliance, the Committee on Committees and Rules shall be informed and consulted on faculty governance issues that arise in the CIC. Such items will be periodically reported to the Senate.

## 4. Subcommittees

(i) Constitution Subcommittee: The subcommittee shall consult with faculty governance organizations to ensure that their governance documents conform with Senate rules. These functions include review of Unit Constitutions, Bylaws, and Standing Rules. The subcommittee will consist of the Senate Parliamentarian and at least two elected Senators appointed by the Senate Chair and will be chaired by the Senate Secretary. Final vote of approval of the unit governance documents shall be by Senate Council.
(ii) Elections Commission Subcommittee: The subcommittee will have at least three members, including the chair of the Committee on Committees and Rules and the Senate Parliamentarian and will be chaired by the Senate Secretary. Membership of this subcommittee should not overlap with the Nominating Committees. The subcommittee shall have responsibility over the Senate Census and responsibility over all Senate run elections.
5. Mandated reports: Nomination report. The Committee on Committees and Rules shall have the authority to approve its mandated Informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.
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# SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES 

Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article I Section 12 (e)<br>(Legislative)<br>Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

## Introduction and Rationale

This report is one of a series of legislative reports from the Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on Committees and Rules. The charge of the subcommittee was to provide consistency, transparency, and clarity for all University Faculty Senate elections.

Article I Section 12 (e) of the Standing Rules describes the role and appointment process of the election tellers. Tellers verify the election results and according to Robert's Rules of Order should be chosen for accuracy and dependability and have no direct personal involvement in the result of the vote to the extent that they should abstain from voting. These principles can be most reliably maintained by senators who are members of the Elections Commission, which already has the authority to supervise the elections.

As currently written, tellers are appointed by the Senate Chair from among the members of the Senate at large. As the Elections Commission has the authority to supervise elections, it would provide more consistency and transparency if the Senate's tellers were selected from among the members of that body instead of from the Senate at large.

## Recommendation

We recommend changing the way that the Senate's tellers are selected. This legislation proposes that the Senate's tellers be selected from among the members of the Elections Commission, as that body has responsibility over all Senate-run elections.

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

Standing Rules Article, I
Section 12
(e) Votes shall be counted or verified by three tellers, [DELETE] appointed by the Chair of the Senate from among the members of the Senate [END DELETE] [ADD] formed from members of the Elections Commission [END ADD] who are not members of the Nominating Committee [see (c)]. The tellers will report the results of the election to the Executive Director of the Senate

Office who will immediately inform the Senate officers, candidates, and the chair of the Committee on Committees and Rules of these results. The full Senate will be notified of the results in a timely fashion.

## Revised Copy

Standing Rules Article, I
Section 12
(e) Votes shall be counted or verified by three tellers, formed from members of the Elections Commission who are not members of the Nominating Committee [see (c)]. The tellers will report the results of the election to the Executive Director of the Senate Office who will immediately inform the Senate officers, candidates, and the chair of the Committee on Committees and Rules of these results. The full Senate will be notified of the results in a timely fashion.
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# SENATE COMMITTEES ON COMMITTEES AND RULES AND CURRICULAR AFFAIRS 

Revision to Standing Rules, Article II - Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (c) Committee on Curricular Affairs<br>(Legislative)<br>Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

## Introduction and Rationale

To support all members of our Commonwealth and beyond, the University's values and mission are firmly laid on proactive efforts to ensure diversity, equity, and inclusion. To truly incorporate these values into our research, teaching, learning, outreach, assessment, operations, and decision making-at all levels of the University-we must ensure that the work of the entire University Faculty Senate considers diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in a meaningful and actionable way in everything we do.

During the 2020-2021 academic year, each Senate standing committee was charged with examining how DEI could be better incorporated into its duties. The work of the Committee on Curricular Affairs is directed by both its standing rules and by (hundreds of) curricular policies and procedures. To reflect the committee's dedication for advancing DEI throughout our work, we are proposing a stepwise effort to first revise the standing rules in a simple but profound way. Our next steps are holistic and critical review of curricular policies and procedures for equity and inclusion; recommended changes will subsequently be brought to the full Senate for consideration and approval.

This revision to our rules is also an opportune time to update the membership to reflect the long standing resource members who contribute to the work of the committee.

## Recommendation

We recommend that the Standing Rules, Article II-Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (c) be revised as follows.

Please note that the following contains bold text for additions and strikeouts indicating deleted text. Deleted text is notated with [Delete] [End Delete]. Added text is notated with [Add] [End Add].
(c) Committee on Curricular Affairs

1. Membership:
(i) At least 17 elected faculty senators including one faculty senator from each college at University Park and one faculty senator from each of Abington, Altoona, Berks, Erie, Harrisburg, and the University College.
(ii) One undergraduate student senator
(iii) A member of the Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education (selected by ACUE)
(iv) Dean of University Libraries and Scholarly Communications or representative
(v) Chair of the Graduate Council Committee on Programs and Courses
[add] (vi) A representative from the Office of the University Registrar
(vii) A representative from the Division of Undergraduate Studies
(viii) A representative from the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research
(ix) A representative from the Office of Undergraduate Education
(x) A representative from the Office for General Education [end add]
2. Selection: Committee members shall be selected by the Committee on Committees and Rules. One Chair and two Vice Chairs shall be chosen from the elected faculty senate members.

## Duties

3. Duties: The Committee on Curricular Affairs shall review, evaluate, and approve or reject all course and curriculum proposals including proposals to limit program enrollment submitted by the various departments, colleges, and other appropriate units of the University that have not received delegation or responsibility in this area from the Senate. With regard to program enrollment limitations, restrictions proposed for academic reasons are subject to approval or rejection while restrictions proposed for resource restraints are subject only to consultative review. The Committee shall study the existing courses and curricula of the University with reference to the needs of students; [add] enhancing diversity, equity, and inclusion [end add]; and opportunities for service to the Commonwealth and make recommendations for changes where appropriate. It shall develop [add] equity-minded [end add] criteria for evaluating courses and curricula and recommend procedures for handling courses and curriculum proposals. It shall have oversight of the following subcommittees: Bachelors of Arts, Certificates, General Education, Integrative Studies, Retention and Transfer, United States and International Cultures, and Writing. It shall disperse vice chair duties such that one vice chair shall oversee General Education efforts including serving as subcommittee chair for General Education and Integrative Studies subcommittees, and one vice chair shall support all general business of the committee and shall oversee at least two remaining subcommittees. It shall make recommendations to Senate Council on the establishment, reorganization, naming or discontinuation of organizational units pursuant to Council duties specified in Article II, Section 1 (d) of the Bylaws. It shall maintain such liaison with University administration and faculty as may be necessary for the implementation of these procedures.

## 4. Standing Subcommittees:

[add] All subcommittees shall for their activities consider with earnest the advancement of diversity, equity, and inclusion. [end add]
(i) General Education Subcommittee

It shall consist of nine members to monitor the General Education Program and make recommendations for assuring the delivery of effective general education as mandated in the General Education legislation. The subcommittee shall be led by the vice chair of SCCA; its membership shall be such that the subcommittee has at least one member with expertise in each of the General Education Categories (GWS, GQ, GA, GH, GN, GS and GHW). An effort should be made to include at least one member from a non-University Park location, but with disciplinary expertise remaining the primary consideration. When the subcommittee's workload is especially intense, the chair of SCCA may appoint additional members, drawn from SCCA or other Senate committees. The Subcommittee shall review all General Education course proposals (except as provided in ii, iii, and iv below) and forward recommendations to the Committee. It shall also develop, revise, and edit official University publications that provide information about General Education. (See Appendix "H," 1-23-90.)
(ii) Integrative Studies Subcommittee

It shall include at least three members of the General Education subcommittee and shall be led by the vice chair of SCCA; membership shall be such that the subcommittee has at least one member with expertise in each of the Breadth Across Knowledge Domains (GA, GH, GN, GS, GHW). An effort should be made to include at least one member from a non-University Park location, but with disciplinary expertise remaining the primary consideration. When the subcommittee's workload is especially intense, the chair of SCCA may appoint additional members, drawn from SCCA or other Senate committees. The subcommittee shall be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Integrative Studies requirement in the undergraduate curriculum. It shall periodically review and revise, as necessary, guidelines for courses intended to fulfill this requirement. It shall also accept and review proposals for integrative coursework year-round and forward recommendations to the Committee. (See Appendix B, 3-15-16).
(iii) United States and International Cultures Subcommittee

It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of ten members and shall be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the United States cultures and International Cultures requirement in the undergraduate curriculum. It shall periodically review and revise, as necessary, guidelines for courses intended to fulfill this requirement. It shall also review proposals for courses under this requirement and forward recommendations to the Committee. (See Appendix II, 12-4-90 and III, 4-27-04.)
(iv) Writing Subcommittee

It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of ten members and shall be responsible for overseeing and reviewing, as necessary, the implementation of Writing Across the Curriculum in the undergraduate curriculum. It shall periodically review and revise,
as necessary, guidelines for writing-intensive courses. It shall also review all writing-intensive course proposals and forward recommendations to the Committee. (See Appendix "E" 3-20-90.)
(v) Bachelor of Arts Requirements Subcommittee

It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of eleven members including a faculty member from each college that offers the BA degree (Abington, Altoona, Arts and Architecture, Berks, Communications, Earth and Mineral Sciences, Erie, Harrisburg, Liberal Arts, Science, and University College). It shall review BA course proposals and monitor and review all BA requirements and it shall consider recommendations for changes in these requirements. These recommendations shall be reported to the Committee and, if approved, shall be forwarded to the Senate for vote. (See Appendix II, 4-13-93 and E, 10-26-04.)
(vi) Retention and Transfer Subcommittee

It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of five members to review, make recommendations and monitor all holds on student admissions to programs and special or more restrictive academic requirements for entrance into a college, major or minor, and/or for retention in a program, consistent with general academic guidelines established by the Committee on Education. (See Appendix "E," 10-26-93.)
(vii) Certificates Subcommittee

It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of at least five members to review and make recommendations about certificate programs. It shall periodically review and revise, as necessary, guidelines for undergraduate credit certificates. It shall also monitor recertification of certificates at the 5-year expiration and review extension requests. (See Appendix "E" 3-15-16)
5. Mandated reports: Senate Curriculum Report. The Committee on Curricular Affairs shall have the authority to approve its mandated Informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall continue to send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

## Revised Policy

(c) Committee on Curricular Affairs

1. Membership:
(i) At least 17 elected faculty senators including one faculty senator from each college at University Park and one faculty senator from each of Abington, Altoona, Berks, Erie, Harrisburg, and the University College.
(ii) One undergraduate student senator
(iii) A member of the Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education (selected by ACUE)
(iv) Dean of University Libraries and Scholarly Communications or representative
(v) Chair of the Graduate Council Committee on Programs and Courses
(vi) A representative from the Office of the University Registrar
(vii) A representative from the Division of Undergraduate Studies
(viii) A representative from the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research
(ix) A representative from the Office of Undergraduate Education
(x) A representative from the Office for General Education
2. Selection: Committee members shall be selected by the Committee on Committees and Rules. One Chair and two Vice Chairs shall be chosen from the elected faculty senate members.

## Duties

3. Duties: The Committee on Curricular Affairs shall review, evaluate, and approve or reject all course and curriculum proposals including proposals to limit program enrollment submitted by the various departments, colleges, and other appropriate units of the University that have not received delegation or responsibility in this area from the Senate. With regard to program enrollment limitations, restrictions proposed for academic reasons are subject to approval or rejection while restrictions proposed for resource restraints are subject only to consultative review. The Committee shall study the existing courses and curricula of the University with reference to the needs of students; enhancing diversity, equity, and inclusion; and opportunities for service to the Commonwealth and make recommendations for changes where appropriate. It shall develop equity-minded criteria for evaluating courses and curricula and recommend procedures for handling courses and curriculum proposals. It shall have oversight of the following subcommittees: Bachelors of Arts, Certificates, General Education, Integrative Studies, Retention and Transfer, United States and International Cultures, and Writing. It shall disperse vice chair duties such that one vice chair shall oversee General Education efforts including serving as subcommittee chair for General Education and Integrative Studies subcommittees, and one vice chair shall support all general business of the committee and shall oversee at least two remaining subcommittees. It shall make recommendations to Senate Council on the establishment, reorganization, naming or discontinuation of organizational units pursuant to Council duties specified in Article II, Section 1 (d) of the Bylaws. It shall maintain such liaison with University administration and faculty as may be necessary for the implementation of these procedures.

## 4. Standing Subcommittees:

All subcommittees shall for their activities consider with earnest the advancement of diversity, equity, and inclusion.
(i) General Education Subcommittee

It shall consist of nine members to monitor the General Education Program and make
recommendations for assuring the delivery of effective general education as mandated in the General Education legislation. The subcommittee shall be led by the vice chair of SCCA; its membership shall be such that the subcommittee has at least one member with expertise in each of the General Education Categories (GWS, GQ, GA, GH, GN, GS and GHW). An effort should be made to include at least one member from a non-University Park location, but with disciplinary expertise remaining the primary consideration. When the subcommittee's workload is especially intense, the chair of SCCA may appoint additional members, drawn from SCCA or other Senate committees. The Subcommittee shall review all General Education course proposals (except as provided in ii, iii, and iv below) and forward recommendations to the Committee. It shall also develop, revise, and edit official University publications that provide information about General Education. (See Appendix "H," 1-23-90.)
(ii) Integrative Studies Subcommittee

It shall include at least three members of the General Education subcommittee and shall be led by the vice chair of SCCA; membership shall be such that the subcommittee has at least one member with expertise in each of the Breadth Across Knowledge Domains (GA, GH, GN, GS, GHW). An effort should be made to include at least one member from a non-University Park location, but with disciplinary expertise remaining the primary consideration. When the subcommittee's workload is especially intense, the chair of SCCA may appoint additional members, drawn from SCCA or other Senate committees. The subcommittee shall be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Integrative Studies requirement in the undergraduate curriculum. It shall periodically review and revise, as necessary, guidelines for courses intended to fulfill this requirement. It shall also accept and review proposals for integrative coursework year-round and forward recommendations to the Committee. (See Appendix B, 3-15-16).
(iii) United States and International Cultures Subcommittee

It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of ten members and shall be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the United States cultures and International Cultures requirement in the undergraduate curriculum. It shall periodically review and revise, as necessary, guidelines for courses intended to fulfill this requirement. It shall also review proposals for courses under this requirement and forward recommendations to the Committee. (See Appendix II, 12-4-90 and III, 4-27-04.)
(iv) Writing Subcommittee

It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of ten members and shall be responsible for overseeing and reviewing, as necessary, the implementation of Writing Across the Curriculum in the undergraduate curriculum. It shall periodically review and revise, as necessary, guidelines for writing-intensive courses. It shall also review all writing-intensive course proposals and forward recommendations to the Committee. (See Appendix "E" 3-20-90.)
(v) Bachelor of Arts Requirements Subcommittee

It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of eleven members including a faculty member from each college that offers the BA degree (Abington, Altoona, Arts and Architecture, Berks, Communications, Earth and Mineral Sciences, Erie, Harrisburg, Liberal Arts, Science, and University College). It shall review BA course proposals and monitor
and review all BA requirements and it shall consider recommendations for changes in these requirements. These recommendations shall be reported to the Committee and, if approved, shall be forwarded to the Senate for vote. (See Appendix II, 4-13-93 and E, 10-26-04.)
(vi) Retention and Transfer Subcommittee

It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of five members to review, make recommendations and monitor all holds on student admissions to programs and special or more restrictive academic requirements for entrance into a college, major or minor, and/or for retention in a program, consistent with general academic guidelines established by the Committee on Education. (See Appendix "E," 10-26-93.)
(vii) Certificates Subcommittee

It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of at least five members to review and make recommendations about certificate programs. It shall periodically review and revise, as necessary, guidelines for undergraduate credit certificates. It shall also monitor recertification of certificates at the 5-year expiration and review extension requests. (See Appendix "E" 3-15-16)
5. Mandated reports: Senate Curriculum Report. The Committee on Curricular Affairs shall have the authority to approve its mandated Informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall continue to send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.
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# SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES AND SELF-STUDY COMMITTEE 

Proposed Preamble to the Senate Constitution entitled: A Statement on the Role of the Faculty Senate at the Pennsylvania State University

CORRECTED COPY
(Shaded areas in [square brackets] reflect editorial revisions made by committee after the Senate meeting.)
(Legislative)
Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate and President

## Introduction and Rationale

In 2020, as part of commemorating the $100^{\text {th }}$ year of the University Faculty Senate (1921-2021), then-Senate Chair Beth Seymour appointed a Senate Self-Study Committee that has considered multiple aspects of the Senate's structure, function, and documentation. The Self-Study Committee has worked in consultation with the Senate Committee on Committee and Rules and has welcomed additional input, including through Senate Listening Forums (the most recent of which was held on January 18, 2022).

The Self-Study Committee is here proposing that a Preamble be added to the Senate's Constitution. Though the Constitution is arguably the Senate's most important document, it presently lacks any initial statement of principles for this crucial faculty organization and for the concepts of shared governance on which it relies. In observation of the centennial of the University Faculty Senate's contributions to this university, what follows is a statement of principles that we hold to be true. It is produced as an affirmation of the Senate's purposes and as a recognition of the faculty's fundamental role in the university's highest and most noble of concerns: that of providing a quality education and advancement in action and mind for current and future generations.

We therefore make the recommendation to add the Preamble shown below.*

[^1]
## Recommendation

Given that the principles above have been foundational to the University Faculty Senate as an institution and continue to guide our work, it is our recommendation that the University Faculty Senate adopt and include the Statement on "The Role of the Faculty Senate at the Pennsylvania State University" as a preamble to the Constitution of our Senate, as shown below.

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

## SENATE CONSTITUTION

The [ADD] faculty governance body underlying the University Faculty Senate first came into existence in 1921. A [END ADD] new Constitution for the University Faculty Senate was approved by the President of the University and adopted by Faculty Referendum of March 27, 1971, to become effective on June 1, 1971. Since that date other major changes were made in May 1975, [DELETE] and [END DELETE]April 1993, [ADD] and April 2022. [END ADD] All changes in this [ADD] version [END ADD] are shown as approved by the Senate as of [DELETE] April 28, 2015 [END DELETE] [ADD] April -- , 2022.[END ADD]

- [ADD] Preamble [END ADD]
- Article I -Functions
- Article II - Membership
- Article III - Amendments


## [ADD]PREAMBLE

The Role of the University Faculty Senate at The Pennsylvania State University
Faculty perform a fundamental mission of the University's highest and noble purpose to educate an ethical global citizenry. As the cornerstone of the university, they provide the knowledge-based environment and expansive capacity to address educational issues. Their deep expertise, broad experience, diverse perspectives, multifaceted creativity, and passion to drive innovations in teaching, research, extension and outreach to stakeholders and the public, are critical to the mission of the university. Therefore, we affirm:

The faculty of the Pennsylvania State University community, represented by the University Faculty Senate whose Constitution follows, along with the Senate's elected student members and appointed members, [End add] [(Delete) have the right to authentic participation in the shared governance of our institution-(End delete)] [Add] have been delegated the authority by the Board of Trustees to participate authentically in the shared governance of the institution. Through its senate, faculty have authority over the University's curriculum (programs, requirements, courses, etc.) and all changes must occur through senate action. Furthermore, faculty serve in many ways as participants in the decisions and actions of the University's administrative and Board leadership. Additionally, faculty, in collaboration with the University's administrative and Board leadership, share the responsibility to guard and protect the mission of the University by keeping each other accountable.

Those principles mean that in addition to its primary role in oversight of an ever-evolving body of curriculum and guidance in implementation of the curriculum, Penn State's University Faculty Senate operates as a general advisory and consultative body to achieve shared governance. This entails an ongoing role beyond that of a conduit of communication between faculty and administration. In the course of their various committee assignments or areas of expertise, Senators engage with and influence policies in wide-ranging areas from athletics to ethics, sustainability and planning, human resources and beyond. The purview of the Senate, therefore, is quite broad. The voice of the faculty, expressed individually and collectively through its duly elected representatives on the Senate, is essential for shared governance to exist in principle and in practice.

It is hereby affirmed that the quality of this institution is, in large part, measured by its success in sharing communication and expertise between the faculty, the University administration, and Board leadership, and in working together in partnership toward the inviolability of its mission. Respect and esteem for the faculty must be strong for our institution to continue its inspiring and successful mandate. Balanced and meaningful collaboration between all parties-shared governance-must exist for our institution to successfully continue to fulfill its mandate. [END ADD]

## Revised Constitution

## SENATE CONSTITUTION

The faculty governance body underlying the University Faculty Senate first came into existence in 1921. A new Constitution for the University Faculty Senate was approved by the President of the University and adopted by Faculty Referendum of March 27, 1971, to become effective on June 1, 1971. Since that date other major changes were made in May 1975, April 1993, and April 2022.

All changes in this version are shown as approved by the Senate as of April --, 2022.

- Preamble
- Article I -Functions
- Article II - Membership
- Article III - Amendments


## PREAMBLE

The Role of the University Faculty Senate at The Pennsylvania State University
Faculty perform a fundamental mission of the University's highest and noble purpose to educate an ethical global citizenry. As the cornerstone of the university, they provide the knowledgebased environment and expansive capacity to address educational issues. Their deep expertise, broad experience, diverse perspectives, multifaceted creativity, and passion to drive innovations in teaching, research, extension and outreach to stakeholders and the public, are critical to the mission of the university.

Therefore, we affirm:
The faculty of the Pennsylvania State University community, represented by the University Faculty Senate whose Constitution follows, along with the Senate's elected student members and appointed members, have been delegated the authority by the Board of Trustees to participate authentically in the shared governance of the institution. Through its senate, faculty have authority over the University's curriculum (programs, requirements, courses, etc.) and all changes must occur through senate action. Furthermore, faculty serve in many ways as participants in the decisions and actions of the University's administrative and Board leadership. Additionally, faculty, in collaboration with the University's administrative and Board leadership, share the responsibility to guard and protect the mission of the University by keeping each other accountable.

Those principles mean that in addition to its primary role in oversight of an ever-evolving body of curriculum and guidance in implementation of the curriculum, Penn State's University Faculty Senate operates as a general advisory and consultative body to achieve shared governance. This entails an ongoing role beyond that of a conduit of communication between faculty and administration. In the course of their various committee assignments or areas of expertise, Senators engage with and influence policies in wide-ranging areas from athletics to ethics, sustainability and planning, human resources and beyond. The purview of the Senate, therefore, is quite broad. The voice of the faculty, expressed individually and collectively through its duly elected representatives on the Senate, is essential for shared governance to exist in principle and in practice.

It is hereby affirmed that the quality of this institution is, in large part, measured by its success in sharing communication and expertise between the faculty, the University administration, and Board leadership, and in working together in partnership toward the inviolability of its mission. Respect and esteem for the faculty must be strong for our institution to continue its inspiring and successful mandate. Balanced and meaningful collaboration between all parties-shared governance - must exist for our institution to successfully continue to fulfill its mandate.
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# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 

Rescind Policy 44-40 Proctoring of Examinations

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

## Introduction and Rationale

Policy 44-40 requires that "all examinations must be adequately proctored." The stated purpose in the policy is to protect honest students from the actions of a few dishonest students. The true purpose of the policy is to protect the integrity of evaluation methods. This policy was written in 1957 and last updated in 1989. The Committee on Education recently reviewed this policy with the intent to update it to match current pedagogical practices. For example, many types of "exams" neither need a human proctor, nor are designed in ways that make proctoring necessary or reasonable (e.g take home exams, group exams). It became apparent that the intent of this policy was already addressed in existing policy on Academic Integrity (see policy 49-20). Any attempt to update the current policy would be redundant.

## Recommendation

The committee recommends eliminating policy 44-40 in order to streamline policies related to instruction and avoid redundancy.
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## SENATE COMMITTEE ON GLOBAL PROGRAMS

Revision to Standing Rules, Article II - Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (h) Committee on Global Programs

(Legislative)
Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

## Introduction and Rationale

Penn State's "Office of Global Programs" recently changed its name to "Penn State Global" thereby making the current name of the "Senate Committee on Global Programs" obsolete. This legislative report seeks to revise the standing rules for the "Senate Committee on Global Programs" to rename it "Senate Committee on Global Engagement" and have that name change be reflected across all Faculty Senate Governance Documents.

The new name is meant both to align the committee with the priorities of "Penn State Global," whose mission extends beyond the commitment to study abroad that is suggested by "Global Programs," and simultaneously to highlight that the committee's own mission exceeds that of Penn State Global. The committee's role is to advise on all aspects of the faculty, students, and staff's engagement with global contexts including, but not limited to, those activities that involve international travel.

## Recommendation

We recommend that the Standing Rules, Article II-Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (h) be revised as follows.

Please note that the following contains bold text for additions and strikeouts indicating deleted text. In addition, deleted text is delimited with [Delete] [End Delete] pairs while added text is delimited with [Add] [End Add] pairs.
(h) Committee on Global [Delete]Programs[End Delete][Add]Engagement[End Add]

1. Membership:
(i) At least seven elected faculty senators with at least two senators from locations other than University Park
(ii) A representative of Graduate Council
(iii) One undergraduate student senator
(iv) One graduate student
(v) The Vice Provost for [Delete]Global Programs[End Delete] [Add]Penn State Global[End Add]
2. Selection: By the Committee on Committees and Rules

## Duties

3. Duties: The Committee on Global [Delete]Programs[End Delete] [Add]Engagement[End Add] shall provide advice and consultation to the Vice Provost for [Delete]Global Programs[End Delete] [Add]Penn State Global[End Add] about the implementation of activities, standards, and programs to enhance the inclusive internationalization of Penn State's undergraduate and graduate education, research, campus environment, and student affairs. It shall be the Senate advisory body to the Vice Provost for [Delete]Global Programs[End Delete] [Add]Penn State Global [End Add]. The committee will provide guidelines and develop policies that are relevant to the academic integrity of content, delivery, and support of programs associated with [Delete]the Office of Global Programs[End Delete] [Add]Penn State Global[End Add]. It shall provide consultation on the affiliation and partnerships of the University with institutions and organizations outside the United States. The committee shall provide advice and consultation emphasizing diversity, equity, and inclusion to support international and exchange students at Penn State. It will also participate in tracking progress in achieving the strategic goals of [Delete] the Office of Global Programs[End Delete] [Add]Penn State Global[EndAdd] and the University for inclusively internationalizing the students and academic programs. The committee shall also maintain liaisons with other Senate committees, where appropriate, as well as with students and faculty, University-wide through the Senate.
4. Mandated Reports: The committee shall report annually to the Senate on the participation of Penn State students in global programs, both on campus and abroad, and other University-wide global initiatives related to the University's strategic goals. This report should disaggregate participation by some combination of race and ethnicity, gender identity, dis/ability status, sexual identity or orientation, and country of citizenship, at minimum. Additionally, this annual report should include retention and graduation statistics of international and domestic students (similarly disaggregated). The Committee on Global [Delete]Programs[End Delete] [Add]Engagement[End Add] shall have the authority to approve its mandated Informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

## Revised Policy

(h) Committee on Global Engagement

1. Membership:
(i) At least seven elected faculty senators with at least two senators from locations other than University Park
(ii) A representative of Graduate Council
(iii) One undergraduate student senator
(iv) One graduate student
(v) The Vice Provost for Penn State Global
2. Selection: By the Committee on Committees and Rules

## Duties

3. Duties: The Committee on Global Engagement shall provide advice and consultation to the Vice Provost for Penn State Global about the implementation of activities, standards, and programs to enhance the inclusive internationalization of Penn State's undergraduate and graduate education, research, campus environment, and student affairs. It shall be the Senate advisory body to the Vice Provost for Penn State Global. The committee will provide guidelines and develop policies that are relevant to the academic integrity of content, delivery, and support of programs associated with Penn State Global. It shall provide consultation on the affiliation and partnerships of the University with institutions and organizations outside the United States. The committee shall provide advice and consultation emphasizing diversity, equity, and inclusion to support international and exchange students at Penn State. It will also participate in tracking progress in achieving the strategic goals of Penn State Global and the University for inclusively internationalizing the students and academic programs. The committee shall also maintain liaisons with other Senate committees, where appropriate, as well as with students and faculty, University-wide through the Senate.
4. Mandated Reports: The committee shall report annually to the Senate on the participation of Penn State students in global programs, both on campus and abroad, and other University-wide global initiatives related to the University's strategic goals. This report should disaggregate participation by some combination of race and ethnicity, gender identity, dis/ability status, sexual identity or orientation, and country of citizenship, at minimum. Additionally, this annual report should include retention and graduation statistics of international and domestic students (similarly disaggregated). The Committee on Global Engagement shall have the authority to approve its mandated Informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.
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# SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS 

Guiding Principles for the Design of Health Care Plans

(Advisory/Consultative)
Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

## Introduction and Rationale

In October 2020, the Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits presented an Informational Report on the Guiding Principles for the Design of Health Care Plans for Penn State. Lengthy, complex discussions of this report informed the committee's subsequent efforts to discern what recommendations on the current state of Penn State's health care plan design it should propose to the University. The present report identifies a series of critical observations about Penn State's health care plans as currently formulated.

The committee's observations rely on the analysis presented in the original Informational Report, of 2020, based on data available at that time: https://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/october-20-2020-agenda/appendix-c/ . Where applicable, we have also used information presented in the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits' annual report regarding 2020 utilization, presented to the Senate in November 2021: https://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/november-30-2021-agenda/appendix-p/.
Health care expenditures are a significant part of the University's budget: \$322 million (\$277 million for active employees) in 2020, around $11 \%$ of the Educational and General Budget (funded by tuition and state support). Plan designs are of immense importance to all employees, directly impacting their physical and financial health. They are also crucial to the University's ability to attract and retain employees at every level, and to employees' ability to perform the work necessary to carrying out the University's mission. The committee takes seriously the opportunity and obligation to consider the interests of faculty, and, to the best of our ability, all other employees covered under these plans. We recognize that faculty comprise about $1 / 3$ of all 18,000 benefitseligible PSU employees.
The committee's chosen approach is to point out aspects of the current Penn State plans it finds anomalous, problematic, or incompatible with the Senate's previously approved principles and priorities which guide health care plan design. Below, we highlight anomalies in four of the six guiding principles and propose general recommendations for addressing these issues. Overall, this committee finds that the current healthcare plan design is deficient because it lacks: adequate faculty/employee participation in plan design; sufficient plan choice; clear definitions regarding equity and affordability; and an inequitable cost distribution structure.

## Background

In 2016, the Faculty Senate approved six "Principles for the Design of Penn State Health Care Plans":

1) A principle of choice for employees in health care plans.
2) A principle of overall cost sharing of $75 \%$ of total medical claims paid by university and
$25 \%$ paid by the employee.
3) A principle of affordability and equity.
4) A principle of informed utilization.
5) The principle of quality, transparency, accessibility, and cost effectiveness should guide the negotiation and management of contracts for healthcare services.
6) A principle of fostering and promoting a culture of health should guide the design of plan features and programs that promote healthy choices and activities, shared efforts to establish tobacco-free campuses, and support the consistent and effective management of health risks.

The following discussion of issues draws from the framework provided by these principles, with a focus on Principles 1, 2, 3, and 6.

## Principle 1: Choice for employees in health care plans

Penn State currently offers two health care plans: the PPO Plan, a traditional form of insurance, and the PPO Savings Plan, a high-deductible health plan (HDHP). As of 2020, approximately 70\% of employees chose the PPO Plan, and $30 \%$ the PPO Savings Plan. The University is self-insured, meaning that it, and not an external insurance company, is responsible for paying its own health care costs. Plans are administered, however, by a contracted Third-Party Administrator (TPA), currently Aetna, and Pharmacy Benefit Manager (PBM), currently CVS/Caremark.

The design of both PSU plans uses multiple features to shape how costs are distributed among employees: premiums (called "contributions"; a percentage of income); deductibles (which increase across four income tiers); copays and coinsurance (fixed per service type); HSA seed (which diminishes across four income tiers). The resulting structure establishes a progressive framework, in which higher-salary employees make higher contributions and pay a greater portion of total costs. Some variables are set by laws and regulations, including the Affordable Care Act (ACA), the IRS, and other agencies. Others are set by Penn State in cooperation with Aetna and CVS/Caremark.

Benchmarking of peer institutions for the 2020 report showed that 17 of 25 (68\%) institutions offered at least two different plans for employees. The committee re-asserts that for faculty, a choice of plans is imperative and non-negotiable. Choice must also be meaningful, accessible, and applicable to all employees. This is not necessarily the case under current plans. Not all plans may be accessible to all employees. For example, there may be governmental restrictions on access to certain plans that are imposed upon Medicare-eligible employees. Furthermore, significant choice should also ensure maximum choice among health care providers, not only plan types. At present, "choice" consists exclusively in how employees pay for care; both plans provide access to identical networks of providers.

Furthermore, HDHPs (like our PPO Savings plan) are a recent development in the health care industry. They offer clearest financial benefits for low-utilization and higher-income employees, with the Health Savings Accounts providing a tax-advantaged form of additional retirement savings, at least to those who are able to freely participate without imposition of a possible Medicare penalty. In 2021, approximately $30 \%$ of PSU employees elected the HDHP.

Meaningful choice of health care plans means that an HDHP must not be the only option, but a voluntary election. We see room for even more robust guidance and transparency regarding how the
plan works, and a need for qualitative information beyond the numerical data provided by Benefits Mentor during Open Enrollment, which is based on prior usage and broad categories of anticipated need for the coming year. Because members pay for costs more directly, an HDHP entails different patterns of payment that can affect usage of health care.

In addition, as a recent industry innovation, the long-term impact of HDHPs on health outcomes remains unknown. While they have been shown to save costs in the short term, immediate benefits to the University budget may come at the price of delaying care that can, in the long run, decrease health and increase costs.

Finally, employees are only able to choose from plans offered by the University and its chosen TPA and PBM. In the current system, the only choices available are Aetna and CVS/Caremark. Selection of these entities thus precedes and defines the character of specific plan choices. At present, selection of the TPA and PBM and specific plan designs only involve representatives of the University's faculty and staff to a limited extent, through the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits (JCIB) and the President's Health Care Advisory Committee (HCAC). To ensure that the choices offered will benefit from the faculty and staff perspective, the principle of shared governance requires direct participation by faculty and staff representatives in both TPA and PBM selection, and in the design of plan types offered. The Penn State University community includes faculty whose research makes them experts on benefit design, employee health and wellness, and other content areas. They should be included in the overall benefit design and selection process.

Principle 2: Overall cost sharing of 75\% of total medical claims paid by the University and 25\% paid by the employee

This principle of proportional participation in cost-sharing remains important, and based on analysis for the 2020 report, tracks the general practice at peer institutions. The committee saw two items to address:

1. As currently written, the last phrase in this principle is ambiguous and potentially misleading. "The employee" should be replaced with "all employees in the aggregate" or something similar, to clarify that the $25 \%$ portion of medical claims does not apply to any individual employee but refers to all employees collectively. As with any system of insurance, the percentage of costs paid by members in any given year will vary based on utilization and (in the current system) income level. It is not unusual for any individual employee's cost share to be higher or lower than $25 \%$, depending on salary and usage.
2. Recent JCIB annual reports show that participants in the PPO Savings (HDHP) plan have collectively paid above $25 \%$ of their costs. The $34.9 \%$ they paid in 2020 is an anomaly because of the pandemic (reduced system utilization meant many did not reach their deductible), but $30 \%$ was not unusual in prior years.

## Principle 3: Affordability and equity

One way the University addresses affordability is with the TPA and PBM, which negotiate rates with health care providers. Plan designs are another strategy to make health care affordable and equitable for and among employees. Remarkably, there have been no changes to the cost structure
from 2018-2021, a period of five years when other costs have risen substantially. The committee expects this will not be typical going forward.

While recognizing these efforts, it also found issues of concern. For one, this principle remains an especially challenging one for the committee to discuss and evaluate. Many applicable definitions of "equity" exist across the University's units, although it is not clear to the committee which such definition of the term should apply to evaluation of the health insurance programs. In addition, the committee is aware of no internal definition of "affordability" to use as a reference. It is incumbent upon the university to provide employees with a clear, consistent definition of equity and affordability as operative standards for its health care plans.

The ACA and IRS do set a standard for "affordable" employee health coverage: the employee portion of premiums for self-only coverage does not exceed $9.83 \%$ of the employee's household income in 2021. This is quite high: an individual with a household income of $\$ 50,000$ and annual premium under $\$ 4915$ ( $\$ 409 /$ month) would be deemed to have "affordable" individual coverage. This amount is more than twice the highest premium cost for individual coverage in PSU's PPO Plan and does not address total cost exposure in the form of deductibles, copays, or coinsurance. The ACA/IRS standard was thus not a useful baseline for the committee's discussions. As will be discussed later in this report, the Penn State plans do not consider household income.

The system structures how $\sim 25 \%$ of total healthcare costs are distributed among Penn State's employees. In the current system, the portion of costs borne by individual employees varies by both system utilization and employee salary, filtered differently depending on the plan selected.

Indexing cost sharing to usage is typical across the industry; indexing it to salary is somewhat less so. The benchmarking conducted for the 2020 Informational Report found that:

- 5 of 24 institutions offered tiered premiums based on income. Of these, all used fixed amounts by salary range. Only PSU set premiums as a percentage of salary.
- 19 of 24 had the same premiums for all members in the same plan, regardless of income.
- No peer institution had either differing deductibles or HSA seed money based on income tier.

Currently, three of the four categories of cost-sharing variables (premiums, deductibles, and HSA seed) are based on salary. Premiums are a fixed percentage of salary per plan type (for full-time faculty on 36-week appointments, calculations use base salary as of October of the prior year, up to a $\$ 140 \mathrm{~K}$ cap [salary for summer research or teaching is not included]). Percentage-based premiums were approved in 2012. Deductibles and HSA seed change across four income tiers, setting the boundaries between tiers at $\$ 45 \mathrm{k}, \$ 60 \mathrm{k}$, and $\$ 90 \mathrm{k}$ ).

The table below offers a simplified comparison to illustrate the way premiums and deductibles (including HSA seed, which constitutes a "discount" for the deductible) vary for employees at different salary levels who elect the same health care plans. Copayments and coinsurance are consistent for all members, and thus excluded.

| Plan premium and deductible costs across different salary levels |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Health Plan Type | @ 45K salary | @90K salary | @ 135K salary |
| PPO: Individual |  |  |  |
| Annual Premium (1.51\%) | 679.50 | 1359 | 2038.50 |
| Deductible | 250 | 500 | 625 |
| AP + D | 929.50 | 1859 | 2663.50 |
|  |  |  |  |
| PPO: Family |  |  | 6331.50 |
| Annual Premium (4.69\%) | 2110.50 | 4221 | 1250 |
| Deductible | 500 | 1000 | 7581.50 |
| AP + D | 2610.50 | 5221 |  |
|  |  |  | 1053 |
| PPO Savings: Individual |  | 702 | 1600 |
| Annual Premium (0.78\%) | 351 | 1600 | $(200)$ |
| Deductible* | 1600 | $(400)$ | 2453 |
| HSA Seed (contribution) | $(800)$ | 1902 |  |
| AP + D - S | 1151 |  | 3253.50 |
|  |  | 2169 | 3200 |
| PPO Savings: Family |  | 3200 | $(400)$ |
| Annual Premium (2.41\%) | 1084 | $(800)$ | 6053.50 |
| Deductible* | 3200 | 4569 |  |
| HSA Seed (contribution) | $(1600)$ |  |  |
| AP + D - S | 2684 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| *Deductibles for HDHP plans <br> regulations. PSU's deductibles are slightly higher than those amounts. For 2022, they are <br> \$1400 individual coverage/\$2800 family. |  |  |  |

The table demonstrates that coverage begins at different points of expenditure for employees at different salary levels. Effectively, members pay different amounts for access to the same care to an extent that reflects salary disparities: an employee who earns twice or three times as much as another may pay twice or three times as much in premiums and deductibles, up to $\$ 140 \mathrm{k}$.

The 2020 report considered how an alternative system might distribute costs differently. Willis Towers Watson used 2018 data to simulate a system in which all employees in the same plan pay uniform premiums and deductibles, and all those in the HDHP plan received identical HSA seed. It generated "flat dollar alternative" premiums using this model (Appendix A, Table 1), along with tables showing how those flat premiums compare to current premiums by income level, with the number of employees in each category (Tables 2 and 3 in Appendix A).

PPO Plan: flat dollar alternative premium $=\$ 1083.62$ individual $/ \$ 3365.64$ family The table for the PPO Plan (Appendix A, Table 2) shows that in 2018, participants who earned over $\$ 75 \mathrm{k}$ paid above the flat premium calculated, and those earning under $\$ 75 \mathrm{k}$ paid less. The impact
of a flat structure at the extremes is shown below for a $\$ 140 \mathrm{k}$ salary, the highest savings, and a $\$ 20 \mathrm{k}$ salary, the greatest cost increase.

Current structure: maximum added cost for PPO participants earning $>\$ 75 \mathrm{k}$
$\$ 140 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{PPO} /$ single: premium $=\$ 1,030$ above flat ( $<1 \%$ of salary)
$\$ 140 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{PPO} /$ family: premiums $=\$ 3,200$ above flat ( $2.3 \%$ of salary )
Flat Premiums \& Deductibles: maximum added cost for PPO participants earning <\$75k
$\$ 20 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{PPO} /$ single: premium increase $=\$ 782$ (3.9\% of salary) + higher deductible
$\$ 20 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{PPO} /$ family: premium increase $=\$ 2428$ ( $12 \%$ of salary) + higher deductible
The enrollment numbers provided on the tables indicate that in 2018, a flat structure would have increased costs for $\mathbf{6 3 \%}$ of 7376 employees in the individual/family PPO ( 4425 individual/1665 family $=4666$ total) and decreased them for $\mathbf{2 7 \%}$ ( 1424 individual/ 1286 family $=2710$ total). In addition, those earning below $\$ 75 \mathrm{k}$ would see further increases in out-of-pocket costs because of higher deductibles. If deductibles increased to the highest tier level, they would go up $\$ 375 / \$ 750$ for individual/family coverage.

PPO Savings: flat dollar alternative premium $=\$ 708.14$ individual $/ \$ 2199.45$ family For the PPO Savings plan (Table 3, Appendix A), employees earning over $\$ 90 \mathrm{k}$ paid more than the uniform premium calculated, and those earning under $\$ 90 \mathrm{k}$ paid less:

Current structure: maximum added cost for PPO Savings participants earning $>\$ 90 \mathrm{k}$
$\$ 140 \mathrm{k} /$ PPOS/single: premium $=\$ 384$ above flat ( $0.27 \%$ of salary )
$\$ 140 \mathrm{k} /$ PPOS/family: premiums $=\$ 1,175$ above flat ( $0.8 \%$ of salary )
Flat Premiums \& HSA Seed: maximum added cost for PPO Savings participants earning <\$90k $\$ 20 \mathrm{k} /$ PPOS/single: premium increase $=\$ 552$ ( $2.8 \%$ of salary) + higher deductible $\$ 20 \mathrm{k} /$ PPOS/family: premium increase $=\$ 1,717$ ( $8.6 \%$ of salary $)+$ higher deductible

Again using 2018 enrollment (Appendix A, Table 3), flat premiums and deductibles would have increased costs for $\mathbf{5 9 \%}$ of the 3636 employees in the individual/family PPO Savings (1407 individual/743 family $=2150$ total). It would have decreased costs for $\mathbf{4 1 \%}$ (548 individual/938 family $=1486$ total). Those earning below $\$ 95 \mathrm{k}$ would also see further increases in out-of-pocket costs because of reduced HSA seed, increasing their deductible by $\$ 800$ individual/ $\$ 1600$ family.

The committee appreciates the intent to ensure affordability by connecting employee contributions to income. However, the existing approach raises the following concerns:

1. In the absence of any definition of "affordability" for health plans, the University has no way to assess whether current, or future, plan offerings achieve this for employees.
2. The plans make coverage more affordable for some employees by raising costs for others, resulting in drastic cost disparities. The committee is concerned about ensuring plans are affordable for all colleagues across the University. This issue has a direct impact on the University's diversity, equity, and inclusion goals insofar as its cost-sharing structures
(salary-based premiums, deductibles, and HSA seed) impose an affordability burden as higher-salaried employees are essentially subsidizing the healthcare costs of lower-salaried employees via the current premium structure. In other words, some employees' health care premiums are subsidized by other employees' salaries. The current salary structure for faculty and staff cannot be justified, and given wage changes nationwide, it is no longer sustainable. We hope the Compensation Modernization project will address these inequities, but also have a principled concern with imposing the burden of lowering costs for certain employees on other employees, effectively pitting their interests against each other. The university, not select groups of employees, should bear primary responsibility for ensuring affordability of health care costs.

In an increasingly competitive hiring landscape, plans that achieve affordability in an equitable way for all are essential. The PSU system's multiple income-indexed features make it anomalous. The University should provide a rationale for the unusual approach it has chosen and ensure that it reflects best practices across the industry and serves all employees according to transparent standards of affordability and equity.

The 2020 report noted that some peer institutions address affordability using measures that rely on a determination of need, such as Ohio State. It offers a lower-cost plan for those with qualifying household incomes (see Appendix B). This requires that employees share private financial information, although if only lower-income employees must disclose such private information, that burden poses equity issues.
3. The ACA/IRS standard of plan affordability uses total household income, but the PSU plans are indexed to individual salary. This approach can have unintended consequences. There may be cases where a lower-salary PSU employee lives in a high-income household. The $\$ 1200$ annual surcharge for employees covering family members with access to other health plans helps mitigate this, but it remains possible that higher-salary employees with high health care costs due to family size, disabilities, and serious or chronic conditions, may subsidize colleagues with less need. This possibility seems incompatible with "affordability and equity." The committee also recognizes that moving to a total household income versus salary premium model may pose additional burdens on lower-income households to prove their lower-income status, which (as noted in point 2 above) conflicts with the university's diversity, equity, and inclusion principles. However, some members believe accountability would be appropriate in circumstances where employees receive beneficial treatment.
4. PSU addressed one issue regarding couples who are both PSU employees by establishing that a shared plan must be indexed to the higher-paid partner's salary. This resolved an internal version of the problem of salary versus household income presented above, but only in part. If PSU Couple A earns salaries of $\$ 20,000+\$ 140,000$ and Couple B both earn $\$ 80,000$, they have the same household income $(\$ 160,000)$. The first couple's costs for premiums and deductibles will be far higher, however, because they are indexed to a higher salary. If both couples have the PPO family plan, Couple A's annual premium would be $\$ 6566+$ a $\$ 1250$ deductible, while Couple B’s would be $\$ 3752$ with a $\$ 1000$ deductible, or $\$ 3064$ (39\%) less than Couple A. If both have PPO Savings family coverage, Couple A's premium would be $\$ 3374$ and its deductible $\$ 2800$ ( $\$ 3200-\$ 400$ HSA seed). Couple B's
premium would be $\$ 1928$ and its deductible $\$ 2400$ (\$3200-\$800 HSA seed), or $\$ 1846$ ( $29 \%$ ) less. The committee does not find this equitable.
5. The committee noted disparities of concern in comparative total maxima for all costs that accrue to employees (premiums, deductibles, copays, and coinsurance) in the different plans, with the greatest disparity in the family plans (see Tables 4-5 in Appendix A). Depending on the plan and income level, members in PPO Savings have a maximum for all fixed and out-of-pocket in-network costs (premiums, deductibles, coinsurance, copays - anything to be paid by the employee) that is between $50-77 \%$ that of comparable PPO members (calculated apart from federally set maxima that are seldom reached in practice. The greatest apparent disparity is seen in the family plans, although this is somewhat misleading because pharmacy benefit limits are calculated in different ways.

The committee believes that employees in one type of plan should not be subject to higher exposure for total expenses, which typically occur under catastrophic conditions. This is an extension of the principle of meaningful plan choice. For options to be accessible and meaningful for all, they should determine the way one pays for health care (higher premium/ lower out of pocket vs. lower premium/higher out of pocket). They need not, and should not, radically alter how much one pays for similar care or provide measurably different degrees of total protection from catastrophic costs.
6. In addition, the maximum cost exposure for amount for PPO members appears excessive: At $\$ 20 \mathrm{~K}$ salary, it is $\$ 3802$ for an individual and $\$ 11,938$ for a family, or $19 \% / 60 \%$ of annual gross salary, a disastrous amount (under the PPO Savings it is $\$ 2931 / \$ 6032$ ). Even at $\$ 140 \mathrm{~K}$ salary, this limit is $\$ 8,049 /$ individual or $\$ 18,790 /$ family, or $5.7 \% / 13 \%$ of income. Usage data shows this threshold is seldom reached: in 2021 no family reached the PPO's limit, while 317 of PPO Savings families met its limit. Here again, without a definition of affordability, the committee could only apply a general sense of what limits are excessive.

## Principle 6: Fostering and promoting a culture of health should guide the design of plan features and programs that promote healthy choices and activities, shared efforts to establish tobacco-free campuses, and support the consistent and effective management of health risks.

This principle speaks to what the committee agrees should be the larger aim of any health care plan: to support the health and well-being of all employees and their families. The committee is aware of ongoing HR initiatives to address this principle more directly. They have its support, with the understanding that these efforts are following evidence-based best practices.

The University's "Take Care of Your Health" initiative (intended to take effect on $1 / 1 / 2014$ ) initially took an approach to this goal that was coercive, invasive, and penalty based, and was thus discontinued. The committee urges an approach based on positive incentives and opportunities, one that guards employee privacy, and does not treat employees' physical and mental health in isolation from systemic employment conditions that can exacerbate these same issues and thus negate otherwise excellent efforts and investments.

The approach should go beyond tracking how we compare to our peers, but take an aspirational, and not defensive, approach. The University should identify models of excellence in encouraging a culture of health, models that Penn State can learn from and strive to emulate.

## Recommendations

Based on the above observations regarding Penn State's current health care plan design, the committee recommends that the University address the following concerns, following the order of the above discussion, concluding with one overarching item:

1. Principle of Choice:
a. A choice of at least two plans must be maintained, and at least one should follow the traditional (not HDHP) structure currently chosen by $70 \%$ of PSU employees.
b. Representatives of faculty and staff should have greater involvement in the initial selection of plan providers (TPA/PBM) and in plan design.
c. All available plans should provide similar access and cost protections for all employees. The goal of "choice" should also apply to maintaining and expanding access to health care providers for employees across the system.
d. Any HDHP plan's efficacy must be assessed in terms of long-term health outcomes, not only short-term cost savings, based on both internal data and external research. The tiered, annually renewing HSA seed (a form of untaxed income) should be reviewed to ensure equity as well as efficacy.
e. Expand information regarding how HDHP plans operate and more robust selection guidance beyond the Benefits Mentor tool data. The current and excellent advising available from HR during Open Enrollment should be used more widely. It should also be supplemented through investment in additional resources to help employees understand whether they would benefit from an HDHP and their readiness to adopt and use such a plan. These plans provide cost savings for the University but may not be suitable for individual employees depending on circumstances and preferences.
f. The names of Penn State's two very different plans are so similar that it is difficult to discuss them comparatively. The PPO Savings Plan should be renamed for clarity.
2. Principle of $75 / 25$ Cost Sharing:
a. The principle's final phrase should replace "the employee" with "all employees in the aggregate" or similar for greater clarity when describing the current cost structure.
b. Investigate the reasons why PPO Savings Plan participants have collectively paid well above $25 \%$ of their medical claims in recent years and address any issues in utilization and/or plan design.
3. Principle of Affordability and Equity:
a. Define what "affordability" and "equity" mean for Penn State's health care plans and how they relate to employee cost-sharing.
b. Explain the Penn State health plans' unusual and complex approach to cost-sharing in relation to industry best practices. In addition, justification is needed for a system in which affordability for some employees is achieved by increasing costs for others.
c. Assessing "affordability" (as measured by variable premiums, out of pocket maxima, and HSA seed amounts) based on an individual employee's salary rather than household income can produce certain clear inequities that should be rectified, looking to industry best practices.
d. Disparate limits on total employee cost exposure under the different plans are an issue of concern, given the higher amounts set for the PPO, especially for lowest-salary employees. A definition of "affordability" should address how much any employee would pay in a year of maximum health care needs.
4. Principle of Fostering a Culture of Health:
a. The University's continuing efforts in this arena should follow evidencebased best practices. The committee supports an approach based on positive incentives and opportunities, one that considers physical and mental health within the context of its broader workplace culture.
b. An aspirational approach to supporting and improving employee health that looks towards models of demonstrated success will both improve employee satisfaction and performance and help to control health care expenditures.
5. PSU Plan Complexity:
a. The US health care system is immensely complicated, making discussions and decisions in this space difficult for all patients. The committee found the unusual complexity of Penn State's health care plans compared to peer institutions exacerbates this issue and makes system navigation and informed decision making even more difficult. The committee appreciates our HR colleagues' expertise and persistent, often heroic efforts to help employees understand the plans and make the best choices. It also sees opportunities to save employee time, effort, and costs (direct and indirect) by aiming for greater simplicity in plan design.
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## Appendix A: Supporting Information

Tables 1-3 below present modeling for the 2020 Informational Report to explore how premiums would change if all participants in any given plan had the same premiums, deductibles, and HSA seed while generating the same $75 / 25$ cost share.

Table 1: "Flat Dollar Alternative Premiums" calculated by Willis Tower Watson based on 2018 utilization data (from 2020 Informational Report)

| Plan and Coverage <br> Tier | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ Current State | 2020 Flat Dollar <br> Alternative <br> (Monthly) | 2020 Flat Dollar <br> Alternative <br> (Annual) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PPO Plan | $1.51 \%$ of salary | $\$ 90.30$ | $\$ 1,083.61$ |
| Individual | $3.68 \%$ of salary | $\$ 220.07$ | $\$ 2,640.84$ |
| 2 Person | $3.41 \%$ of salary | $\$ 203.92$ | $\$ 2,447.09$ |
| Parent/Child(ren) |  |  |  |
| Family | $4.69 \%$ of salary | $\$ 280.47$ | $\$ 3,365.64$ |
| PPO Savings Plan | $1.89 \%$ of salary | $\$ 143.82$ | $\$ 708.14$ |
| Individual | $1.75 \%$ of salary | $\$ 133.26$ | $\$ 1,725.79$ |
| 2 Person | $2.41 \%$ of salary | $\$ 183.29$ | $\$ 1,599.17$ |
| Parent/Child(ren) |  |  |  |
| Family | $\$ 2,199.45$ |  |  |

Table 2: Comparison of 2018 premiums in existing PPO Plan with Flat Annual premiums (from 2020 Informational Report)

## Contribution Differences by Salary - PPO Plan

- The chart below compares the currentannual contribution by salary with the flat dollar amount
- The employees with the lowest salaries would see the largest negative impact
- All employees with a salary over $\$ 75,000$ would see savings from their current contributions

| PFO - Single Coverage |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salary | Enroilment | Current Annual Contribution | Plat Annusl Contribution | Contribution Difference |
| 520,000 | 59 | stre2 | S1,084 | 3782 |
| 525,000 | 20 | \$378 | \$1,064 | 3706 |
| \$30,000 | 103 | \$453 | \$1,084 | 5631 |
| 535,000 | 256 | 5529 | \$1,064 | 5355 |
| 540,000 | 377 | \$504 | \$1,064 | \$480 |
| \$45,000 | 323 | \$690 | \$1,084 | 3404 |
| 550,000 | 547 | 3755 | \$1,064 | 53 Ca |
| 555,000 | 440 | 3831 | \$1,084 | 3253 |
| \$80,000 | 338 | \$906 | \$1,084 | 5178 |
| 565,000 | 276 | 3582 | \$1,064 | \$100 |
| 570,000 | 262 | \$1,057 | \$1,064 | 527 |
| \$75,000 | 218 | \$1,133 | \$1,084 | (549) |
| 580,000 | 177 | \$1,206 | \$1,064 | (5124) |
| 585,000 | 148 | \$1,284 | \$1,084 | (5200) |
| \$90,000 | 124 | \$1,359 | \$1,084 | (5275) |
| 595,000 | 106 | \$1.435 | \$1,084 | [3531) |
| \$100,000 | 112 | \$1,510 | \$1,084 | (5426) |
| \$105,000 | 58 | \$1,586 | \$1,084 | (8502) |
| \$110,000 | 64 | \$1,661 | \$1,064 | [3577) |
| 5115,000 | 48 | \$1.737 | \$1,064 | (3653) |
| \$120,000 | 45 | \$1,812 | \$1,084 | (3728) |
| \$125,000 | 39 | \$1,8\%3 | \$1,084 | (5504) |
| \$130,000 | 39 | \$1.963 | \$1,084 | (5379] |
| \$135,000 | 24 | \$2,039 | \$1,084 | (5955) |
| \$140,000+ | 220 | \$2,114 | \$1,064 | [51,030) |


| PFO = Fam, ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Coverage |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Solary | Enrolliment | Current Annual Contribution | Flat Annual Contribution | Contribution Difference |
| 520,000 | 11 | 59318 | \$3366 | 52428 |
| 525,000 | 2 | 51,173 | \$3,366 | \$2, 193 |
| \$30,000 | 41 | \$1,407 | \$3,366 | \$1,959 |
| 535,000 | 98 | \$1,642 | \$3366 | \$1.724 |
| 540,000 | 168 | 51,876 | \$3,366 | \$1,490 |
| \$45,000 | 185 | \$2,111 | \$3,366 | \$1,255 |
| \$50,000 | 237 | 52,345 | \$3366 | \$1,021 |
| 555,000 | 277 | 52,580 | \$3,366 | 5765 |
| \$80,000 | 227 | \$2,814 | \$3,366 | 5552 |
| 565,000 | 206 | 53,049 | \$3,366 | 5317 |
| 570,000 | 233 | 53,283 | \$3,366 | 583 |
| \$75,000 | 180 | \$3,518 | \$3,366 | (S152) |
| \$80,000 | 156 | 53,752 | \$3366 | [ $3 \times 5$ ] |
| 585,000 | 121 | 53,987 | \$3,366 | (5621) |
| \$90,000 | 100 | \$4,221 | \$3,366 | (\$855) |
| \$95,000 | 105 | 54,456 | \$3,366 | [ 51.000 ] |
| \$100,000 | 95 | 54,690 | \$3,366 | [51,324) |
| \$105,000 | 73 | 34,925 | \$3,366 | (51,559) |
| \$170,000 | 61 | 55,159 | \$3,366 | (51.763) |
| \$115,000 | 59 | 55,394 | \$3,366 | (52068) |
| \$120,000 | 45 | \$5,82日 | 53,366 | (52262) |
| \$125,000 | 34 | 55,863 | \$3366 | (32.497) |
| \$130,000 | 29 | 56,097 | \$3366 | (52731) |
| \$135,000 | 30 | \$8,332 | \$3,366 | (52868) |
| \$140000+ | 218 | 56,566 | \$3,366 | [33200) |

Table 3: Comparison of 2018 premiums in existing PPO Savings Plan with Flat Annual premiums (from 2020 Informational Report)

## Contribution Differences by Salary - PPO Savings Plan

- The chart below compares the current annual contribution by salary with the flat dollar amount
- The employees with the lowest salaries would see the largest negative impact
* All employees with a salary over $\$ 95,000$ would see savings from their current contributions

| FPO Savinge = Sing e Coversye |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salary | Enrollment | Current Annual Contribution | Flat Annual Contribution | Contribution Difference |
| Ste0000 | 9 | \$156 | 3708 | 5552 |
| \$25,000 | 5 | \$195 | \$708 | 5513 |
| \$30000 | 32 | 5234 | 5708 | S474 |
| \$35000 | 81 | 3273 | \$708 | 5435 |
| \$40000 | 100 | 5312 | 5708 | \$398 |
| \$45,000 | 122 | \$351 | \$708 | \$357 |
| \$50000 | 226 | \$300 | 5768 | 5318 |
| \$56,000 | 187 | 5429 | \$708 | \$279 |
| \$800000 | 148 | 3468 | 5708 | 5240 |
| \$65,000 | 116 | 3507 | 5768 | 5201 |
| \$70000 | 106 | 3546 | \$708 | \$182 |
| \$75,000 | 117 | 8585 | \$708 | \$123 |
| \$30,000 | 98 | 3624 | 5768 | 584 |
| \$85,000 | 101 | 5853 | \$708 | \$45 |
| \$90,000 | 80 | \$702 | \$708 | 96 |
| \$85000 | 78 | 5741 | 5768 | (533) |
| \$100000 | 84 | 5780 | 5708 | (572) |
| \$105,000 | 57 | \$819 | 5708 | (डाi1) |
| \$110000 | 42 | 5858 | 3768 | (F50) |
| \$115000 | 35 | 5897 | 5708 | (\$189) |
| \$120,000 | 28 | 5986 | 5708 | (5228) |
| \$125000 | 23 | 3975 | 5708 | 5267) |
| \$130000 | 17 | \$1,014 | \$708 | (5308) |
| \$135000 | 24 | \$1,053 | 5708 | (3345) |
| \$140,000+ | 160 | \$1,082 | \$708 | (5384) |


| FPVO Savings - Family Coverage |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salary | Enroilment | Current Annual Contribution | Plat Annual Contribution | Contribution Difference |
| Ste0000 | 3 | 5482 | \$2. 199) | \$1.717 |
| 525000 | 1 | 5803 | 52199 | \$1.697 |
| \$30,000 | 7 | \$723 | \$2,199 | 51.476 |
| \$35000 | 25 | \$844 | \$2.199 | \$1,356 |
| 540000 | 40 | \$984 | \$2, 199 | \$1235 |
| 345000 | 28 | \$1,085 | \$2,199 | \$1,115 |
| \$50,000 | 49 | \$1,205 | \$2.199 | \$994 |
| \$55,000 | 62 | \$1,328 | 52199 | \$374 |
| 380000 | 73 | \$1.448 | \$2,199 | \$753 |
| 365000 | 63 | 51,567 | \$2.199 | 5633 |
| \$70000 | 83 | \$1,687 | \$2,199 | 3512 |
| \$75,000 | 77 | \$1,808 | 52,199 | 3352 |
| \$50,000 | 72 | \$1,928 | \$2.1999 | S2271 |
| \$85000 | 85 | \$2,049 | \$2199 | 5151 |
| \$900000 | 87 | \$2,189 | \$2,199 | \$30 |
| \$85,000 | 77 | 52,290 | \$2, 199 | (350]) |
| \$100000 | 76 | \$2,410 | 52199 | (5211) |
| \$105,000 | 88 | \$2,531 | S2,199 | [3331) |
| \$110000 | 58 | 52,651 | \$2,199 | (5452) |
| \$115000 | 50 | \$2,772 | \$2199 | [5572] |
| \$120000 | 55 | \$2,892 | 52,199 | [5853) |
| \$125,000 | 47 | 53,073 | 32,199 | [5313) |
| \$130000 | 42 | \$3,133 | \$2,199 | [3934] |
| \$135,000 | 48 | \$3,254 | \$2,199 | (31,054) |
| \$140,000+ | 389 | 53,374 | \$2.199 | (51, 175) |

Table 4: Maximum Employee Cost Exposure (annual premium + deductible + OOP limit + pharmacy limit - HSA seed for PPO) in 2021 by Plan Type and Salary

| Maximum possible expenditures @ \$140K: | PPO | PPO Savings* |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Individual | $\$ 8049$ | $\$ 4667$ |
| Family | $\$ 18,790$ | $\$ 10,524$ |
|  |  |  |
| Maximum possible expenditures @ \$20K: | PPO | PPO Savings* |
| Individual | $\$ 3802(7150)^{* *}$ | $\$ 2931$ |
| Family | $\$ 11,938(14,300)^{* *}$ | $\$ 6032$ |

*PPO Savings maximum possible expenditure $=$ annual premium + deductible + out-of-pocket maximum - HSA seed.
**The first amount is the effective cost exposure for members under the PPO plan apart from fixed copays for services ( $\$ 20$ for PCP, $\$ 30$ Specialist, $\$ 100$ ER unless admitted). These apply even after deductible and OOP limit for coinsurance have been met. The $\$ 7150$ individual/ $\$ 14,300$ family limit is a federally mandated cap for annual cumulative costs.

Table 5: Breakdown of Maximum Employee Cost Exposure in PPO Plan (annual premium + deductible + OOP limit + pharmacy limit +) in 2021 by Plan Type and Salary

| Maximum possible expenditures for PPO Family @ \$20,000 salary |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Family Premium 4.69\% | 938 |  |
| Deductible | 500 In Network | 1000 Out of Network |
| OOP Limit (excludes pharmacy) | 2500 In Network | 5000 Out of Network |
| Pharmacy OOP Max | $8000^{*}$ |  |
| Premium + Deductible + OOP | 11,938 | 14,938 |
| Total OOP Limit** | $14,300^{* *}$ |  |


| Maximum possible expenditures for PPO Family @ \$140,000 salary |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Family Premium 4.69\% | 6566 |  |
| Deductible | 1250 In Network | 2500 Out of Network |
| OOP Limit (excludes pharmacy) | 2500 In Network | 5000 Out of Network |
| Pharmacy OOP Max | $8000^{*}$ |  |
| Premium + Deductible + OOP | 18,316 | 22,066 |
| Total OOP Limit** | $18,790^{* *}$ |  |


| Maximum possible expenditures for PPO Individual @ \$20,000 salary |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Individual Premium 1.51\% | 302 |  |
| Deductible | 250 In Network | 500 Out of Network |
| OOP Limit (excludes pharmacy) | 1250 In Network | 2500 Out of Network |
| Pharmacy OOP Max | 2000 |  |
| Premium + Deductible + OOP | 3802 | 5302 |
| Total OOP Limit** | $7150^{* *}$ |  |


| Maximum possible expenditures for PPO Individual @ \$140,000 salary |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Individual Premium 1.51\% | 2114 |  |
| Deductible | 625 In Network | 1250 Out of Network |
| OOP Limit (excludes pharmacy) | 1250 In Network | 2500 Out of Network |
| Pharmacy OOP Max | 2000 |  |
| Premium + Deductible + OOP | 5989 | 7864 |
| Total OOP Limit** | $8049^{* *}$ |  |

*NOTE: The PPO Plan Pharmacy Out of Pocket Maximum is $\$ 2000$ for each of four individuals in the family. This means four members of one family would have to separately accrue $\$ 2000$ in out-of-pocket pharmacy costs to reach this limit.
**Under the PPO Plan, some services have copays even after the OOP limit has been reached ( $\$ 20$ for PCP, $\$ 30$ Specialist, $\$ 100$ ER unless admitted). The $\$ 7150$ individual/ $\$ 14,300$ family limit is a federally mandated cap to cumulative costs. It would only apply if copays are incurred beyond plan limits.

Appendix B: Ohio State's Lower Cost Health Plan (per the 2020 Report)
The Ohio State University Prime Care Connect plan offers the following:

- lower deductibles (\$150 individual/\$300 family),
- lower out-of-pocket maximums (\$1,500/\$3,000),
- higher coinsurance
- lower copays


## Plan premiums are the same.

Eligibility: employees below income threshold based on size of household. Individuals qualify by submitting federal income tax forms. 2020 income thresholds:

| Household size | Income |
| :--- | ---: |
| 1 | $\$ 21,858$ |
| 2 | $\$ 29,593$ |
| 3 | $\$ 37,328$ |
| 4 | $\$ 45,063$ |
| 5 | $\$ 52,798$ |
| 6 | $\$ 60,533$ |
| 7 | $\$ 68,268$ |
| 8 | $\$ 76,003$ |
| 9 and up add $\$ 7,735$ per additional person |  |

## Penn State Health Care Plan Design

## Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits

April 26, 2022
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## Health Care \& Penn State's Budget

2020 Educational \& General Expenditures: $\$ 2.906$ Billion
2020 PSU Health Care Expenditures: $\$ 322$ Million

- Health Care = $\sim 11 \%$ of E\&G Budget

University's Health Care Costs ("Outward-Facing"):

- What PSU members pay providers for care, system administration
- Negotiated rates x system utilization

Contextual Issues:

- U.S. health care's "marketplace" model
- Limited means to resist industry's profit incentives

PSU should continue efforts to manage cost increases
Faculty Benefits Committee Purview:

- Internal issues for faculty + other employees (faculty = 1/3)
- Our focus: unusual features, issues of concern
- Recommendations: highlight items for University to consider


Health Care Costs as Percentage of PSU's E\&G Budget

## "Guiding Principles for the Design of Health Care Plans at Penn State"

- Informational Report, passed October 2020
- Multiple committees over several years


## Six Principles for the Design of Penn State Health Care Plans

(approved by Faculty Senate in 2016)

1. A principle of choice for employees in health care plans.
2. A principle of overall cost sharing of $75 \%$ of total medical claims paid by the university and $25 \%$ paid by the employee.
3. A principle of affordability and equity.
4. A principle of informed utilization.
5. The principle of quality, transparency, accessibility, and cost effectiveness should guide the negotiation and management of contracts for health care services.
6. A principle of fostering and promoting a culture of health should guide the design of plan features and programs that promote healthy choices and activities, shared efforts to establish tobacco-free campuses, and support the consistent and effective management of health risks.

Our committee's focus: 1, 2, 3, \& 6
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## Principle 1: Choice

What does "choice of health care plans" mean?

- Definition = implicit

In practice:

- Penn State offers two plans:

PPO (Traditional insurance plan); ~70\% of PSU employees
PPO Savings (High Deductible Health Plan/HDHP); ~30\% of PSU employees

- Penn State = self-insured (health costs paid by University + employees, not insurer)
- PSU plans administered by:

Third-Party Administrator (TPA; Aetna)
Pharmacy Benefit Manager (PBM; CVS/Caremark)

- "Plan Design": structures how costs are distributed
- Variables:
- Premiums ("contributions")
- Deductibles (amount paid before coverage begins)
- Copays/Coinsurance (fixed fee/percentage per service)
- Health Savings Account (HSA) Seed (PPO Savings only)


## Benchmarking for 2020 Report:

17 of 25 peer institutions (68\%) offered more than one plan

## Committee Observations/Concerns:

- Preserve options beside HDHP:
- Recent industry development
- Short-term \$ savings for employer; long-term health outcomes = unclear
- Benefits some employees (low utilization/high income)
- Challenging for others (lower income; Medicare-eligible)
- Selection Process:
- Benefits Mentor: quantitative data (prior 18 months of use + general approximations of anticipated future needs)
- HDHPs: qualitatively different payment \& planning (HSA/savings-based)
- Limited to plans from TPA/PBM
- Both: identical provider networks
- Primary prior "plan choice" = selection of TPA/PBM
- Limited faculty/staff voice in process (JCIB/HCAC in RFP)
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## Recommendations:

1. Continue to offer a MINIMUM of two plans (one NOT an HDHP)
2. Greater faculty/staff involvement in TPA/PBM selection + plan design
3. Ensure similar access and overall cost protections for all plans; maintain/expand provider access (Principle 3)
4. Assess HDHP health outcomes (external research + internal data) + review HSA seed for efficacy and equity (Principle 3)
5. More robust qualitative HDHP selection guidance (in-between Benefits Mentor \& HR Open Enrollment sessions)
6. Change PPO Savings' name (more distinct)

## Principle 2: 75\%/25\% Cost Sharing

1. Edit to clarify: "overall cost sharing of $75 \%$ of total medical claims paid by the university and $25 \%$ paid by the employee all employees in the aggregate"

- Individual employees often pay above/below $25 \%$ of their own annual health costs
- Depends on plan selection, utilization, salary

2. Collectively, PPO Savings members pay above $25 \%$ of their health care costs ( $34.5 \%$ in 2020; ~30\% most years)

## Recommendations:

- Clarify principle's language
- Investigate PPO Savings >30\% cost share, address any issues


Principle 2: Employees' vs. University's Respective Shares of Total Health Care Costs

## Principle 3: Affordability and Equity

No Definitions for this context
How to assess "affordability" without any clear definition or standards?
2021 ACAIRS Standard:
Employee portion of self-only coverage $<9.83 \%$ of Household Income

- \$50,000 household income: $\$ 4915 / \mathrm{yr}(\$ 409 / \mathrm{mo})$
- Premium only (excludes deductibles, copays, coinsurance)
- > 2x PSU's most expensive individual plan at same salary
- PSU plans: individual salary, NOT household income

Federal Standard: NOT useful
"PLAN DESIGN": how employees' portion of costs ( $\sim 25 \%$ of costs) is distributed
PSU Plans based on:

- System Utilization
- Employee Salary

Salary-Based Plan Structures:

- Premiums: \% of salary
- Deductibles: increase by income tier
- HSA Seed: decreases by income tier

PSU Health Care Plans (partial info, per JCIB Report)

| PPO Plan |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Premiums ("Contributions") by Plan |  |
| Individual | $1.51 \%$ |
| Two Person | $3.68 \%$ |
| Parent \& Child(ren) | $3.42 \%$ |
| Family | $4.69 \%$ |
|  |  |
| Deductibles (Individual/Family) |  |
| Tier 1: $<\$ 45 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 250 / \$ 500$ |
| Tier 2: $\$ 45 \mathrm{~K}-\$ 60 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 375 / \$ 750$ |
| Tier 3: $\$ 60 \mathrm{~K}-\$ 90 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 500 / \$ 1000$ |
| Tier 4: $>\$ 90 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 625 / \$ 1250$ |


| PPO Savings Plan |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Premiums ("Contributions") by Plan |  |
| Individual | $0.78 \%$ |
| Two Person | $1.89 \%$ |
| Parent \& Child(ren) | $1.75 \%$ |
| Family | $2.41 \%$ |
| Deductibles | $\$ 1600$ |
| Individual | $\$ 3200$ |
| Family |  |
|  | $\$ 800 / \$ 1600$ |
| HSA Seed (Individual/Family) | $\$ 600 / \$ 1200$ |
| Tier 1: $<\$ 45 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 400 / \$ 800$ |
| Tier 2: $\$ 45 \mathrm{~K}-\$ 60 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 200 / \$ 400$ |
| Tier 3: $\$ 60 \mathrm{~K}-\$ 90 \mathrm{~K}$ |  |
| Tier 4: $>\$ 90 \mathrm{~K}$ |  |

## PSU Plans' Approach to Cost-Sharing:

## Cost Share Indexed to:

- System utilization = standard (nearly universal)
- Salary = less common


## PSU Plans:

Premiums as \% of salary approved in 2012

- 36-week faculty appointments: base salary in October (no summer research/teaching)

Deductibles/HSA Seed: vary over income tiers (@45k, 60k, 90k)
Peer Benchmarking (2020 Report):

- 5 of 24 institutions: salary-indexed cost share
- ALL: premiums tiered by salary range
- NONE: premiums as \% of salary
- NONE: deductibles or HSA Seed vary by income tier

Concern: PSU indexing of cost-sharing to salaries = unusual and extreme (premiums + deductibles)
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Contribution Differences by Salary - PPO Savings Plan

| Decrease in Contrbitoons |
| :--- |
| Increase in Contributions |

* The chart below compares the currentannual contribution by salary with the flat dollar amount
- The employees with the lowest salaries would see the largest negative impact
- All employees with a salary over $\$ 95,000$ would see savings from their current contributions



wilis Towerswatson Lur 1 lat


## PPO Savings Plan (Single/Family only)

FDAP (\$708 Single/ \$2199 Family)
$<\$ 90 \mathrm{~K}$ pay more than current premium
$>\$ 90 \mathrm{~K}$ pay less than current premium

## FDAP's Impact at Extremes:

Greatest possible savings (@ \$140K)
Single: \$384 (0.27\% of salary) Family: \$1175 (0.8\% of salary)

Greatest possible cost increase (@\$20K) Single: \$552 (2.8\% of salary) Family: \$1717 (8.6\% of salary)
PLUS: higher deductible ( $\$ 800 / 1600$ )
\# Employees impacted in each direction:
$2150(59 \%)=$ cost increase
$1486(41 \%)=$ cost decrease
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## Concerns with Affordability and Equity in Current Structure:

General concern: fixed/OOP costs = heavy burden on lower-salary colleagues
Drastic Cost Disparities

- Affordability for some achieved through higher costs for others (i.e., lower costs subsidized by higher salaries)
- Compensation structure: all employees should be able to afford health coverage
- Bulk of affordability burden should fall on the University, NOT other employees
- Equitable system crucial; salary vs. context — household size, acute/chronic conditions, disabilities (DEI: includes intergenerational wealth)
- PSU: anomalous and extreme in indexing costs to income with three variables (peers = one variable max)
- Follow industry best practices, transparent standards of affordability and equity
- Other approaches: Ohio State's lower-cost plan (access based on household income)

Individual Salary vs. Household Income

- Lower-salary employees may be in high-income household
- Higher-salary employees may have high health care costs
- Equity vs. accountability: privacy/added burden to demonstrate need?


## Concerns with Affordability and Equity in Current Structure (continued):

PSU Employee Couples:

- Plans indexed to higher-paid employee's salary
- BUT: Couple A: $\$ 140 \mathrm{~K}+\$ 20 \mathrm{~K}$ (= $\$ 160 \mathrm{~K}$ ); Couple B: $\$ 80 \mathrm{~K}+\$ 80 \mathrm{~K}$ (= $\$ 160 \mathrm{~K}$ )

PPO (Family):
Couple A = \$6566 premium $+\$ 1250$ deductible (\$7816)
Couple B = \$3752 premium $+\$ 1000$ deductible ( $\$ 4753$ ); difference $=\$ 3064$ (39\%)
PPO Savings (Family)
Couple A = \$3374 premium $+\$ 2800$ deductible (\$6174)
Couple $B=\$ 1928$ premium $+\$ 2400$ deductible $(\$ 4328)$; difference $=\$ 1814(29 \%)$
Committee: obvious equity issue
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## Concerns with Affordability and Equity in Current Structure (continued);

PPO vs. PPO Savings: Disparities in Maximum Allowable Employee Costs

- PPO: Significantly higher possible employee costs
- Some factors: different benefit calculations, federal maxima
- Plans: structure HOW to pay, NOT total economic exposure

Committee: both plans should provide equivalent protections for financial impact of catastrophic health needs
Total Cost Exposure for PPO = Excessive

- \$20K: 3802 single/\$11,938 family (19\%/60\% of income)
- \$140K: \$8049 single/\$18,790 family (5.7\%/13\% of income)

Committee: how is this "affordable coverage"?

|    <br> Maximum Employee Cost Exposure (annual premium + deductible + OOP limit +   <br> pharmacy limit - HSA seed for PPO) in 2021 by Plan Type and Salary   |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Maximum possible expenditures @ S140K: | PPO | PPO Savings ${ }^{*}$ |
| Individual | $\$ 8049$ | $\$ 4667$ |
| Family | $\$ 18,790$ | $\$ 10,524$ |
| Maximum possible expenditures @ S20K: | PPO | PPO Savings ${ }^{*}$ |
| Individual | $\$ 3802(7150)^{* *}$ | $\$ 2931$ |
| Family | $\$ 11,938(14,300)^{* *}$ | $\$ 6032$ |

## Principle 6: Promoting a Culture of Health

Aim of any health plan: support health \& well-being of employees \& families
2013-14 "Take Care of Your Health": coercive, invasive, penalty-focused; discontinued
Ongoing HR initiatives: welcome
Committee support for an approach that:

- Follows evidence-based practices
- Positive incentives, opportunities, protect employee privacy
- Physical and mental health: tied to work environment \& demands
- Is aspirational rather than defensive
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## Committee Recommendations:

## 1. Choice:

a. Offer at least two plans (one NOT an HDHP)
b. Greater faculty/staff involvement in TPA/PBM selection + plan design
c. All plans: ensure access and overall cost protections are similar; maintain/expand provider access
d. Assess HDHP health outcomes (external research + internal data); review HSA seed for efficacy and equity
e. More robust, qualitative HDHP selection guidance
f. Change "PPO Savings" name
2. $\mathbf{7 5 / 2 5}$ Cost Sharing:
a. Clarify: $25 \%=$ all employees in aggregate
b. Investigate why PPO Savings $=>30 \%$ cost share, address any issues

## Committee Recommendations (cont.):

3. Affordability and Equity:
a. Provide definitions applicable to Health Care Plans and employee cost-sharing
b. Explain \& justify PSU's unusual cost-sharing approach vs. industry best practices
c. Address clear inequities generated by salary-based costsharing
d. Address plans' disparate cost exposure, esp. high amounts for low-salary employees
4. Fostering a Culture of Health:
a. Follow best practices, rely on positive incentives and opportunities, consider health-work connection
b. Be aspirational: models of success in employee health, satisfaction, and control health care costs
5. Overall Plan Complexity:
a. Employee difficulty understanding, choosing, and utilizing plans; for HR to explain, manage
b. Simpler plans = potential savings in employee time and costs

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING 

PSU COVID Financial Impact

(Informational)

## Background/Introduction

The University Planning Committee reviews, approves, and sponsors the report on Penn State COVID Financial Impact and Care's Act Funding. This report will be presented by Mary Lou Ortiz, the Associate Vice President for Budget and University Budget Officer. Data for this budget presentation is assembled by the University Budget Office in consultation the Penn State Provost. This report contains financial figures and tables that explain the financial impact imposed by the 2 year COVID Pandemic on Penn State's Budget. Additionally, this report outlines US Government funding, which partially offset some of these costs as well as providing significant, direct financial aid to our students. The UPC members acknowledge the significant financial impact the COVID pandemic assessed on Penn State's Budget and the considerable creativity, coordination, and planning undertaken by our Penn State Administration to mobilize its own financial resources, as well as to apply for significant government financing, in order to establish safety protocols, provide COVID testing and reporting, manage instructional, residential and food service infrastructure, and mobilize targeted financial resources directly to students. The UPC members thank the Associate Vice President for Budget, the Provost, and the University Budget Office for assembling this important presentation.
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## Federal Higher Education Emergency Relief Funds (HEERF)

- Penn State received three rounds of HEERF funding for a total of \$290.6M awarded
- HEERF 1: Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act
- HEERF 2: Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSAA)
- HEERF 3: American Rescue Plan Act


## Distribution of HEERF Funding

- HEERF I = \$55M
- \$27.5M for student aid
- $\$ 27.5 \mathrm{M}$ for institutional support
- An additional \$271K to the Commonwealth Campuses*
- HEERF II = \$85M
- \$27.5M for student aid
- \$57.5M for institutional support
- An additional \$375K to the Commonwealth Campuses*
- HEERF III = \$150M
- \$76.2M for student aid
- \$73.8M for institutional support
- Total HEERF Funds = \$290.6M
*Direct funds to the Commonwealth Campuses not available for HEERF III


## HEERF Institutional Funding: \$158.8 Million




# SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING 

College of Medicine Budget Report

(Informational)

## Background/Introduction

The University Planning Committee reviews, approves, and sponsors the College of Medicine Budget Report. This report will be presented by Kurt Kissinger, the Associate Vice President for Finance and Business and Controller of the College of Medicine. Data for this budget presentation is assembled by the Associate VP's Office, in consultation the Penn State Provost, and the University Budget Office. This report contains tables and financial figures that explain the finances for the College of Medicine, which is a smaller but important portion of the larger Education and General Budget. This presentation features funding updates including income, expenses, and reserves for the College of Medicine and provides future projections for budget sustainability. The UPC members acknowledge that the College of Medicine represents the largest single faculty contingency of our University Faculty Senate and thus, specifics of College of Medicine finances and planning are very important. The UPC members thank Associate Vice President Kurt Kissinger, the Provost, and the University Budget Office of for assembling this presentation.
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College of Medicine General Funds:
High Level Financial Trends

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Actual } \\ \text { FY19 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Actual FY20 | Fiscal Year 2020-21 |  | Fiscal Year 2021-22 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Budget FY21 | Actual FY21 | Budget FY22 | Budget FY22 YTD Dec (50\% of Annual) | Actual FY22 YTD Dec | \% Actual to Budget YTD Dec |
| Sources | \$194.9 | \$220.1 | \$202.5 | \$265.5 | \$212.2 | \$106.1 | \$102.9 | 48.5\% |
| Uses | \$195.4 | \$226.1 | \$235.2 | \$220.7 | \$232.2 | \$116.1 | \$104.9 | 45.2\% |
| Surplus/(Deficit) | \$(0.5) | \$(6.0) | \$(32.7) | \$44.8 | \$(20.0) | \$(10.0) | \$(2.0) | 10.0\% |
| Year-end Cash Reserve Balance (excluding RMC) | \$209.6 | \$177.7 | \$113.0 | \$200.1 | \$148.1 |  |  |  |
| - \{\$ in millions] <br> - Updated throu | YTD Dei | ber 202 | of $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |

## College of Medicine General Funds:

 High Level Financial Trends| Sources | Actual <br> FY19 | Actual <br> FY20 | $\underline{\text { Actual }}$ | $\underline{\text { FY21 }}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

- \{\$ in millions]

PennState
College of Medicine

## College of Medicine General Funds: High Level Financial Trends

| Uses | Actual <br> FY19 | Actual <br> FY20 | $\frac{\text { Actual }}{\underline{\text { FY21 }}}$ | $\frac{\text { Budgeted }}{\underline{\text { FY22 }}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salary/Wage/Fringe | $\$ 110.7$ | $\$ 119.8$ | $\$ 109.8$ | $\$ 121.7$ |
| Non-Labor Operating | $\$ 84.7$ | $\$ 78.5$ | $\$ 82.6$ | $\$ 82.7$ |
| Debt Svc (pass-thru) | $\mathbf{\$ 0 . 0}$ | \$27.8 | \$28.3 | \$27.8 |
| Total Uses | $\mathbf{\$ 1 9 5 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 2 6 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 2 0 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 3 2 . 2}$ |

- \{\$ in millions]



## Key Financial Highlights

- COM Budget requires support of Academic Support Payment (ASP) from Penn State Health (PSH)
- Synergies realized from expanding PSH community hospital and medical group sites will allow ASP to grow in the future
- FY23 budgeted ASP is projected to increase over FY22 budgeted amount of $\$ 53.2$ million
- Future anticipated draws against Reserve Fund are expected to slow as ASP increases


## Key Financial Highlights (Continued)

- COM uses its Reserve Fund to invest in facilities and infrastructure
- Key planned investments in COM infrastructure:
- $\$ 4.3$ million in modernization of Central Animal Quarters/ABSL-3 (Spring 2022)
- $\$ 29$ million for newly renovated Comparative Medicine Facility (Fall 2022)
- $\$ 35$ million for enhanced education spaces (Fall 2022)
- Continued ramp-up of Strategic Plan investments
- Commence joint Penn State Health/College of Medicine Campus Master Plan (Summer 2022)
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# SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID 

2021 Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program (Informational)

## Introduction

"Reserved Spaces" are admission spaces reserved at University Park for first-year applicants with special needs or talents that cannot be met at Commonwealth Campus locations, who are admissible to the University, and whose evaluation indices (EI) do not meet the applicable University Park admission criteria. These students contribute to the educational and cultural life and diversity of the University Park campus.

The structure described below was defined most recently in a 1987 report on special admission programs and a December 1991 report on reserved spaces admission. The 1987 report defines the categories of reserved spaces and sets a target that no more than ten (10) percent of the class be admitted through a special admissions program. The 1991 report documents the process to review these data annually and collaboratively set the target for the next year. Detailed historical information is included at the end of this report.

## Action

At its March 2022 meeting, the Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid reviewed this report and voted unanimously to adopt the reserved spaces allocation recommended by staff outlined in Table 3.

## Information

Table 1 shows the distribution of admissions through the Reserved Spaces program by each EI category. The spaces are organized into three types: Senate Approved, Other Academic, and Administrative. The Glossary at the end of the report describes the groups under each type.

In the past, including students entering up to 2012, the limits or targets approved by the Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid applied to fall admissions only. With the increased use of spring and summer as the initial term for many of the new incoming students, the allocated reserved spaces for the years 2013 and forward apply to the full calendar year.

Table 2 provides limits for each type and group of students and the number of reserved spaces actually used. For each year on the chart, the limit of reserved spaces, the number actually used in the fall and the total number used over the full admissions year - spring, summer, fall - are shown.

The graph that follows compares the total number of reserved spaces used to the total first-year admissions for each year at University Park. In 2021, a total of 143 spaces were used in the spring, summer and fall, constituting $2.44 \%$ of all admissions over the full year.

Table 3 shows the proposed reserved space limits for 2021. The spaces utilized by EOP/CAMP have been lower in recent years due to expiration of funding for the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP), though the Comprehensive Studies Programs (CSP) continues to be a university-funded substitute for these government-funded programs. However, we recommend
keeping the current limit in place, as it is anticipated that we will apply for restored funding in the future and in anticipation of growth of CSP.

The Undergraduate Admissions Office recognizes the contributions of Guoyang Lin and Kathy McKinney in preparing this report's data and Anna Butler for compiling the historical information on the program.
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TABLE 1
RESERVED SPACES BY ADMISSION CATEGORY - SPRING, SUMMER, FALL 2021 UNIVERSITY PARK

| TYPE | $\begin{gathered} \text { САТ. } 1 \\ (4.00-3.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CAT. } 2 \\ (3.49-3.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CAT. } 3 \\ (2.99-2.75) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { САТ. } 4 \\ (2.74-2.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CAT. } 5 \\ (2.49-2.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CAT. } 6 \\ (2.24-2.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { САТ. 1-6 } \\ (4.00-2.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAT. } 7-10 \\ & (1.99-.01) \end{aligned}$ | NO CAT. | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SENATE APPROVED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arts \& Arch Talent | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| *Educ Opp Prog/CAMP | 0 | 1 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Veterans | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 1 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| OTHER ACADEMIC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ROTC Scholars | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| **Adm Review Comm | 2 | 16 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Subtotal | 2 | 17 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| ADMINISTRATIVE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Athletes | 2 | 27 | 31 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 5 | 84 |
| Team Sports | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Blue Band | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Vice President \& Dean | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 2 | 30 | 32 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 6 | 91 |
| TOTAL | 4 | 48 | 60 | 23 | 2 | 0 | 137 | 0 | 6 | 143 |
| PERCENTAGE | 2.76\% | 33.10\% | 42.07\% | 15.86\% | 1.38\% | 0.00\% | 95.17\% | 0.00\% | 4.83\% | 100.00\% |
| TOTAL FRESHMEN | 2007 | 5729 | 651 | 73 | 8 | 1 | 8469 | 0 | 542 | 9011 |
| PERCENTAGE | 22.27\% | 63.58\% | 7.22\% | 0.81\% | 0.09\% | 0.01\% | 93.98\% | 0.00\% | 6.01\% | 99.99\% |

*EOP/CAMP = Educational Opportunity Program/College Assistance Migrant Program
**Adm Review Comm = Admissions Review Committee

Source: Office of Undergraduate Admissions, 12/8/2021
2021 Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program

TABLE 2
RESERVED SPACES - 8 YEAR COMPARISON
UNIVERSITY PARK

| TYPE (Evaluation Index) | $2014$ <br> Limit | Fall <br> Actual | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 2014 \\ \text { Full } \\ \text { Year } \\ \text { Actual } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $2015$ <br> Limit | Fall <br> Actual | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 2015 \\ \text { Full } \\ \text { Year } \\ \text { Actual } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $2016$ <br> Limit | Fall <br> Actual | 2016 <br> Full <br> Year <br> Actual | $2017$ <br> Limit | Fall <br> Actual | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 2017 \\ \text { Full } \\ \text { Year } \\ \text { Actual } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $2018$ <br> Limit | Fall <br> Actual | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2018 \\ \text { Full } \\ \text { Year } \\ \text { Actual } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $2019$ <br> Limit | Fall <br> Actual | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 2019 \\ \text { Full } \\ \text { Year } \\ \text { Actual } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 2020 <br> Limit | Fall <br> Actual | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2020 \\ \text { Full } \\ \text { Year } \\ \text { Actal } \end{gathered}$ | $2021$ <br> Limit | Fall <br> Actual | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2021 \\ \text { Full } \\ \text { Year } \\ \text { Actual } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SENATE APPRO VED <br> Arts \& Arch Talent <br> *EOP/CAMP <br> Veterans <br> Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 2 |
|  | 75 | 31 | 31 | 75 | 20 | 22 | 75 | 15 | 16 | 75 | 19 | 19 | 75 | 23 | 24 | 75 | 34 | 38 | 75 | 37 | 40 | 75 | 19 | 21 |
|  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 95 | 31 | 31 | 95 | 21 | 23 | 95 | 19 | 20 | 95 | 23 | 24 | 95 | 30 | 31 | 95 | 36 | 40 | 95 | 40 | 43 | 95 | 21 | 23 |
| OTHER ACADEMICROTC Scholars |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 15 | 5 | 6 | 15 | 8 | 8 | 15 | 4 | 4 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 3 |
| **Adm Review Comm | 40 | 40 | 68 | 75 | 58 | 87 | 75 | 43 | 72 | 75 | 35 | 63 | 75 | 30 | 43 | 75 | 53 | 61 | 75 | 36 | 51 | 75 | 21 | 26 |
| Subtotal | 55 | 45 | 74 | 90 | 66 | 95 | 90 | 47 | 76 | 90 | 42 | 70 | 90 | 40 | 53 | 90 | 55 | 63 | 90 | 39 | 54 | 90 | 24 | 29 |
| ADMINISTRATIVE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Athletes | 140 | 80 | 139 | 140 | 73 | 143 | 140 | 67 | 123 | 140 | 54 | 118 | 140 | 37 | 107 | 140 | 45 | 109 | 140 | 34 | 109 | 140 | 37 | 84 |
| Team Sports | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 2 |  | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Blue Band | 10 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 5 |  | 10 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 3 | 3 |
| VP \& Dean | 25 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal |  |  | 154 | 165 | 83 | 161 | 165 | 73 | 136 |  | 64 | 132 | 165 | 47 | 120 |  | 51 | 118 | 165 | 40 | 116 | 165 | 44 | 91 |
| TO TALS | 330 | 167 | 259 | 350 | 170 | 279 | 350 | 139 | 232 | 350 | 129 | 226 | 350 | 117 | 204 | 350 | 142 | 221 | 350 | 119 | 213 | 350 | 89 | 143 |
| NEW FIRSTYEAR STUDENTS |  | 6289 | 8663 |  | 5756 | 8013 |  | 6547 | 8861 |  | 5934 | 8211 |  | 6130 | 8258 |  | 6655 | 8543 |  | 6483 | 8720 |  | 6624 | 9011 |
| \% |  | 2.66\% | 2.99\% |  | 2.95\% | 3.48\% |  | 2.12\% | 2.62\% |  | 2.17\% | 2.75\% |  | 1.91\% | 2.47\% |  | 2.13\% | 2.59\% |  | 1.84\% | 2.44\% |  | 1.34\% | 1.59\% |

2021 Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program


Bar chart showing the number of reserved spaces used compared to total first-year admission to University Park by year from 2014 to 2021.

The years 2014-2021 reflect full-year (spring, summer, fall) admissions, with 259 of 8663; 279 of $8013 ; 232$ of 8861,226 of 8211,204 of 8258,221 of 8543,213 of 8720 and 143 of 9011 firstyear admissions in 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021 respectively, enrolled via reserved spaces.

TABLE 3
Proposed Reserved Spaces Limits for 2022
Categories Type Limits
Senate Approved A \& A Talent (Architecture/Landscape ..... 10 Architecture)
Educational Opportunity Program/College ..... 75
Assistance Migrant
Program/Comprehensive Studies Program
Veterans ..... 10
Subtotal ..... 95
Other Academic ROTC Scholars ..... 15
Admissions Review Committee ..... 75
Subtotal ..... 90
Administrative Athletes
Varsity Sports ..... 140
Club Sports ..... 5
Blue Band ..... 10
VP\&D ..... 10
Subtotal ..... 165
Grand Total ..... 350

## Glossary of Terms for the Reserved Spaces Report

## Arts and Architecture Talent Review:

The College of Arts and Architecture recommends up to ten exceptionally talented freshman applications for admission to the Architecture and Landscape Architecture programs each year. Applicants interested in pursuing special talent admission are required to submit a representative portfolio of their creative artwork relevant to architectural studies, which will be reviewed by the appropriate faculty. Portfolios are being accepted between January 1 and February 15.

## Admissions Review Committee:

Individual student appeal of an admissions decision based upon additional information, credentials, or extenuating situations that were not considered in the initial decision.

## Educational Opportunity Program (EOP):

Spaces reserved to provide access and retention to low-income Pennsylvania students. Student may not meet regular admission criteria for his or her selected campus. Student must meet financial guidelines established by the Pennsylvania Department of Education for low-income families. Decisions are made in the Undergraduate Admissions Office in collaboration with the Office of the Vice President for Educational Equity.

## College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP):

Reserved spaces for students accessing Penn State through the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP), a federally funded program designed to assist first-year college students from migrant and seasonal farm worker families pursue higher education. Decisions are made in the Undergraduate Admissions Office in collaboration with the Office of the Vice President for Educational Equity.

## Comprehensive Studies Program

Spaces reserved to provide access and retention to low-income Pennsylvania students. Student may not meet regular admission criteria for his or her selected campus. Decisions are made in the Undergraduate Admissions Office in collaboration with the Office of the Vice President for Educational Equity.

## Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education:

Final level of appeal for an admission decision based upon extenuating circumstances, additional information, changes in credentials, etc. not considered in prior decisions.

## Historical Information on the Reserved Spaces Programs and Its Predecessors

- 1968: Faculty presented a petition to the Senate to introduce changes in admissions procedures in order to admit more students from the minority group and poverty backgrounds.
- December 1969: Report with recommendations for admitting Special Educational Opportunity Students (students who have academic challenges due to environmental, socioeconomic, and disruption issues)
- Senate authorized Director of Academic Services to reserve 500 spaces for beginning SEOS students with 300 to be UP students and the remainder to be distributed among the campuses
- Admissions criteria for SEOS program to be developed by Admissions Director of SEOS except Colleges and Campuses who so desire may specify criteria for admission to their academic units
- June 6, 1972: Report concerning codification of Admissions Policies; states that special procedures have been developed in response to varying needs (i.e., Resident Instruction adjunct admissions, Continuing Education credit course admissions, Educational Opportunity Program admissions, and veterans' admissions)
- Committee on Academic Admissions Standards moved that a committee be appointed by the Provost to study and codify all admissions policies and procedures
- Three points considered at Senate Council
- Alterations of admissions policies are experimental, there will be a limit as to the number of students admitted in programs, and review and approval will be done prior to enactment and annually thereafter
- The term "approved" by the Senate Committee on Academic Admissions Standards" indicates some problems: delegation of Senate authority to the committee; seemingly slowness of a legislative body in decision making process; will "approved" ensure interaction
- Ten percent of total undergraduate admission group for the year and fifteen percent on a campus would seem to give a sufficient group to do meaningful experiments
- Proposed Veterans Special Admittance Policy was passed
- June 6, 1972: Motion authorizing University administration to conduct experiments which would alter the standard Admissions Policy-subject to the following guidelines:
- Alterations of policy are to be evaluated annually by Provost and Senate Committee on Academic Admissions Standards until either terminated or incorporated into the basic admissions policy by specific legislation
- Total number of students admitted through such programs may not exceed ten percent of the total undergraduate admission group for the year. At campus locations, the numbers involved may not exceed $15 \%$ except by agreement between University Administration and the Senate Committee on Academic Admissions Standards
- December 12, 1972: Proposal for Experimentation with the Admission Policy for Students in Associate Degree Majors in Engineering Technology was passed
- June 1, 1976: Special Admissions Programs that were reviewed and approved by Subcommittee on Special Admissions were:
- College of Arts and Architecture Experimental Admissions Program
- Dept. of Speech Pathology and Audiology Experimental Admissions Program
- Educational Opportunity Program
- Veterans Special Admittance Program
- International Students
- Associate Degree - Engineering Technology
- Dept. of Independent Study
- Developmental Year
- High School Seniors at UP
- Experimental Programs at Commonwealth Campuses
- February 24, 1987: Report on Special Admissions Programs:
- At Penn State, the University Faculty Senate and the administration have shared responsibilities for the determination of criteria for the admission of degree candidates to the University
- In order to provide flexibility to administration in arriving at special reserved space admissions target figures, categories have been put into three groups:
- Senate-Approved Programs (Arts \& Architecture Talent, Educational Opportunity Program, Developmental Year, Communications Disorders, Veterans, VeteransDevelopmental Year)
- Other Academic Special (Admission Review Committee, International Students, ROTC Scholarships)
- Administrative Special (Athletic, Blue Band, Administrative)
- Senate and administration show concern over issue of reserved spaces
- The number of reserved space categories grew, and the number of students admitted under these categories increased as well. Because of the increasing competition for Fall Semester admission to UP as well as the greater awareness of the opportunities for abuse of special admissions programs (as seen in athletic programs at some other institutions, for example), the administration and the Admissions, Records and Scheduling Committee have agreed that all special admissions targets and statistics as well as performance of specially admitted students should be reviewed annually by the committee.
- Seeing an increased pressure on enrollment at UP, the Senate asked the Committee on Special Admissions Programs to consider with the Administration the history and future of reserved spaces
- Agreement between Senate and Administration to, over the next five years, experiment with controlling all Special Admissions Programs under the Senate-approved guidelines of no more than $10 \%$ of the entire freshman class and no more than $15 \%$ of the entering freshmen in a given location.
- December 10, 1991: Annual Report on Reserved Spaces Admissions
- The maximum "target" number appropriate to the special admissions categories of student is reviewed annually and set for the forthcoming year as a result of consultation involving the Senior Vice President and Dean for the Commonwealth Education System (formerly the Vice President and Vice Provost), the Office of Undergraduate Admissions, and the University Faculty Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid. Once a maximum "target" for the overall set of categories is approved, a maximum number for each category is determined on the basis of past admissions data and projections of the probable number of incoming students who would qualify.
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## PennState

Date: $\quad$ March 14, 2022
From: Rob Springall
To: Kathleen Phillips, Chair, Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid

Subj: High School Students Enrolled Nondegree in Credit Courses from Summer 2019 through Spring 2021

In accordance with 1974 Senate action and Academic Administrative Policy and Procedure (AAPPM) A09 governing enrollment of high school students (http://www.psu.edu/oue/aappm/A-9-admission-high-school-students-and-experimental-admissions.html) the attached tables and graphs provide the information the Senate requires annually from the Undergraduate Admissions Office and additional historical data from the two previous academic years. This information is now reported from iTwo, in previous years the information was from ISIS.

Table 1 Summary of high school students enrolled in nondegree credit courses
Graphs A, B, C Grade point distributions
Tables 2A, 2B, 2C Enrollment by high school level and admission status of senior level students
Tables 3A, 3B, 3C Enrollment by course description
Table $4 \quad$ Enrollment by ethnicity
Table 5 Enrollment by gender
Penn State encourages the enrollment of academically prepared students to study college-level coursework prior to high school graduation to begin the pathway to higher education. Penn State's 20 undergraduate campuses across the Commonwealth provide an excellent opportunity for students to connect with faculty and campus resources close to home. Students who complete college courses at Penn State while in high school are likely to apply to the University and become full-time degreeseeking students. Yield of these dual-enrolled students exceed the average PA applicant yield by approximately $15 \%$.

| Terms | HS Seniors Offered <br> Admission | HS Seniors Accepted <br> Offer | Yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SU18-SP19 | 315 | 206 | $65 \%$ |
| SU19-SP20 | 315 | 184 | $58 \%$ |
| SU20-SP21 | 277 | 175 | $63 \%$ |

The peak of high school student enrollment from this cohort was during SU08-SP09 when 1,609 high school students were enrolled at all 20 undergraduate campuses. The total number of high school students enrolled across the system has declined $45 \%$ ( 719 students) from SU08-SP09 to SU17-SP18. More enrollment information follows in the tables below:

| Terms | HS Students at <br> campuses |
| :---: | :---: |
| SU18-SP19 | 789 |
| SU19-SP20 | 691 |
| SU20-SP21 | 589 |

Some of the enrollment decline can be attributed to the demographic decline in the number of students enrolled and graduating from Pennsylvania high schools. Another factor contributing to the decline in enrollments is the Penn State cost of attendance. College-level courses taken during high school were an affordable opportunity for many in SU08-SP09 with state grant funding awarded to Pennsylvania school districts who met approved guidelines. Commonwealth Campuses matched state grants for many students which contributed to a record number of high school student enrollments. Since that funding has been removed, students have found more affordable options either by attending community colleges, taking advanced placement (AP) courses and earning college credits in their high school through partnerships developed by competitor colleges in the area.

The Commonwealth Campuses offer dual enrollment students a 50-percent tuition reduction to encourage students to enroll in Penn State class in their communities.

Campuses have developed partnerships with service area high schools and attempt to attract and retain successful high school students through these nondegree courses.

Of the 589 high school students enrolled from SU20-SP21, 67\% reported ethnicity as White; 3\% reported ethnicity as Hispanic/Latino; 1\% reported ethnicity as Black or African American; 4\% reported ethnicity as Asian; $4 \%$ reported ethnicity as two or more races, and $21 \%$ did not report (Table 4).

During SU20-SP21 female high school students represented 61\% of the total enrollment compared to $38 \%$ male high school students, with six students not identifying (Table 5).

Students currently enrolled in high school who have completed their junior year or are in their senior year of high school are reviewed for nondegree enrollment by the Admissions Office at the campus of enrollment. Students who are currently in their junior year or younger may be recommended by the Undergraduate Admissions Office for an exception to enroll as a nondegree student through the Faculty Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid.

Application should be made at the Admissions Office at the campus the student plans to attend by completing a Nondegree Enrollment form. Nondegree Enrollment forms can be accessed on the web: https://www.registrar.psu.edu/student_forms/nondegree form.cfm and are available in some high school guidance offices. The student's high school guidance counselor must also submit an official high school transcript and a statement in support of the student's enrollment at Penn State. Students who are approved may register for eight credits per semester or session.

Table 1
High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State
Enrollment by Campus
Summer 2018 to Spring 2021
by Academic Year (Summer to Spring)

| Campus | SU18-SP19 | SU19-SP20 | SU20-SP21 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Abington | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Altoona | 14 | 5 | 9 |
| Beaver | 51 | 40 | 40 |
| Berks | 51 | 49 | 42 |
| Brandywine | 16 | 0 | 4 |
| DuBois | 112 | 95 | 91 |
| Erie | 67 | 56 | 27 |
| Fayette | 5 | 9 | 20 |
| Greater Allegheny | 5 | 8 | 9 |
| Harrisburg | 22 | 6 | 3 |
| Hazleton | 43 | 64 | 36 |
| Lehigh Valley | 84 | 82 | 64 |
| Mont Alto | 128 | 51 | 38 |
| New Kensington | 4 | 8 | 8 |
| Schuylkill | 47 | 64 | 71 |
| Scranton | 9 | 9 | 14 |
| Shenango | 32 | 52 | 51 |
| University Park | 146 | 71 | 60 |
| Wilkes-Barre | 29 | 44 | 5 |
| World Campus | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| York | 55 | 48 | 59 |
|  | 926 | 764 | 637 |

High School Students Enrolled Nondegree in Credit Courses at Penn State GPA Analysis for Summer 2020 to Spring 2021


| $\underline{\text { GPA }}$ | $\underline{\text { Percentage }}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $3.67-4.00$ | 49.92 |
| $3.34-3.66$ | 16.30 |
| $3.01-3.33$ | 11.88 |
| $2.67-3.00$ | 10.70 |
| $2.34-2.66$ | 4.07 |
| $2.00-2.33$ | 3.23 |
| $1.01-1.99$ | 0.00 |
| $0-1.00$ | 0.00 |
| NO GRADE | 0.00 |
| OTHER | 3.90 |

GRAPH B
High School Students Enrolled Nondegree in Credit Courses at Penn State GPA Analysis for Summer 2019 to Spring 2020


| GPA | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- |
| $3.67-4.00$ | 54.85 |
| $3.34-3.66$ | 16.50 |
| $3.01-3.33$ | 8.39 |
| $2.67-3.00$ | 8.83 |
| $2.34-2.66$ | 4.92 |
| $2.00-2.33$ | 5.21 |
| $1.01-1.99$ | 0.00 |
| $0-1.00$ | 0.00 |
| NO GRADE | 0.00 |
| OTHER | 1.30 |

## GRAPH C

High School Students Enrolled Nondegree in Credit Courses at Penn State GPA Analysis for Summer 2018 to Spring 2019


| GPA | $\underline{\text { Percentage }}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $3.67-4.00$ | 46.13 |
| $3.34-3.66$ | 17.62 |
| $3.01-3.33$ | 13.81 |
| $2.67-3.00$ | 10.65 |
| $2.34-2.66$ | 4.56 |
| $2.00-2.33$ | 4.94 |
| $1.01-1.99$ | 0.00 |
| $0-1.00$ | 0.00 |
| NO GRADE | 0.00 |
| OTHER | 2.28 |

Table 2A
High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State Admissions Status
Summer 2020 to Spring 2021

| Campus | $\begin{gathered} \text { Freshman } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | Sophomore 2 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Junior } \\ 3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Senior } \\ 4 \end{array}$ | Seniors Who Applied to PSU | Seniors Offered Admission | Seniors Accepted Offer | Yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abington | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Altoona | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 100\% |
| Beaver | 2 | 1 | 10 | 27 | 22 | 22 | 13 | 59\% |
| Berks | 3 | 0 | 4 | 34 | 13 | 13 | 4 | 31\% |
| Brandywine | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 25\% |
| DuBois | 11 | 1 | 30 | 49 | 39 | 39 | 31 | 82\% |
| Erie | 6 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 17 | 16 | 11 | 69\% |
| Fayette | 1 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 100\% |
| Greater Allegheny | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 75\% |
| Harrisburg | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Hazleton | 1 | 1 | 6 | 28 | 23 | 21 | 10 | 48\% |
| Lehigh Valley | 3 | 0 | 9 | 50 | 42 | 41 | 15 | 37\% |
| Mont Alto | 1 | 0 | 7 | 28 | 20 | 19 | 15 | 79\% |
| New Kensington | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 80\% |
| Schuylkill | 8 | 3 | 23 | 37 | 26 | 32 | 11 | 50\% |
| Scranton | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 67\% |
| Shenango | 3 | 1 | 5 | 42 | 16 | 12 | 7 | 58\% |
| University Park | 11 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 23 | 23 | 16 | 70\% |
| Wilkes-Barre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 50\% |
| World Campus | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 100\% |
| York | 2 | 1 | 15 | 41 | 33 | 33 | 27 | 82\% |
|  | 62 | 23 | 141 | 419 | 315 | 298 | 189 | 63\% |

1 Incoming freshman ( $9^{\text {th }}$ ) year in high school
2 Incoming sophomore ( $10^{\text {th }}$ ) year in high school
3 Incoming Junior (11 $1^{\text {th }}$ ) year in high school
4 Incoming senior ( $12^{\text {th }}$ ) year in high school
Student may attend more than one campus in the same academic year

Table 2B
High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State Admissions Status
Summer 2019 to Spring 2020

| Campus | $\begin{gathered} \text { Freshman } \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Sophomore 2 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Junior } \\ 3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Senior } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | Seniors Who Applied to PSU | Seniors Offered Admission | Seniors Accepted Offer | Yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abington | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Altoona | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 100\% |
| Beaver | 5 | 0 | 7 | 28 | 21 | 20 | 10 | 50\% |
| Berks | 2 | 0 | 5 | 42 | 26 | 24 | 10 | 42\% |
| Brandywine | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| DuBois | 7 | 1 | 39 | 48 | 22 | 18 | 14 | 78\% |
| Erie | 10 | 0 | 13 | 33 | 35 | 35 | 21 | 60\% |
| Fayette | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 88\% |
| Greater Allegheny |  | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 67\% |
| Harrisburg |  | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 50\% |
| Hazleton | 4 | 1 | 18 | 41 | 36 | 33 | 20 | 61\% |
| Lehigh Valley | 5 | 0 | 14 | 63 | 37 | 35 | 14 | 40\% |
| Mont Alto |  | 1 | 8 | 42 | 37 | 37 | 17 | 46\% |
| New Kensington | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0\% |
| Schuylkill | 8 | 4 | 14 | 38 | 26 | 25 | 16 | 64\% |
| Scranton |  | 0 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 63\% |
| Shenango | 3 | 0 | 5 | 44 | 28 | 27 | 16 | 59\% |
| University Park | 22 | 3 | 27 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 67\% |
| Wilkes-Barre | 2 | 3 | 19 | 20 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 89\% |
| World Campus |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 100\% |
| York | 2 | 1 | 10 | 34 | 22 | 22 | 12 | 55\% |
|  | 73 | 17 | 189 | 482 | 352 | 336 | 194 | 58\% |

1 Incoming freshman ( $9^{\text {th }}$ ) year in high school
2 Incoming sophomore ( $10^{\text {th }}$ ) year in high school
3 Incoming Junior (11 $1^{\text {th }}$ ) year in high school
4 Incoming senior ( $12^{\text {th }}$ ) year in high school
Student may attend more than one campus in the same academic year

Table 2C
High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State
Admissions Status
Summer 2018 to Spring 2019

| Campus | $\begin{gathered} \text { Freshman } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | Sophomore | $\begin{gathered} \text { Junior } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Senior } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | Seniors Who Applied to PSU | Seniors <br> Offered <br> Admission | Seniors Accepted Offer | Yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abington | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Altoona | 7 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 67\% |
| Beaver | 11 | 1 | 10 | 29 | 24 | 23 | 16 | 70\% |
| Berks | 7 | 0 | 8 | 36 | 24 | 23 | 13 | 54\% |
| Brandywine | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 4 | 29\% |
| DuBois | 8 | 2 | 31 | 71 | 39 | 39 | 26 | 67\% |
| Erie | 8 | 3 | 10 | 46 | 35 | 32 | 19 | 59\% |
| Fayette | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 100\% |
| Greater Allegheny | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 100\% |
| Harrisburg | 4 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 50\% |
| Hazleton | 3 | 0 | 5 | 35 | 23 | 19 | 8 | 42\% |
| Lehigh Valley | 4 | 1 | 10 | 69 | 35 | 34 | 22 | 65\% |
| Mont Alto | 22 | 5 | 28 | 73 | 46 | 43 | 29 | 67\% |
| New Kensington | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 100\% |
| Schuylkill | 5 | 4 | 10 | 28 | 18 | 14 | 11 | 79\% |
| Scranton | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 83\% |
| Shenango | 2 | 0 | 3 | 27 | 13 | 12 | 8 | 67\% |
| University Park | 46 | 6 | 48 | 45 | 29 | 27 | 21 | 78\% |
| Wilkes-Barre | 0 | 1 | 18 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 83\% |
| World Campus | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 67\% |
| York | 6 | 1 | 14 | 34 | 22 | 19 | 13 | 68\% |
|  | 138 | 26 | 204 | 557 | 356 | 331 | 214 | 65\% |

1 Incoming freshman ( $9^{\text {th }}$ ) year in high school
2 Incoming sophomore ( $10^{\text {th }}$ ) year in high school
3 Incoming Junior ( $11^{\text {th }}$ ) year in high school
4 Incoming senior (12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ ) year in high school
Student may attend more than one campus in the same academic year

Table 3 A
High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State Courses Taken Summer 2020-Spring 2021

| Course | No. | Course | No. | Course | No. | Course | No. | Course | No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACCTG211 | 2 | CHNS 1 | 5 | GER 3 | 1 | MATH 251 | 3 | SCM 200 | 1 |
| AFAM 147 | 1 | CHNS 110 | 1 | HDFS 108N | 2 | MATH 26 | 9 | SOC 1 | 18 |
| AFAM 250 | 1 | CHNS 2 | 3 | HDFS 129 | 14 | MATH 312 | 1 | SOC 12 | 2 |
| AMST 105 | 3 | CHNS 3 | 2 | HDFS 239 | 3 | MATH 34 | 7 | SOC 13 | 8 |
| ANTH 21 | 1 | CMLIT108 | 3 | HINDI1 | 2 | MATH 41 | 1 | SOC 5 | 7 |
| ANTH 45N | 4 | CMPSC101 | 3 | HIST 10 | 2 | MATH 414 | 1 | SPAN 1 | 1 |
| ARAB 1 | 2 | CMPSC121 | 2 | HIST 101 | 2 | MATH 484 | 1 | SRA 111 | 1 |
| ARAB 2 | 2 | CMPSC132 | 2 | HIST 11 | 2 | METEO3 | 4 | SRA 211 | 2 |
| ART 1 | 1 | CMPSC360 | 1 | HIST 110 | 1 | MGMT 215 | 8 | STAT 200 | 10 |
| ART 10 | 1 | COMM 100N | 4 | HIST 144 | 4 | MIS 204 | 2 | STAT 250 | 3 |
| ART 101 | 2 | CRIM100 | 1 | HIST 151N | 4 | MUSIC11 | 1 | STAT 414 | 1 |
| ART 50 | 1 | CRIMJ100 | 11 | HIST 2 | 1 | MUSIC191 | 1 | THEA 105 | 4 |
| ART 80 | 1 | CRIMJ113 | 2 | HIST 20 | 7 | MUSIC207N | 1 |  |  |
| ARTH 100 | 3 | CRIMJ12 | 12 | HIST 21 | 1 | MUSIC7 | 2 |  |  |
| ARTH 112 | 1 | EARTH100 | 1 | HPA 101 | 1 | MUSIC9 | 8 |  |  |
| ASTRO1 | 3 | EARTH103N | 3 | HUM 200N | 3 | NUTR 251 | 9 |  |  |
| BA 250 | 4 | EARTH104N | 3 | INART125 | 4 | PHIL 1 | 7 |  |  |
| BBH 101 | 4 | EARTH107N | 1 | IST 110 | 12 | PHIL 10 | 6 |  |  |
| BBH 201N | 1 | EARTH111N | 1 | IST 210 | 3 | PHIL 103 | 1 |  |  |
| BIOL 11 | 2 | EARTH2 | 3 | IST 250 | 3 | PHIL 132 | 40 |  |  |
| BIOL 110 | 10 | ECON 102 | 27 | IT 20 | 2 | PHIL 200 | 2 |  |  |
| BIOL 133 | 1 | ECON 104 | 19 | KINES61 | 2 | PHIL 4 | 4 |  |  |
| BIOL 155 | 1 | EDPSY10 | 1 | KINES81 | 2 | PHOTO100 | 7 |  |  |
| BIOL 161 | 59 | EDSGN100 | 2 | KINES82 | 4 | PHYS 1 | 1 |  |  |
| BIOL 162 | 59 | EDUC 197 | 20 | KINES84 | 1 | PHYS 211 | 6 |  |  |
| BIOL 163 | 54 | ENGL 104 | 1 | KINES92 | 1 | PL SC 1 | 4 |  |  |
| BIOL 164 | 54 | ENGL 15 | 153 | KOR 1 | 1 | PL SC 10 | 1 |  |  |
| BISC 2 | 2 | ENGL 184 | 3 | LATIN1 | 2 | PL SC 111 | 5 |  |  |
| BISC 3 | 8 | ENGL 223N | 1 | LATIN2 | 1 | PL SC 2OON | 1 |  |  |
| BISC 4 | 5 | ENGL 30H | 4 | LING 1 | 1 | PL SC 297 | 1 |  |  |
| CAS 100A | 134 | ENGL 50 | 27 | MATH 10 | 1 | PL SC 3 | 1 |  |  |
| CAS 100B | 2 | ENGR 197 | 2 | MATH 110 | 4 | PSU 8 | 9 |  |  |
| CAS 203 | 1 | FR 1 | 1 | MATH 140 | 42 | PSYCH100 | 112 |  |  |
| CAS 271N | 3 | FR 2 | 1 | MATH 140B | 1 | PSYCH221 | 1 |  |  |
| CED 152 | 2 | FR 3 | 1 | MATH 141 | 17 | PSYCH232 | 1 |  |  |
| CHEM 1 | 1 | GAME 160N | 1 | MATH 21 | 10 | PSYCH238 | 1 |  |  |
| CHEM 110 | 51 | GEOG 10 | 1 | MATH 22 | 4 | PSYCH263N | 1 |  |  |
| CHEM 111 | 43 | GEOG 3N | 4 | MATH 220 | 5 | PSYCH270 | 3 |  |  |
| CHEM 112 | 4 | GER 1 | 1 | MATH 220H | 3 | RLST 1 | 4 |  |  |
| CHEM 113 | 1 | GER 2 | 2 | MATH 230 | 5 | SC 120N | 4 |  |  |

Table 3B
High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State Courses Taken Summer 2019-Spring 2020

| Course | No. | Course | No. | Course | No. | Course | No. | Course | No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AA 100 | 1 | BIOL 177 | 1 | ENGL 15 | 175 | KOR 120 | 1 | PL SC 14 | 5 |
| ACCTG211 | 2 | BIOL 240W | 2 | ENGL 184 | 1 | KOR 2 | 1 | PL SC 291 | 1 |
| AED 101S | 1 | BISC 2 | 1 | ENGL 191 | 1 | KOR 3 | 2 | PL SC 3 | 1 |
| AFAM 83 | 1 | BISC 3 | 2 | ENGL 192 | 1 | LLED 297 | 17 | PSU 16 | 2 |
| AGBM 101 | 1 | BISC 4 | 3 | ENGL 30H | 2 | MATH 10 | 2 | PSU 8 | 7 |
| AMST 100 | 1 | CAMS 33 | 3 | ENGL 50 | 40 | MATH 110 | 6 | PSU 8T | 1 |
| AMST 105 | 8 | CAMS 45 | 2 | ENGR 297 | 1 | MATH 140 | 25 | PSYCH100 | 92 |
| ANTH 1 | 2 | CAMS 5 | 2 | ENGR 97 | 1 | MATH 140E | 1 | PSYCH175N | 2 |
| ARAB 1 | 10 | CAS 100 | 34 | FRNSC100 | 4 | MATH 140H | 1 | PSYCH212 | 10 |
| ARAB 2 | 1 | CAS 100A | 96 | GAME 220 | 1 | MATH 141 | 15 | PSYCH221 | 4 |
| ARCH 121 | 1 | CAS 100B | 16 | GAME 250 | 2 | MATH 21 | 13 | PSYCH261 | 1 |
| ARCH 131 | 1 | CAS 137H | 1 | GLIS 101N | 3 | MATH 22 | 6 | RHS 100 | 1 |
| ART 1 | 3 | CAS 203 | 4 | GLI 102N | 3 | MATH 220 | 1 | RLST 140Y | 2 |
| ART 11 | 1 | CAS 271N | 1 | HDFS 108N | 2 | MATH 230 | 3 | RPTM 120 | 1 |
| ART 110 | 1 | CHEM 110 | 57 | HDFS 129 | 22 | MATH 250 | 1 | SC 120N | 1 |
| ART 168 | 1 | CHEM 111 | 41 | HDFS 239 | 3 | MATH 251 | 6 | SCM 200 | 1 |
| ART 20 | 2 | CHEM 112 | 1 | HDFS 287Y | 1 | MATH 26 | 10 | SOC 1 | 27 |
| ART 50 | 4 | CHEM 113 | 1 | HIST 10 | 3 | MATH 34 | 3 | SOC 110 | 2 |
| ART 80 | 1 | CHNS 1 | 1 | HIST 11 | 2 | MATH 41 | 5 | SOC 119N | 2 |
| ARTH 100 | 1 | CHNS 3 | 1 | HIST 117 | 1 | METEO4 | 1 | SOC 12 | 1 |
| ARTH 112 | 1 | CIVCM211N | 2 | HIST 12 | 2 | MGMT 215 | 9 | SOILS101 | 3 |
| ARTH 201 | 1 | CMLIT112N | 1 | HIST 121 | 2 | MIS 204 | 1 | SPAN 1 | 1 |
| ASTRO1 | 9 | CMPEN271 | 1 | HIST 144 | 1 | MUSIC207N | 1 | SPAN 131 | 1 |
| ASTRO480 | 1 | CMPEN275 | 1 | HIST 173 | 1 | MUSIC4 | 2 | SPAN 2 | 1 |
| ASTRO496 | 2 | CMPSC101 | 1 | HIST 20 | 12 | MUSIC9 | 3 | SPAN 3 | 5 |
| ASTRO7N | 1 | CMPSC121 | 3 | HIST 21 | 8 | NAVSC101 | 2 | SRA 111 | 9 |
| BA 100 | 1 | CMPSC131 | 3 | HPA 101 | 1 | NURS 100 | 1 | STAT 200 | 15 |
| BA 250 | 5 | COMM100N | 4 | INART1 | 1 | NURS 357 | 1 | STS 110N | 2 |
| BBH 101 | 1 | COMM 205 | 1 | INART3 | 2 | NURS 390 | 1 | THEA 105 | 3 |
| BBH 119 | 1 | CRIMJ100 | 4 | IST 110 | 24 | NUTR 251 | 9 | THEA 434 | 1 |
| BBH 143 | 1 | CRIMJ12 | 6 | IST 210 | 12 | PHIL 103 | 3 | VBSC 50 | 1 |
| BBH 146 | 3 | CRIMJ13 | 1 | IST 220 | 9 | PHIL 105 | 1 | WMNST106N | 1 |
| BBH 150N | 1 | EARTH101 | 2 | IST 250 | 12 | PHIL 119 | 1 |  |  |
| BBH 302 | 2 | EARTH2 | 1 | IT 1 | 1 | PHIL 132 | 36 |  |  |
| BBH 48 | 2 | ECON 102 | 34 | JAPNS1 | 2 | PHIL 233Z | 1 |  |  |
| BIOL 1 | 1 | ECON 104 | 19 | JAPNS2 | 1 | PHIL 4 | 2 |  |  |
| BIOL 110 | 32 | EDSGN100 | 40 | JST 181 | 1 | PHIL 7 | 1 |  |  |
| BIOL 129 | 2 | EE 210 | 2 | KINES61 | 1 | PHOTO100 | 9 |  |  |
| BIOL 161 | 54 | EGEE 101 | 1 | KINES81 | 2 | PHYS 211 | 8 |  |  |
| BIOL 162 | 54 | EMCH 211 | 1 | KINES82 | 6 | PHYS 212 | 1 |  |  |
| BIOL 163 | 53 | ENGL 101 | 1 | KOR 1 | 1 | PL SC 291 | 5 |  |  |
| BIOL 164 | 53 | ENGL 104 | 1 | KOR 110 | 2 | PL SC 111 | 1 |  |  |

## Table 3C

## High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State Courses Taken Summer 2018 - Spring 2019

| Course | No. | Course | No. | Course | No. | Course | No. | Course | No. | Course | No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACCTG211 | 4 | CAS 137H | 2 | EMCH 213 | 1 | HPA 101 | 2 | MATH 251 | 3 | PL SC 297 | 1 |
| AED 101S | 1 | CAS 175 | 1 | EMET 100 | 1 | IET 101 | 2 | MATH 26 | 8 | POL 197 | 2 |
| AERSP1 | 1 | CHE 100 | 1 | ENGL 137H | 2 | INART1 | 2 | MATH 310 | 1 | PSU 14 | 1 |
| AG 150 | 2 | CHEM 1 | 1 | ENGL 15 | 238 | INART10 | 1 | MATH 34 | 1 | PSU 16 | 4 |
| AGRO 28 | 2 | CHEM 110 | 60 | ENGL 15A | 1 | INART197B | 1 | MATH 35 | 1 | PSU 5 | 4 |
| AMST 104 | 1 | CHEM 110H | 3 | ENGL 15S | 2 | INTST100 | 2 | MATH 41 | 6 | PSU 6 | 3 |
| AMST 105 | 2 | CHEM 111 | 49 | ENGL 170N | 2 | IST 110 | 28 | ME 102 | 1 | PSU 7 | 5 |
| ANTH 45N | 1 | CHEM 112 | 5 | ENGL 180 | 2 | IST 111S | 4 | METEO3 | 1 | PSU 8 | 13 |
| APLNG210 | 1 | CHEM 113 | 2 | ENGL 193N | 3 | IST 140 | 6 | METEO5 | 1 | PSYCH100 | 157 |
| APLNG280N | 1 | CHEM 210 | 1 | ENGL 263 | 1 | IST 210 | 4 | MGMT 215 | 2 | PSYCH212 | 7 |
| ARAB 1 | 11 | CHEM 212 | 1 | ENGL 297E | 1 | IST 220 | 15 | MICRB106 | 1 | PSYCH221 | 1 |
| ARMY 101 | 1 | CHEM 213W | 1 | ENGL 30H | 1 | IST 230 | 1 | MICRB107 | 1 | PSYCH243 | 2 |
| ART 1 | 4 | CHNS 1 | 1 | ENGL 5 | 1 | IST 250 | 1 | MUSIC119 | 1 | PSYCH256 | 2 |
| ART 101 | 1 | CI 200 | 1 | ENGL 50 | 37 | IST 495 | 1 | MUSIC121 | 1 | PSYCH261 | 1 |
| ART 11 | 1 | CMLIT108 | 3 | ENGR 100 | 2 | IT 1 | 2 | MUSIC131 | 1 | PSYCH270 | 2 |
| ART 111 | 1 | CMPSC121 | 6 | ENGR 297 | 2 | KINES100 | 1 | MUSIC207N | 4 | PT 100S | 2 |
| ART 20 | 10 | CMPSC131 | 2 | ERM 297 | 1 | KINES101 | 1 | MUSIC4 | 2 | RHS 100 | 3 |
| ART 50 | 2 | CMPSC200 | 2 | FORT 150 | 1 | KINES24 | 1 | MUSIC5 | 1 | RHS 297 | 29 |
| ARTH 111 | 2 | COMM 100N | 2 | FR 1 | 1 | KINES57 | 1 | MUSIC7 | 5 | RLST 1 | 3 |
| ARTH 112 | 3 | COMM 118 | 1 | GAME 160 | 2 | KINES61 | 5 | MUSIC77 | 1 | RPTM 101 | 1 |
| ARTH 307N | 1 | COMM 150N | 2 | GEOG 20 | 2 | KINES63 | 1 | MUSIC82 | 2 | RPTM 297 | 1 |
| ASTRO1 | 1 | COMM 197I | 1 | GEOG 40 | 1 | KINES67 | 1 | MUSIC88 | 1 | RUS 2 | 1 |
| ASTRO5 | 1 | CRIM 100 | 1 | GEOSC1 | 1 | KINES68 | 1 | MUSIC9 | 3 | SC 120N | 6 |
| AYFCE211N | 1 | CRIM12 | 1 | GER 1 | 1 | KINES72 | 1 | NURS 100 | 2 | SC 205N | 1 |
| BA 100 | 4 | CRIMJ100 | 6 | GER 100 | 1 | KINES81 | 7 | NURS 357 | 1 | SOC 1 | 52 |
| BA 250 | 3 | CRIMJ113 | 2 | GER 2 | 1 | KINES82 | 3 | NURS 390 | 1 | SOC 12 | 5 |
| BBH 101 | 21 | CRIMJ12 | 3 | HDFS 129 | 18 | KINES88 | 7 | NUTR 100 | 1 | SOC 5 | 1 |
| BBH 143 | 2 | CRIMJ13 | 3 | HDFS 197 | 2 | KINES89 | 3 | NUTR 251 | 10 | SPAN 1 | 5 |
| BBH 146 | 2 | CSD 297 | 27 | HDFS 229 | 2 | KINES90A | 1 | OT 100 | 1 | SPAN 131 | 1 |
| BIOL 11 | 5 | CYBER100 | 1 | HDFS 239 | 2 | KOR 1 | 1 | OT 101 | 1 | SPAN 2 | 6 |
| BIOL 110 | 51 | EARTH150 | 1 | HDFS 287Y | 2 | KOR 2 | 1 | PHIL 1 | 1 | SPAN 3 | 4 |
| BIOL 129 | 68 | ECON 102 | 50 | HHD 496 | 2 | LING 100 | 2 | PHIL 103 | 5 | SRA 111 | 5 |
| BIOL 141 | 74 | ECON 104 | 36 | HIST 1 | 1 | LLED 297 | 17 | PHIL 105 | 2 | SRA 211 | 1 |
| BIOL 142 | 69 | ECON 302 | 1 | HIST 107 | 2 | MATH 10 | 2 | PHIL 123 | 1 | STAT 100 | 1 |
| BIOL 141 | 70 | EDPSY10 | 1 | HIST 11 | 4 | MATH 110 | 7 | PHIL 2 | 2 | STAT 200 | 18 |
| BISC 2 | 3 | EDPSY14 | 1 | HIST 12 | 2 | MATH 140 | 57 | PHIL 204 | 1 | THEA 102 | 1 |
| BISC 3 | 3 | EDSGN100 | 19 | HIST 121 | 5 | MATH 140B | 1 | PHIL 4 | 2 | THEA 105 | 2 |
| BISC 4 | 5 | EDSGN100H | 2 | HIST 144 | 6 | MATH 140E | 1 | PHIL 6 | 1 | THEA 112 | 1 |
| BMB 398 | 2 | EDSGN100S | 4 | HIST 153Y | 1 | MATH 141 | 21 | PHOTO100 | 9 | THEA 477 | 1 |
| CAMS 33 | 2 | EDTHP115A | 1 | HIST 173 | 2 | MATH 200 | 1 | PHYS 10 | 1 | WILDL101 | 1 |
| CAMS 45 | 1 | EDUC 100 | 1 | HIST 2 | 2 | MATH 21 | 16 | PHYS 211 | 10 | WMNST100 | 3 |
| CAS 100 | 78 | EE 211 | 1 | HIST 20 | 28 | MATH 22 | 9 | PHYS 212 | 4 | WMNST104 | 2 |
| CAS 100A | 102 | EET 105 | 11 | HIST 21 | 5 | MATH 220 | 9 | PHYS 250 | 2 | WMNST105N | 1 |
| CAS 100B | 12 | EMCH 211 | 2 | HIST 83 | 1 | MATH 230 | 8 | PL SC 1 | 6 | WMNST106N | 2 |
| CAS 100C | 1 | EMCH 212 | 1 | HORT 150N | 2 | MATH 231 | 1 | PL SC 14 | 2 | WMNST117 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | WMNST297B | 1 |

Table 4
High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State
Enrollment by Ethnicity
Summer 2018 to Spring 2021
by Academic Year (Summer to Spring)

| Ethnicity | SU18-SP19 | $\%$ | SU19-SP20 | \% | SU20-SP21 | \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Not Reported | 182 | $23 \%$ | 144 | $21 \%$ | 125 | $21 \%$ |
| American Indian | 1 | $0.1 \%$ | 1 | $0.1 \%$ | 1 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Asian | 17 | $2 \%$ | 24 | $3 \%$ | 26 | $4 \%$ |
| Black or African American | 27 | $3 \%$ | 17 | $2 \%$ | 6 | $1 \%$ |
| Foreign (In US on Student or <br> Temporary Visa) | 3 | $0.3 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Hispanic/Latino |  | 33 | $4 \%$ | 42 | $6 \%$ | 18 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific <br> Islander | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Two or More Races | 19 | $2 \%$ | 29 | $4 \%$ | 21 | $4 \%$ |
| White | 507 | $64 \%$ | 434 | $63 \%$ | 392 | $67 \%$ |
|  | 789 |  | 691 |  | 589 |  |

Ethnicity collected and reported following federal requirements beginning in 2009.

Table 5
High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State Enrollment by Gender
Summer 2018 to Spring 2021
by Academic Year (Summer to Spring)

| Gender | SU18-SP19 | \% | SU19-SP20 | \% | SU20-SP21 | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F | 472 | $60 \%$ | 426 | $61 \%$ | 362 | $61 \%$ |
| M | 309 | $39 \%$ | 261 | $38 \%$ | 221 | $38 \%$ |
| U | 8 | $1 \%$ | 4 | $1 \%$ | 6 | $1 \%$ |
|  | 789 |  | 691 |  | 589 |  |

## *This is unduplicated by year

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 

## Summary of Petitions by College, Campus, and Unit 2020-2021

(Informational)
The Senate permits students to petition for exceptions to the Senate academic policies found in the Policies and Rules for Undergraduate Students. Exceptions to these policies are the responsibility of the Senate Committee on Education. The committee reports annually to the Senate on student petition actions. This report provides a summary of petitions by colleges and campuses.

A petition provides an opportunity for a student to receive consideration on extenuating circumstances affecting their progress. A petition typically contains a letter and transcript from the student, and supporting documents from advisers, instructors, physicians, or other appropriate professionals. The final decision by the Subcommittee on Undergraduate Petition Review represents an effort to weigh the personal circumstances of the individual while maintaining the academic standards of the University.

There are many factors that can cause the number of student petition submissions to vary from year to year, and this is normal. Every student petition is unique, and students submit petitions based on extenuating circumstances beyond their control that affected their academic performance. Fluctuations in numbers of petitions submitted reflects the types of issues students are dealing with at a certain point in their academic career, and in their personal lives.

Due to the Coronavirus Pandemic, Senate Policy 49-70 Supplemental Satisfactory Grade/Passing Grade/No Grade Grading System - Baccalaureate and Associate Degree Candidates was enacted for the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 terms. Enacting Senate Policy 49-70 meant that students had the opportunity to choose alternative grades in place of conventional quality grades. This caused unusual fluctuations in petition numbers. For the 2020-2021 academic year, the increase of $191 \%$ for the number of LionPATH petitions resulted from students familiarizing themselves with using the alternative grading tool in LionPATH. Also, reduction in the number of petitions for the following petition types resulted due to students choosing to petition for alternative grading instead:

- Retroactive late drops-decreased by $48 \%$
- Retroactive withdrawals-decreased by $37 \%$
- Reduction in Length of Academic Suspension-decreased by $57 \%$
- Stay of Suspension-decreased by $50 \%$
- Stay of Dismissal-decreased by $67 \%$
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# Appendix P 

$4 / 26 / 22$
TABLE \#1
COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF PETITIONS
2019-2020; 2020-2021

| College or Campus | 2020-2021 <br> Submitted | 2020-2021 <br> Petition \% based on unit enrollment | 2020-2021 <br> Approved | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2020-2021 } \\ \text { Not } \\ \text { Approved } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2020-2021 <br> Cncl/Pndg | 2019-2020 Submitted | \% <br> Increase/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agricultural Sciences | 26 | 1.3 | 24 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 4\% |
| Arts and Architecture | 32 | 2.5 | 29 | 3 | 0 | 25 | 28\% |
| Business | 105 | 2.1 | 97 | 5 | 3 | 48 | 119\% |
| Communications | 55 | 2.2 | 49 | 5 | 1 | 34 | 62\% |
| Div. of Undergrad. Studies | 110 | 3.2 | 104 | 4 | 2 | 61 | 80\% |
| Earth and Mineral Sciences | 22 | 1.6 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 52 | -58\% |
| Education | 29 | 2.0 | 25 | 4 | 0 | 17 | 71\% |
| Engineering | 173 | 2.2 | 158 | 11 | 4 | 83 | 108\% |
| Health and Human Dev. | 54 | 1.4 | 45 | 8 | 1 | 50 | 8\% |
| Information Sci. \& Tech. | 44 | 2.5 | 41 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 91\% |
| Liberal Arts | 189 | 3.7 | 164 | 20 | 5 | 140 | 35\% |
| Nursing | 3 | 0.6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 200\% |
| Science | 41 | 1.2 | 38 | 2 | 1 | 40 | 3\% |
| Abington | 45 | 1.3 | 44 | 1 | 0 | 38 | 18\% |
| Altoona | 32 | 1.1 | 30 | 2 | 0 | 38 | -16\% |
| Berks | 30 | 1.3 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 43\% |
| Erie | 58 | 1.7 | 54 | 4 | 0 | 66 | -12\% |
| Harrisburg | 83 | 1.9 | 75 | 4 | 4 | 52 | 60\% |
| University College | 8 |  | 7 | 1 | 0 | 13 | -38\% |
| Beaver | 5 | 0.9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7 | -29\% |
| Brandywine | 14 | 1.1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 56\% |
| DuBois | 6 | 1.2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 100\% |
| Fayette | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | -80\% |
| Greater Allegheny | 2 | 0.5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -33\% |
| Hazleton | 10 | 1.9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 900\% |
| Lehigh Valley | 17 | 1.8 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 42\% |
| Mont Alto | 10 | 1.4 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 67\% |
| New Kensington | 6 | 1.1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 100\% |
| Schuylkill | 4 | 0.6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | -33\% |
| Scranton | 9 | 0.9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 350\% |
| Shenango | 10 | 2.7 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 233\% |
| Wilkes-Barre | 2 | 0.6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0\% |
| York | 10 | 1.3 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 11\% |
| TOTALS | 1245 |  | 1139 | 82 | 24 | 898 | 39\% |

NOTE: Data represents the total number of petitions submitted for each academic unit. These numbers include specialized petitions where applicable (i.e., World Campus, eLion/LionPATH, Trauma, and Appeal petitions).

| College or Campus | Academic Renewal | Corrected Grade | Course Cancel | Late <br> Add | Late <br> Drop | Late <br> Registration | Reduction <br> in Length of <br> Academic <br> Suspension | $\begin{gathered} \text { Registration } \\ \text { Cancel } \end{gathered}$ |  | Stay of Academic Suspension | Withdrawal | Other | Alternative Grading |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agricultural Sciences | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 14 |
| Arts and Architecture | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 |
| Business | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 82 |
| Communications | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 36 |
| Div. of Undergrad. Studies | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 2 | 62 |
| Earth and Mineral Sciences | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 |
| Education | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 18 |
| Engineering | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 117 |
| Health and Human Dev. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 2 | 29 |
| Information Sci. \& Tech. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 26 |
| Liberal Arts | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 50 | 7 | 79 |
| Nursing | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Science | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 15 |
| Abington | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 30 |
| Altoona | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 20 |
| Berks | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 16 |
| Erie | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 14 |
| Harrisburg | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 50 |
| University College | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| Beaver | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Brandywine | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| DuBois | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Fayette | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Greater Allegheny | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Hazleton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| Lehigh Valley | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 |
| Mont Alto | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 |
| New Kensington | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Schuylkill | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Scranton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Shenango | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Wilkes-Barre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| York | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| TOTALS | 9 | 20 | 13 | 48 | 160 | 2 | 3 | 27 | 1 | 2 | 245 | 37 | 678 |

NOTE: Data represents the total number of petitions per case type for each academic unit. These numbers include specialized petitions where applicable (i.e., World Campus, eLion/LionPATH, Trauma, and Appeal petitions).

## TABLE \#3: INCREASE/DECREASE IN SUBMITTED PETITIONS BY CASE TYPE 2019-2020 TO 2020-2021

| Case Type |  |  | \% of Increase/ <br> Decrease |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic Renewal | 2 | 9 | $350 \%$ |
| Alternative Grading System | 53 | 678 | $1179 \%$ |
| Corrected Grade | 16 | 20 | $25 \%$ |
| Course Cancel | 13 | 13 | $0 \%$ |
| Late Add | 47 | 48 | $2 \%$ |
| Late Drop | 307 | 160 | $-48 \%$ |
| Late Registration | 2 | 2 | $0 \%$ |
| Reduction in Length of Academic Suspension | 7 | 3 | $-57 \%$ |
| Registration Cancel | 26 | 27 | $4 \%$ |
| Stay of Academic Dismissal | 3 | 1 | $-67 \%$ |
| Stay of Academic Suspension | 4 | 2 | $50 \%$ |
| Withdrawal | 390 | 245 | $-37 \%$ |
| Other* | 28 | 37 | $32 \%$ |
| TOTALS | $\mathbf{8 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 \%}$ |
| World Campus | 103 | 79 | $-23 \%$ |
| LionPATH | 11 | 32 | $191 \%$ |
| Trauma | 29 | 13 | $-55 \%$ |
| Appeals | 39 | 24 | $-38 \%$ |

*Examples of "Other" petitions are changing withdrawal or late drop to retroactive administrative cancellation; changing number of credits for an internship; and changing late drop to retroactive regular drop.

## NOTE:

- A World Campus petition is one that involves requests for courses taken through World Campus.
- A LionPATH petition is one where a student indicates the unsuccessful use of LionPATH as the basis of the petition.
- A Trauma petition is one where the student's circumstances require unusual confidentiality (e.g., the victim of a sexual assault or violent crime).
- An Appeal petition is one where a student provides additional documentation to support a previously denied request.

TABLE \#4: THREE-YEAR SUMMARY OF PETITIONS BY CASE TYPE 2018-2019; 2019-2020; 2020-2021
Academic Year: 2018-2019
Overall Percentage Granted: 70\%

| Case Type | Submitted | Granted | Denied | Cncl/Pndg |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic Renewal | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| Corrected Grade | 44 | 42 | 1 | 1 |
| Course Cancel | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Late Add | 69 | 69 | 0 | 0 |
| Late Drop | 436 | 224 | 189 | 23 |
| Late Registration | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| Other* | 37 | 35 | 1 | 1 |
| Registration Cancel | 40 | 37 | 0 | 3 |
| Withdrawal | 396 | 301 | 83 | 12 |
| TOTALS | $\mathbf{1 0 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ |

Academic Year: 2019-2020
Overall Percentage Granted: 74\%

| Case Type | Submitted | Granted | Denied | Cncl/Pndg |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic Renewal | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Alternative Grading System | 53 | 50 | 0 | 3 |
| Corrected Grade | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| Course Cancel | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Late Add | 47 | 46 | 0 | 1 |
| Late Drop | 307 | 177 | 125 | 5 |
| Late Registration | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Reduction in Length of Academic Suspension | 7 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| Registration Cancel | 26 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| Stay of Academic Dismissal | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Stay of Academic Suspension | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Withdrawal | 390 | 299 | 75 | 15 |
| Other* | 28 | 28 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | $\mathbf{8 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 7}$ |

Academic Year: 2020-2021
Overall Percentage Granted: $91 \%$

| Case Type | Submitted | Granted | Denied | Cncl/Pndg |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic Renewal | 9 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| Alternative Grading System | 678 | 647 | 16 | 15 |
| Corrected Grade | 20 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| Course Cancel | 13 | 11 | 0 | 2 |
| Late Add | 48 | 48 | 0 | 0 |
| Late Drop | 160 | 127 | 29 | 4 |
| Late Registration | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduction in Length of Academic Suspension | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Registration Cancel | 27 | 27 | 0 | 0 |
| Stay of Academic Dismissal | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Stay of Academic Suspension | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Withdrawal | 245 | 211 | 32 | 2 |
| Other* | 37 | 34 | 3 | 0 |
| TOTALS | $\mathbf{1 2 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ |

*Examples of "Other" petitions are changing withdrawal or late drop to retroactive administrative cancellation; changing number of credits for an internship; and changing late drop to retroactive regular drop.

TABLE \#5: THREE-YEAR SUMMARY OF SPECIALIZED PETITIONS 2018-2019; 2019-2020; 2020-2021

Academic Year: 2018-2019

| Case Type | Submitted | Granted | Denied | Cncl/Pndg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| World Campus | 105 | 81 | 20 | 4 |
| LionPATH | 20 | 12 | 8 | 0 |
| Trauma | 47 | 46 | 1 | 0 |
| Appeals | 42 | 32 | 7 | 3 |

## Academic Year: 2019-2020

| Case Type | Submitted | Granted | Denied | Cncl/Pndg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| World Campus | 103 | 78 | 23 | 2 |
| LionPATH | 11 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| Trauma | 29 | 28 | 1 | 0 |
| Appeals | 39 | 31 | 8 | 0 |

## Academic Year: 2020-2021

| Case Type | Submitted | Granted | Denied | Cncl/Pndg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| World Campus | 79 | 62 | 14 | 3 |
| LionPATH | 32 | 28 | 3 | 1 |
| Trauma | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Appeals | 24 | 22 | 1 | 1 |

NOTE:

- A World Campus petition is one that involves requests for courses taken through World Campus.
- A LionPATH petition is one where a student indicates the unsuccessful use of LionPATH as the basis of the petition.
- A Trauma petition is one where a student's circumstances require unusual confidentiality (e.g., the victim of a sexual assault or violent crime).
- An Appeal petition is one where the student provides additional documentation to support a previously denied request.

NOTE: Numbers of specialized petitions displayed here are also included in the Comparative Summary of Petitions by College/Campus above. Data for specialized petitions is tracked due to specific interest in the numbers of World Campus, eLion/LionPATH, Trauma, and Appeal petitions submitted.

TABLE \#6: FIVE-YEAR SUMMARY OF MENTAL HEALTH RELATED PETITIONS
2016-2021

|  | Total <br> Number of <br> Petitions <br> Submitted | \% of Mental Health <br> Related Petitions based on <br> TOTAL Number of <br> Petitions Submitted | \% of Mental Health Related <br> Petitions based on Number of <br> WITHDRAWAL AND LATE <br> DROP Petitions Submitted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2016-2017$ | 1207 | $42 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| $2017-2018$ | 1120 | $46 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| $2018-2019$ | 1041 | $45 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| $2019-2020$ | 901 | $47 \%$ | $58 \%$ |
| $2020-2021$ | 1245 | $24 \%$ | $35 \%$ |

NOTE: Mental Health Related petitions are any that involve mental health issues (e.g., anxiety, depression, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)). Generally, mental health related petitions are for retroactive withdrawals and retroactive late drops. Therefore, it is important to reflect these data in the report, along with the percentages of the total number of petitions submitted.

Note: Due to students' multiple reasons for petitioning, numbers will not always total $100 \%$.

## REGISTRATION CANCELLATION PETITIONS

## 27 Granted <br> 0 Denied <br> 0 Cancelled/Pending <br> 27 TOTAL

## Reasons for Petition

- Financial difficulties: 4 (15\%)
- Illness/death of family member or friend: 4 (15\%)
- Mental health: 3 (11\%)
- Military: 1 (4\%)
- Work/School conflicts: 1 (4\%)
- *Other: 19 (70\%)
*Examples of "Other" reasons for petitioning for retroactive registration cancellation are miscommunications; family conflict; and confusing non-attendance with cancelling.


## COURSE CANCELLATION PETITIONS

11 Granted
0 Denied
2 Cancelled/Pending
13 TOTAL

## Reasons for Petition

- Financial: 1 (8\%)
- Illness/death of family member or friend: 1 (8\%)
- Medical: 1 (8\%)
- Mental health: 3 (23\%)
- *Other: 10 (77\%)
*Examples of "Other" reasons for petitioning for retroactive course cancellation are course overload; student/instructor conflicts; and alleged administrative errors.

| $\mathbf{2}$ | Granted |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0 | Denied |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | Cancelled/Pending |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | TOTAL |

## Reasons for Petition

- Financial difficulties: 2 ( $100 \%$ )
- *Other: 2 ( $100 \%$ )
*Examples of "Other" reasons for petitioning for retroactive late registration are confusion about regular and internship scheduling and financial issues.


## LATE ADD PETITIONS

| 48 | Granted |
| ---: | :--- |
| 0 | Denied |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | Cancelled/Pending |
| $\mathbf{4 8}$ | TOTAL |

## Reasons for Petition

- Financial difficulties: 2 (4\%)
- Illness/death of family member or friend: 1 (2\%)
- Medical: 2 (4\%)
- *Other: 44 (92\%)
*Examples of "Other" reasons for petitioning for retroactive late add are administrative error; accidentally dropping course; confusion about adding Internship; Research, ROTC, or Independent Study courses; financial issues; and student thought department/adviser added course.


## CORRECTED GRADE PETITIONS

## 20 Granted <br> 0 Denied <br> 0 Cancelled/Pending <br> 20 TOTAL

## Reasons for Petition

- Illness/death of family member or friend: 2 (10\%)
- Medical: 1 (5\%)
- Mental health: 3 ( $15 \%$ )
- *Other: 18 (90\%)
*Examples of "Other" reasons for petitioning for retroactive corrected grade are Internship timelines; instructor failed to report grade; student/instructor conflicts; and deferred or Independent Study completed.

| $\mathbf{8}$ | Granted |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Denied |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | Cancelled/Pending |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | TOTAL |

Reason for Petition

- Illness/death of family member or friend: 2 (22\%)
- Mental Health: 1 (11\%)
- Military: 1 (11\%)
- Work/School conflicts: 1 (11\%)
- Other: 7 (78\%)


## Reasons for Denial (1 Denied)

- Insufficient documentation: 1 (100\%)
- College/Campus not supportive: 1 (100\%)
*Examples of "Other" reasons for petitioning for academic renewal are attaining academic renewal prior to the 4 -year absence and attaining academic renewal while having a previous cumulative GPA that was not below 2.00.


## REDUCTION IN LENGTH OF ACADEMIC SUSPENSION PETITIONS

## 2 Granted <br> 0 Denied <br> 1 Cancelled/Pending <br> 3 TOTAL

Reasons for Petition

- Illness/death of family member or friend: 1 (33\%)
- Mental health: 2 (67\%)


## STAY OF ACADEMIC SUSPENSION PETITIONS

| $\mathbf{2}$ | Granted |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | Denied |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | Cancelled/Pending |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | TOTAL |

## Reasons for Petition

- Financial difficulties: 1 (50\%)
- Illness/death of family member or friend: 1 ( $50 \%$ )
- Mental health: 1 ( $50 \%$ )

| 0 | Granted |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Denied |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | Cancelled/Pending |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | TOTAL |

Reasons for Petition

- Financial difficulties: 1 (100\%)
- Illness/death of family member or friend: 1 ( $100 \%$ )
- Mental health: 1 (100\%)


## Reasons for Denial (1 Denied)

- Insufficient documentation: 1 (100\%)


## LATE DROP PETITIONS

127 Granted
29 Denied
4 Cancelled/Pending
160 TOTAL

## Reasons for Petition

- Financial difficulties: 9 (7\%)
- Illness/death of family member or friend: 29 (18\%)
- Medical: 48 ( $30 \%$ )
- Mental health: 71 ( $44 \%$ )
- Military: 2 (1\%)
- Work/School conflicts: 4 (3\%)
- LionPATH: 6 (4\%)
- *Other: 63 (39\%)
*Examples of "Other" reasons for petitioning for retroactive late drop are confusion about late drop procedure/date; not enough time to evaluate anticipated grade; adjustment issues; family issues; and student/instructor conflicts.

Reasons for Denial (29 Denied)

- College/Campus not supportive: 8 (28\%)
- Insufficient documentation: 20 (69\%)
- Insufficient extenuating circumstances: 8 (28\%)
- Selective drop: 1 (3\%)
- Time frame documented does not match request: 4 (14\%)
- No reason for not completing action in timely manner: 15 (52\%)
- Other: 13 (45\%)


## ALTERNATIVE GRADING PETITIONS

| 647 | Granted |
| ---: | :--- |
| 16 | Denied |
| 15 | Cancelled/Pending |
| 678 | TOTAL |

## Reasons for Petition

- Financial difficulties: 12 (2\%)
- Illness/death of family member or friend: 38 (6\%)
- LionPATH: 20 (3\%)
- Medical: 24 (4\%)
- Mental health: 39 (6\%)
- Work/School conflicts: 9 (1\%)
- *Other: 594 (88\%)
*Examples of "Other" reasons for petitioning for alternative grading are not understanding alternative grading policies and for which terms they were enacted; and not understanding how alternative grades would affect entrance to majors or acceptance into graduate school.


## Reasons for Denial (16 Denied)

- Insufficient documentation: 6 (38\%)
- Insufficient extenuating circumstances: 8 (50\%)
- No reason for not completing action in timely manner: 10 (63\%)


## OTHER PETITIONS

| 34 | Granted |
| ---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Denied |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | Cancelled/Pending |
| $\mathbf{3 7}$ | TOTAL |

## Reasons for Petition

- Financial difficulties: 4 (11\%)
- Illness/death of family member or friend: 2 (5\%)
- LionPATH: 20 (54\%)
- Medical: 2 (5\%)
- Mental health: 2 (5\%)
- Military: 1 (\%)
- Work/School conflicts: 1 (3\%)
- *Other: 32 (86\%)
*Examples of "Other" petitions are changing withdrawal or late drop to retroactive administrative cancellation; changing number of credits for an internship; and changing late drop to retroactive regular drop. "Other" Reasons correspond with these issues.


## Reasons for Denial (3 Denied)

- College/Campus not supportive: 2 ( $67 \%$ )
- Insufficient documentation: 1 (33\%)
- Insufficient extenuating circumstances: 2 (67\%)

211 Granted
32 Denied
2 Cancelled/Pending
245 TOTAL
Reasons for Petition

- Financial difficulties: 13 (5\%)
- Illness/death of family member or friend: 68 (28\%)
- LionPATH: 6 (2\%)
- Medical: 65 (27\%)
- Mental health: 175 (71\%)
- Military: 3 ( $1 \%$ )
- Work/School conflicts: 7 (3\%)
- *Other: 46 (19\%)
*Examples of "Other" reasons for petitioning for retroactive withdrawal are family issues, relationship issues; transportation issues; and relocation.

Reasons for Denial (32 Denied)

- College/Campus not supportive: 7 ( $22 \%$ )
- Insufficient documentation: 27 (84\%)
- Insufficient extenuating circumstances: 4 (13\%)
- No reason for not completing action in timely manner: 17 (53\%)
- Selective withdrawal: 4 (13\%)
- Time frame documented does not match request: 5 (16\%)


# SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS AND INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS 

Faculty Tenure Flow Annual Report - March 2022

(Informational)

## Executive Summary

During academic year 2014-15, 138 faculty members entered the tenure track for the first time. At the end of a seven-year period, $75(54 \%)$ had achieved tenure. Those not achieving tenure were not necessarily denied tenure. Several individuals had longer tenure paths due to stays or the newly offered Covid extension. ${ }^{1}$ As of August 2021, 30 individuals had taken at least one stay, and 15 (out of an eligible pool of 26) took Covid extensions. Eighteen of these individuals ( $13 \%$ of the original cohort) were still on path, being up for review, taking an extension, or still progressing (including one ten-year track individual). Table 1 summarizes the numbers.

Table 1: Totals and Tenure Rates for Cohort 2014-15 as of October 2021

| Cohort <br> Year | \# <br> Entrants | \# <br> Tenured | \% <br> Tenured | \# On Path <br> Fall 21 | \% On <br> Path |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014-15 | 138 | 75 | $54 \%$ | 18 | $13 \%$ |


| Took <br> Stay* | Took <br> Extension* | Eligible for <br> Extension |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 | 15 | 26 |

The full report provides information on characteristics of entrants and tenure achievement rates, as well as the number of reviews and positive recommendations during the second-, fourth-, and sixthyear reviews. New for this year's report is a summary of tenure stays and Covid extensions.

Key findings include the following:

- At least for this year and probably throughout the period affected by the Covid extension, many provisional faculty members are taking longer than seven years to achieve tenure. As of Fall 202118 were still on path.
- Women outnumber men in taking stays (19 to 11 or $63 \%$ to $37 \%$ ) and extensions ( 12 to 3 or $19 \%$ to $4 \%$ ). Fourteen out of the 18 individuals still on path were women.
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## Introduction

For over 20 years, Penn State has analyzed the rates at which provisionally appointed (tenure track) faculty members achieve tenure. Tabulations are shared with Penn State's administrative and academic leadership and with the University Faculty Senate. This report and an archive of prior years' reports are available on the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research's web page (https://opair.psu.edu/institutional-research/projects/faculty-tenure-flow-rates/). This report is conducted at the request of and provided to the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Faculty Senate.

## Distribution of Penn State Faculty

In Fall 2014, Penn State employed 6,000 full-time faculty members, including lecturers, librarians, and research faculty (Table 2). Of these, $48 \%$ were tenure line. By Fall 2021, this number was 6,462, with $47 \%$ being tenure line. Since both Fall 2020 and Fall 2021 were exceptional years due to the Covid-19 pandemic, Fall 2019 is also provided for comparison.

Table 2: Full-Time Faculty ${ }^{2}$ by Tenure Status: Fall $2014^{3}$ compared with Fall 2019 ${ }^{4}$, 2020, and 2021

|  | Fall 2014 |  | Fall 2019 |  | Fall 2020 |  | Fall 2021 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Faculty type | Number | $\%$ | Number | $\%$ | Number | $\%$ | Number | $\%$ |
| Tenured | 2,239 | $37 \%$ | 2,145 | $34 \%$ | 2,161 | $33 \%$ | 2,169 | $34 \%$ |
| Tenure track <br> (Provisional) | 640 | $11 \%$ | 884 | $14 \%$ | 910 | $14 \%$ | 898 | $14 \%$ |
| Subtotal <br> Tenure Line <br> Faculty | $\mathbf{2 , 8 7 9}$ | $48 \%$ | 3,029 | $47 \%$ | 3,071 | $47 \%$ | 3,067 | $47 \%$ |
| Other | 3,121 | $52 \%$ | 3,363 | $53 \%$ | 3,395 | $53 \%$ | 3,395 | $53 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{6 , 3 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 4 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 4 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

The years leading up to 2014 were part of a long-term trend where the number of overall faculty slowly increased. This trend continued through 2021 as virtually the same number of faculty were employed during Fall 2020 and Fall 2021. The slight dip in tenured faculty from 2014 to 2019 can be attributed to the VRP (Voluntary Retirement Program) of 2016-17, as can the subsequent rise in tenure track faculty during the following years to maintain tenure-line numbers. Despite Covid pandemic stressors, the faculty counts remained steady, at least at the overall University level. This lack of volatility, especially within tenure-line faculty, suggests that policies such as tenure stays and the Covid extension (both discussed later) likely contributed to the stability and, at the very least, were not detrimental.

[^3]
## Tenure-Track Progression of Assistant Professors <br> Overall Statistics

Tenure rates are calculated from the time of appointment through the seventh year, which allows for a year of tenure stay during the provisional period. While unusual for a faculty member to stop the tenure clock more than once, University policy does allow it. The cohort of 2014 saw eight individuals take two stays during their provisional period while 22 took one stay. Table 3 shows the typical timeline for those on the tenure-track. Those taking no time off would go up for tenure in 2019-2020 and, if successful, have tenure conferred on June 30, 2020, at the end of Year 6. Those taking one stay with no other pauses would go up for review in 2020-2021 and have tenure conferred on June $30^{\text {th }}, 2021$, at the end of Year 7.

Table 3: "Typical" Tenure-Track Timeline for the 2014 Cohort

| Time | Year | Event |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| July 1, 2014 |  | Effective date of appointment on the tenure track |
| $2014-2015$ | 1 | Annual review |
| $2015-2016$ | 2 | Second-year review |
| $2016-2017$ | 3 | Annual review |
| $2017-2018$ | 4 | Fourth-year review |
| $2018-2019$ | 5 | Annual review |
| $2019-2020$ | 6 | Sixth-year review (for tenure decision) |
| June 30, 2020 |  | Tenure conferred at end of Year 6 |

The 2014 cohort is complicated by the ongoing pandemic and the resulting temporary option to extend the provisional period by one year for anyone on path during 2020. Fifteen individuals in the 2014 cohort chose to take this extension. The number of stays (38) and extensions (15) suggest that the seven-year tenure rate of $54 \%$ for the cohort will continue to increase. As of Fall 2021, 18 individuals are still on path, ${ }^{5}$ representing $13 \%$ of the original 2014 cohort.

Table 4 (below) shows the tenure achievement rates for each cohort disaggregated by gender. Race and ethnicity are shown in a later table. Over the past ten cohort years, 1,340 faculty members have entered provisional status at Penn State at all locations. ${ }^{6}$ During 2014, 138 faculty members started the tenure path and 75 had achieved tenure by June 30, 2021, including eight individuals receiving early tenure.

[^4]Table 4: Overall Tenure Rates Since 2002-03 by Gender

|  | Total |  |  | Female |  |  | Male |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cohort | Entrants | Tenured |  | Entrants | Tenured | Entrants | Tenured |  |  |
| Cohort | N | N | $\%$ | N | N | $\%$ | N | N | $\%$ |
| $2002-03$ | 156 | 105 | $67 \%$ | 65 | 40 | $62 \%$ | 91 | 65 | $71 \%$ |
| $2003-04$ | 145 | 88 | $61 \%$ | 65 | 41 | $63 \%$ | 80 | 47 | $59 \%$ |
| $2004-05$ | 133 | 76 | $57 \%$ | 43 | 21 | $49 \%$ | 90 | 55 | $61 \%$ |
| $2005-06$ | 147 | 83 | $56 \%$ | 65 | 32 | $49 \%$ | 82 | 51 | $62 \%$ |
| $2006-07$ | 134 | 77 | $57 \%$ | 64 | 34 | $53 \%$ | 70 | 43 | $61 \%$ |
| $2007-08$ | 159 | 101 | $64 \%$ | 67 | 35 | $52 \%$ | 92 | 66 | $72 \%$ |
| $2008-09$ | 162 | 89 | $55 \%$ | 59 | 31 | $53 \%$ | 103 | 58 | $56 \%$ |
| $2009-10$ | 130 | 72 | $55 \%$ | 57 | 27 | $47 \%$ | 73 | 45 | $62 \%$ |
| $2010-11$ | 138 | 82 | $59 \%$ | 59 | 35 | $59 \%$ | 79 | 47 | $59 \%$ |
| $2011-12$ | 81 | 52 | $64 \%$ | 36 | 22 | $61 \%$ | 45 | 30 | $67 \%$ |
| $2012-13$ | 112 | 59 | $53 \%$ | 47 | 22 | $47 \%$ | 65 | 37 | $57 \%$ |
| $2013-147$ | 139 | 91 | $65 \%$ | 58 | 34 | $59 \%$ | 81 | 57 | $70 \%$ |
| $2014-15$ | 138 | 75 | $54 \%$ | 63 | 32 | $51 \%$ | 75 | 43 | $57 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ Yr Tot | 607 | 359 |  | 263 | 145 |  | 345 | 214 |  |
| $\mathbf{5 Y r}$ Yvg | 121.6 | 71.8 | $59 \%$ | 52.6 | 29 | $55 \%$ | 69 | 42.8 | $62 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ Yr Tot | 1339 | 781 |  | 575 | 304 |  | 765 | 477 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ Yr Avg | 133.9 | 78.1 | $58 \%$ | 57.5 | 30.4 | $53 \%$ | 76.5 | 47.7 | $62 \%$ |
| All Yrs Tot | 1773 | 1050 |  | 748 | 406 | 1026 | 601 |  |  |
| All Yrs Avg | 136.4 | 80.8 | $59 \%$ | 57.5 | 31.2 | $54 \%$ | 77.9 | 49.5 | $64 \%$ |

Despite fluctuations in entering cohort size, the tenure achievement rate of each cohort has remained between $53 \%$ and $64 \%$ over the last 10 years. Figure 1 (below) shows that the proportion of tenure achievement within 7 years hovers between a high of $67 \%$ and a low of $53 \%$, which occurred in the cohort of 2012. As discussed previously, the 2014 figure of $54 \%$ is likely artificially low due to the number of stays and Covid extensions taken by cohort members. Figure 1 shows the rate for cohort 2014 with a broken line to indicate that the eight or nine-year tenure achievement will be higher, given the number of individuals still on path.

[^5]Figure 1: Count and Percent of All Entrants Achieving Tenure by Year


The Covid Pandemic and the 2020 Extension
While academic year 2019-20 started normally, in March of 2020 the State of Pennsylvania shut down and instructional activity went online. Travel for conferences, collaboration, or research was halted and faculty members worked from home, often in less-than-ideal conditions. The shutdown lasted into the spring semester of 2021, negatively affecting many provisional faculty members' progress towards tenure achievement.

In response to these circumstances, the University announced a one-year extension of the provisional tenure period for all faculty in their probationary period during calendar year 2020. ${ }^{8}$ The Covid extension is not a tenure stay, although it effectively acts as a stay since the tenure clock stops for both. However, while any faculty member is eligible to take a stay, only those who were on track during 2020 may take a Covid extension. ${ }^{9}$ Additionally, while multiple stays are allowed, only one Covid extension may be taken. If a faculty member takes it but then decides to rescind it, they cannot take it again later. Several faculty members (14 out of 26) opted to take both an extension and a stay.

During the Fall 2020, 26 of 138 individuals remained from the 2014 cohort who were eligible for the extension (

Table 5). A total of 15 individuals (58\%), took the extension. No one from the 2014 cohort rescinded their extension.

[^6]
## Table 5: Extensions

| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ <br> Cohort | Eligible for <br> Extension | Took <br> Extension | \% of <br> Eligible |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 138 | 26 | 15 | $58 \%$ |

Tenure Stays
Tenure stays, which stop the tenure clock for a year, may be granted for reasons including (but not limited to) medical, family, and personal reasons. For the cohort of $2014,30(22 \%)$ out of the 138 entrants took a stay and eight of these individuals took a second stay, for a total of 38 stays. No one took a third stay. The stays occurred across the probationary period with the majority happening in the third (8), fourth (9), and fifth (10) years.

Table 6: Timing of Stays taken by the 2014 Cohort

| Stays | $2014-15$ | $2015-16$ | $2016-17$ | $2017-18$ | $2018-19$ | $2019-20$ | No Stay <br> Taken | Grand Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Not Taken |  |  |  |  |  |  | 108 | 108 |
| Taken | $\mathbf{1}$ | 6 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 4 |  | 38 |
| Stay\#1 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 2 |  | 30 |
| Stay \#2 |  |  |  | 2 | 4 | 2 |  | 8 |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{1}$ | 6 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 4 | 108 |  |

Table 7 provides statistics for tenure achievement within seven years for those taking stays and not taking stays. Only nine out of the thirty individuals (30\%) taking a stay ended up achieving tenure within this timeframe.

Table 7: Tenure Achievement and Stay-Taking

|  | Not Tenured <br> in 7 Yrs | $\%$ | Tenured <br> in 7 Yrs | $\%$ | Total | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Did not Take Stay | 43 | $40 \%$ | 65 | $60 \%$ | 108 | $100 \%$ |
| Took Stay | 21 | $70 \%$ | 9 | $30 \%$ | 30 | $100 \%$ |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{6 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

The above statistic, however, must be taken in context. Table 8 (below) indicates that many individuals took combinations of stays and extensions. Out of the thirty individuals taking at least one stay, eight also took an extension (details regarding extensions are covered in the next section). Thus, it would be more accurate to say that out of the twenty two individuals taking one stay and no extension, nine ( $41 \%$ ) achieved tenure within seven years while five ( $23 \%$ ) did not. No one on the six-year path without tenure credit would be able to take two stays or a stay plus extension and still
achieve tenure in seven years. However, with eighteen individuals still on track in Fall 2021 many are likely to achieve tenure within eight years.

The "on path during 2020" extension criteria falls on this cohort's Year 7. Thus, it was extemely unlikely that someone would still be on path to take an extension without having taken at least one prior stay. However, the tenure clock also stops for individuals who are on Leave No Pay status for more than six months at a time. Thus, one person ended up taking an extension with no prior stays.

Table 8: Seven-Year Tenure Achievement by Stays and Extensions

|  | Took 1 Stay | \% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Took } 2 \\ & \text { Stays } \end{aligned}$ | \% | No Stays | \% | Total Count | Total \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tenured within 7 Years <br> No Extension | 9 | 41\% |  |  | 66 | 61\% | 75 | 54\% |
| Not Tenured within 7 Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Extension | 5 | 23\% | 2 | 25\% | 41 | 38\% | 48 | 35\% |
| Took Extension | 8 | 36\% | 6 | 75\% | 1 | 1\% | 15 | 11\% |
| Total | 22 | 100\% | 8 | 13\% | 108 | 100\% | 138 | 100\% |

With Table 8 showing various permutations of stopping the clock and the overlap between stays and extensions, it should be noted that 31 individuals ( $22 \%$ ) stopped the clock in some way (Table 9). On one hand, this number is in line with anecdotal evidence from previous cohorts regarding the number of stays. On the other hand, 31 is somewhat low considering the total number of individual extensions/stays taken ( 53 , or 15 extensions and 38 stays).

## Table 9: Stopping the Clock

|  | Count | \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Stopped the clock at least once | 31 | $22 \%$ |
| Did not stop the clock | 107 | $78 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

## Gender

In 2014, 63 women entered the tenure path and $32(51 \%)$ achieved tenure by Spring 2021 (Table 4). During the same time, 75 men entered and 43 achieved tenure ( $57 \%$ ). These numbers are in line with previously documented trends in the Spring 2021 version of this report. ${ }^{10}$ Over the last decade

[^7]nearly one third more men than women have entered the tenure track and a greater proportion typically receive tenure at the end of seven years. Notably, as of Fall 2021 eighteen individuals were still on path and fourteen of these were women. The overall tenure rate for women in the 2014 cohort will likely be higher.

Figure 2: Tenure Achievement Counts and Percentages by Gender


The male and female tenure rates reflect the percent of people who achieved tenure within seven years. However, the number of people who are denied tenure cannot be derived from the remainder even if discounting the 18 individuals still on path. Table 10 shows that many faculty members left prior to 2019 during what are typically Years 2, 4, and 5.

Table 10: Number Leaving Penn State by Gender

|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | Total <br> Leaving | In <br> Cohort | \% Leaving |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 18 | 63 | $29 \%$ |
| Male |  | 6 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 29 | 75 | $39 \%$ |
| Total Leaving | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{4 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 \%}$ |

Notably, Table 10 shows that although women enter in smaller numbers, they left at a lower rate than did men during the first seven years on path. Couple this with the statistic that 14 out of the 18 individuals still on path are women, it is not unreasonable to hypothesize that the overall tenure rates for men and women will be similar even though the seven-year rates favor men. The findings of this report suggest that one measurement at the close of Year 7 is not enough to understand tenure achievement patterns for this cohort. Reporting should continue at least through Year 8.

## Gender and the Covid extension

Out of the 26 individuals eligible to take the Covid-19 extension in 2020, 18 were women and 8 were men. While roughly the same number of men and women decided to forego the extension (6 women and 5 men ), the six women represented $33 \%$ of eligible women while the 5 men represented $62 \%$ of the eligible men. On the other hand, disproportionally more women ( $67 \%$ versus $38 \%$ of men) chose to take the extension. This choice helps explain the disproportionate number of women still on path in Fall 2021 (14 women as opposed to 4 men).

## Table 11: Extensions by Gender

|  | Did not Take | \% | Took <br> Extension | \% | Total <br> Count | Total \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 6 | $33 \%$ | 12 | $67 \%$ | 18 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 5 | $62 \%$ | 3 | $38 \%$ | 8 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 11 | $\mathbf{4 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

## Gender and Tenure Stays

Women, though fewer in number within the cohort, took little over twice as many stays as did men (19 versus 11). Moreover, seven out of eight of the second stay takers were women (not shown). However, it is too soon to know the tenure outcome as many of these individuals are still on path. One or two stays will delay additional salary monies but may be the difference between achieving and not achieving tenure.

Table 12: Stays by Gender

|  | Female | $\%$ | Male | $\%$ | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Did not take stay | 44 | $41 \%$ | 64 | $59 \%$ | 108 | $100 \%$ |
| Took stay | 12 | $55 \%$ | 10 | $45 \%$ | 22 | $100 \%$ |
| Took 2 stays | 7 | $87 \%$ | 1 | $13 \%$ | 8 | $100 \%$ |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{6 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

## Race/Ethnicity

Table 13 (next page) shows the last five years of race/ethnicity data for the 2010-11 through 201415 cohorts while Table 14 and Table 15 break out men and women. This report only focuses on the years 2010-11 through 2014-15 due to changes in data collection in 2006-07 and again in 2010 that make comparisons misleading. ${ }^{11}$

[^8]
## Table 13: Entrants by Race/Ethnicity Since 2010-11

| Cohort | Total |  |  | Asian |  |  | Black |  |  | Hispanic |  |  | American Indian/ Native Alaskan |  |  | International |  |  | Multi-Racial |  |  | Unknown |  |  | White |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entrants | Tenured |  | Entrants | Tenured |  | Entrants | Tenured |  | Entrants | Tenured |  | Entrants | Tenured |  | Entrants | Tenured |  | En- <br> trants <br> N | Tenured |  | En- <br> trants <br> N | Tenured |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { En- } \\ \text { trants } \end{gathered}$ | Tenured |  |
|  | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% |  | N | \% |  | N | \% |  | N | \% |
| 2010-11 | 138 | 82 | 59\% | 4 | 1 | 25\% | 7 | 4 | 57\% | 8 | 5 | 63\% | 2 | 1 | 50\% | 30 | 13 | 43\% |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 100\% | 83 | 54 | 65\% |
| 2011-12 | 81 | 52 | 64\% | 6 | 5 | 83\% | 3 | 2 | 67\% | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 18 | 12 | 67\% |  |  |  | 6 | 3 | 50\% | 46 | 28 | 61\% |
| 2012-13 | 112 | 59 | 53\% | 14 | 10 | 71\% | 2 | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 2 | 67\% |  |  |  | 25 | 12 | 48\% | 1 |  | 0\% | 9 | 4 | 44\% | 58 | 30 | 52\% |
| 2013-14 | 139 | 90 | 65\% | 7 | 5 | 71\% | 3 | 1 | 33\% | 6 | 5 | 83\% |  |  |  | 31 | 19 | 61\% | 1 |  | 0\% | 12 | 7 | 58\% | 79 | 53 | 67\% |
| 2014-15 | 138 | 75 | 54\% | 9 | 6 | 67\% | 6 | 2 | 33\% | 7 | 1 | 14\% |  |  |  | 39 | 21 | 54\% |  |  |  | 7 | 7 |  | 70 | 38 | 54\% |
| 5 Yr Tot | 608 | 358 |  | 40 | 27 |  | 21 | 10 |  | 25 | 14 |  | 3 | 2 |  | 143 | 77 |  | 2 | 0 |  | 38 | 25 |  | 336 | 203 |  |
| 5 Yr Avg | 121.6 | 71.6 | 59\% | 8 | 5.4 | 68\% | 4.2 | 2 | 48\% | 5 | 2.8 | 56\% | 0.75 | 0.5 | 67\% | 28.6 | 15.4 | 54\% | 0.5 | 0 | 0\% | 7.6 | 5 | 66\% | 67.2 | 40.6 | 60\% |

## Table 14: Women by Race/Ethnicity

|  | Total |  |  | Asian |  |  | Black |  |  | Hispanic |  |  | Amer Indian/ Nat Alaskan |  |  | International |  |  | Multi-Racial |  |  | Unknown |  |  | White |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entrants | Tenured |  | En- <br> trants | Tenured |  | Entrants | Tenured |  | Entrants | Tenured |  | En- <br> trants | Tenured |  | En- <br> trants | Tenured |  | En- <br> trants | Tenured |  | En- <br> trants | Tenured |  | Entrants <br> N | Tenured |  |
| Cohort | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% |  | N | \% |
| 2010-11 | 59 | 37 | 63\% | 2 |  | 0\% | 2 | 2 | 100\% | 4 | 2 | 50\% | 2 | 1 | 50\% | 11 | 4 | 36\% |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 100\% | 36 | 26 | 72\% |
| 2011-12 | 36 | 23 | 64\% | 3 | 2 | 67\% | 2 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 1 |  | 0\% | 3 | 2 | 67\% |  |  |  | 4 | 1 | 25\% | 23 | 16 | 70\% |
| 2012-13 | 47 | 22 | 47\% | 5 | 3 | 60\% | 2 | 1 | 50\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 3 | 33\% |  |  |  | 6 | 3 | 50\% | 25 | 12 | 48\% |
| 2013-14 | 58 | 34 | 59\% | 3 | 2 | 67\% | 2 |  | 0\% | 2 | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  | 6 | 1 | 17\% | 1 |  | 0\% | 6 | 5 | 83\% | 38 | 24 | 63\% |
| 2014-15 | 63 | 32 | 51\% | 2 | 2 | 100\% | 5 | 1 | 20\% | 4 | 1 | 25\% |  |  |  | 13 | 5 | 38\% |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 100\% | 36 | 20 | 53\% |
| 5 Yr Tot | 263 | 148 |  | 15 | 9 |  | 13 | 5 |  | 11 | 6 |  | 3 | 1 |  | 42 | 15 |  | 1 |  |  | 21 | 14 |  | 158 | 98 |  |
| 5 Yr Avg | 52.6 | 29.6 | 56\% | 3 | 2.25 | 75\% | 2.6 | 1.25 | 48\% | 2.75 | 1.5 | 55\% | 1.5 | 1 | 67\% | 8.4 | 3 | 36\% | 1 |  | 0\% | 4.2 | 2.8 | 67\% | 31.6 | 19.6 | 62\% |

Table 15: Men by Race/Ethnicity

|  | Total |  |  | Asian |  |  | Black |  |  | Hispanic |  |  | Amer. Indian/ Nat. Alaskan |  |  | International |  |  | Multi-Racial |  |  | Unknown |  |  | White |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entrants | Tenured |  | Entrants | Tenured |  | Entrants | Tenured |  | Entrants | Tenured |  | Entrants | Tenured |  | En- <br> trants | Tenured |  | Entrants | Tenured |  | Entrants | Tenured |  | Entrants N | Tenured |  |
| Cohort | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% | N | N | \% |  | N | \% |
| 2010-11 | 79 | 48 | 61\% | 2 | 1 | 50\% | 5 | 3 | 60\% | 4 | 3 | 75\% |  | 1 |  | 19 | 10 | 53\% |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 100\% | 47 | 29 | 62\% |
| 2011-12 | 45 | 30 | 67\% | 3 | 3 | 100\% | 1 | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 15 | 10 | 67\% |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 100\% | 23 | 13 | 57\% |
| 2012-13 | 65 | 37 | 57\% | 9 | 7 | 78\% |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | 67\% |  |  |  | 16 | 9 | 56\% | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 3 | 1 | 33\% | 33 | 18 | 55\% |
| 2013-14 | 81 | 56 | 69\% | 4 | 3 | 75\% | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 3 | 75\% |  |  |  | 25 | 18 | 72\% |  |  |  | 6 | 2 | 33\% | 41 | 29 | 71\% |
| 2014-15 | 75 | 43 | 57\% | 7 | 4 | 57\% | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 3 |  | 0\% |  |  |  | 26 | 16 | 62\% |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 100\% | 34 | 18 | 53\% |
| 5 Yr Tot | 345 | 214 |  | 25 | 18 |  | 8 | 6 |  | 14 | 8 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 101 | 63 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 17 | 11 |  | 178 | 107 |  |
| 5 Yr Avg | 69 | 42.8 | 62\% | 5 | 3.6 | 72\% | 2 | 1.5 | 75\% | 3.5 | 2.67 | 76\% | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 20.2 | 12.6 | 62\% | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 3.4 | 2.2 | 65\% | 36 | 21 | 60\% |

Figure 3 and Figure 4 display table totals in graphical format. The steady increase of international entrants is more easily seen in the graph. Likewise, the graph highlights the relatively flat lines for Black/African American entrants and Asian entrants. Although the number of White entrants has varied the most over time, they remain the largest group. The scale for Figure 4 has been increased for readability, as an increase or decrease in one of these groups would be hard to see at the scale of Figure 3.

Figure 3: Counts for White, International, Black, and Asian Entrants


Figure 4: Counts for Hispanic, American Indian/Nat. Alaskan, Multi-Racial, and Unknown Entrants*


* Note the scale change due to smaller numbers

While the number of entrants has fluctuated over the last five years, the overall proportions of each racial/ethnic group have remained similar (Table 16 below). White entrants account for at
least $50 \%$ of the entering pool. Asian, and Race/Ethnicity Unknown entrants fluctuate within a small range ( $3 \%-13 \%$ ). International entrants comprise the next largest group, the proportions of which have risen from $22 \%$ in 2010-11 to $28 \%$ in 2014-15. The proportion of Black and Hispanic entrants fell from already small numbers to one Hispanic entrant in 2011-12 and two Black entrants in 2012-13 and 2013-14. At no time did either of these groups see more than eight entrants within a year, and the proportion has not risen above $6 \%$, the high for Hispanics in 2010-11. During 2012-13 through 2014-15 there were no American Indian/Native Alaskan entrants and during 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2014-15 there were no multi-Racial entrants. Moreover, the number of entrants in both these groups has not exceeded one per year.

Table 16: Group Proportions by Cohort Year

|  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 |  | 2013-14 |  | 2014-15 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Race/Ethnicity | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% |
| Asian | 4 | $3 \%$ | 6 | $7 \%$ | 14 | $13 \%$ | 7 | $5 \%$ | 9 | $6 \%$ |
| Black | 7 | $5 \%$ | 3 | $4 \%$ | 2 | $2 \%$ | 3 | $3 \%$ | 6 | $4 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 8 | $6 \%$ | 1 | $1 \%$ | 3 | $3 \%$ | 6 | $4 \%$ | 7 | $5 \%$ |
| Am. Indian/Native Am. | 2 | $1 \%$ | 1 | $1 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ |
| International | 30 | $22 \%$ | 18 | $22 \%$ | 25 | $22 \%$ | 31 | $22 \%$ | 39 | $28 \%$ |
| Multi-Racial |  | $0 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ | 1 | $1 \%$ | 1 | $1 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ |
| Unknown | 4 | $3 \%$ | 6 | $7 \%$ | 9 | $8 \%$ | 12 | $8 \%$ | 7 | $5 \%$ |
| White | 83 | $60 \%$ | 46 | $57 \%$ | 58 | $52 \%$ | 79 | $56 \%$ | 70 | $51 \%$ |
| Total | 138 | $100 \%$ | $\mathbf{8 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | 112 | $100 \%$ | 139 | $100 \%$ | 138 | $100 \%$ |

## Race/Ethnicity and Covid Extensions

Extension-taking varied by group. Out of the 26 remaining individuals eligible to take the extension, sixteen chose to do so while others either went up for tenure or left the path. Table 17 shows the distribution by group. Table 18 shows the intersection of race/ethnicity and gender.

Table 17: Extension Taking by Race/Ethnicity

|  | Did not <br> Take | $\%$ | Took <br> Extension | $\%$ | Total Count | Total\% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Race/Ethnicity |  | $0 \%$ | 2 | $100 \%$ | 2 | $100 \%$ |
| Black/Afr. Amer. | 2 | $100 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ | 2 | $100 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 1 | $17 \%$ | 5 | $83 \%$ | 6 | $100 \%$ |
| International | 2 | $100 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ | 2 | $100 \%$ |
| Unknown | 6 | $43 \%$ | 8 | $57 \%$ | 14 | $100 \%$ |
| White | 11 | $42 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $58 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{1 1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 18: Extension Taking by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

| Gender | Black/Af. Amer. | International | White | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 2 | 4 | 6 | 12 |
| Male |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ |

## Race/Ethnicity and Tenure Stays

Numbers were generally too small to draw a conclusion for most groups. However, the two largest groups, White and International, had comparable stay-taking rates. Notably, the third largest group, Asian, did not have anyone who took a stay.

Table 19: Stay-Taking by Race/Ethnicity

|  | Did not Take <br> Stay |  | $\%$ | Took Stay | $\%$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | Total\%

Table 20 breaks out stays by race/ethnicity and gender. Although cohort 2014 only had four Hispanic women, two of these took a stay. Five of thirteen international women took a stay as well as ten of 36 White women. Comparatively, none of the three Hispanic men, three of 26 international men, and six of twenty-eight White men took stays.

Table 20: Stay-Taking by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

|  | Did not <br> Take stay | $\%$ | Took <br> Stay | $\%$ | Total <br> Count | Total \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 2 | $100 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ | 2 | $100 \%$ |
| Asian | 3 | $60 \%$ | 2 | $40 \%$ | 5 | $100 \%$ |
| Black | 2 | $50 \%$ | 2 | $50 \%$ | 4 | $100 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 8 | $62 \%$ | 5 | $38 \%$ | 13 | $100 \%$ |
| International | 3 | $100 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ | 3 | $100 \%$ |
| Unknown | 26 | $73 \%$ | 10 | $27 \%$ | 36 | $100 \%$ |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 7 | $100 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ | 7 | $100 \%$ |
| Asian | 1 | $100 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ | 1 | $100 \%$ |
| Black | 3 | $100 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ | 3 | $100 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 23 | $89 \%$ | 3 | $11 \%$ | 26 | $100 \%$ |
| International | 2 | $51 \%$ | 2 | $49 \%$ | 4 | $100 \%$ |
| Unknown | 28 | $82 \%$ | 6 | $18 \%$ | 34 | $100 \%$ |
| White | 108 | $78 \%$ | 30 | $22 \%$ | 138 | $100 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 23 |  |  |  |  |  |

The number of individuals still on path at the end of Year 7 raised the question of overall tenure achievement for previous cohorts. Table 21 below shows the numbers of individuals achieving tenure through 2021 for cohorts 2011-2014. Previous cohort information is not shown because data were not readily available in time for this report. Years 8 and above are highlighted in yellow for readability.

In contrast to the anticipated results for the 2014 cohort, very few individuals achieved tenure after Year 7 in the three previous cohorts. Out of those who did, three individuals were on the ten-year track within the College of Medicine: two from the 2011 cohort and one from the 2012 cohort.

Because 14 out of the 18 individuals still on path in the 2014 cohort were women, the table is broken out by gender. However, in terms of tenure achievement after Year 7, no gender difference can be seen in the previous cohorts.

Table 21: Tenure Achievement after Year 7

| Cohort | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |  |  | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | \# In Cohort | Tenured in 7 Years | 7 Year Tenure Rate | Total Tenured | Total Tenure Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2011 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 34 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 81 | 52 | 64\% | 55 | 68\% |
| F | 1 |  | 2 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 1 |  | 36 | 22 | 61\% | 24 | 67\% |
| M | 2 | 4 | 1 | 19 | 4 |  |  | 1 | 45 | 30 | 67\% | 31 | 69\% |
| 2012 |  | 3 | 8 | 5 | 40 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 112 | 63 | 56\% | 66 | 59\% |
| F |  | 1 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 3 | 1 |  | 47 | 23 | 49\% | 24 | 51\% |
| M |  | 2 | 6 | 1 | 27 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 65 | 40 | 62\% | 42 | 65\% |
| 2013 |  |  | 3 | 6 | 4 | 65 | 13 |  | 139 | 91 | 65\% | 91 | 65\% |
| F |  |  | 2 | 1 |  | 24 | 7 |  | 58 | 34 | 59\% | 34 | 59\% |
| M |  |  | 1 | 5 | 4 | 41 | 6 |  | 81 | 57 | 70\% | 57 | 70\% |
| 2014 |  |  |  | 1 | 4 | 9 | 53 | 8 | 138 | 75 | 54\% | 75 | 54\% |
| F |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 25 | 4 | 63 | 32 | 51\% | 32 | 51\% |
| M |  |  |  |  | 4 | 7 | 28 | 4 | 75 | 43 | 57\% | 43 | 57\% |
| Total Tenured | 3 | 7 | 14 | 46 | 56 | 82 | 69 | 10 | 470 | 263 | 56\% | 287 | 61\% |

At least for the 2011-2013 cohorts, the seven-year window appears to be adequate in capturing all but the tenure achievement of ten-year track individuals. Additional work will be necessary to go back further or to identify the number of individuals still on track at the close of Year 7.

Moving forward, however, the eighteen individuals within the 2014 cohort who are still on path at the time of this report suggest that the number of faculty members achieving tenure at the end of Year 8 or 9 will not be trivial, at least for the next few years while those affected by the
pandemic remain on path. It only makes sense to begin tracking overall tenure achievement for the seven- and ten-year track faculty affected by the pandemic.

## Approval Percentages of Upper-Level Reviews

This section summarizes review data for the 2014 cohort, including Hershey ${ }^{12}$ and Dickinson, but excluding the Pennsylvania College of Technology. The tables below reflect second, fourth, and sixth-year reviews happening within a seven-year period, which accommodates one year of tenure stay. Individuals taking a tenure stay would normally have their sixth-year review during year 7. Thus, the sixth-year review outcomes reflected in Table 22, Table 23, and Table 24 do not differentiate between individuals who have their sixth-year review in year six or year seven.

Many possible paths exist through the review process (with campus committees, department, division, and school committees, college committees, and the University committee). These tables present the most common decision points in the tenure review process. In brief, for Abington, Altoona, Berks, Erie, and Harrisburg, the respective chancellors sign off at the dean/vice president level - that is, they are not tallied in the campus chancellor column. For the other 14 campuses comprising the University College, both the campus chancellor and the dean of the University College (who is also the vice president for commonwealth campuses and executive chancellor) sign off. Great Valley faculty fall under the purview of the dean of Great Valley and the vice president for commonwealth campuses and executive chancellor. Faculty in the Applied Research Lab are eligible for promotion only, not tenure, and are not reflected in these data. Appendix B of this report provides a general guide to the tenure review levels at Penn State.

Table 22, Table 23, and Table 24 show the number of reviews and the number of positive and negative recommendations at each year by total, gender, and race/ethnicity. Because the review path differs by unit, the number of reviews cannot be summed across the rows to get the total number of faculty reviewed. Instead, the number of individuals reviewed is provided in a separate column.

The 2014 cohort included 138 faculty members. Six individuals received tenure credit, three of whom are not reflected on Table 22 with second-year reviews but are reflected on the tables having the fourth- and six-year reviews. Eight individuals received early tenure. Six are reflected in the fourth and sixth-year tables because their fourth-year review counted towards for both the fourth and sixth years. The other two are on the ten-year track and are only reflected in the sixthyear review table.

[^9]Second-Year Review
A total of 126 individuals went up for a second-year review. Not everyone was reviewed at each level. For example, two individuals had a review at the college committee level but not the dean level and faculty members at UP colleges did not have campus-level reviews. Furthermore, a few individuals did not complete the review process, either due to negative reviews or leaving the University before reviews were complete.

Table 22: Second-Year Tenure Reviews

|  | Distinct Individuals | Camp Comm | Chancellor | Dept Comm | Dept Head | Coll Comm | Dean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Reviewed | 126 | 24 | 23 | 105 | 105 | 41 | 123 |
| Positive |  | 24 | 23 | 103 | 104 | 40 | 122 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Male Reviewed | 67 | 9 | 8 | 60 | 60 | 19 | 66 |
| Positive |  | 9 | 8 | 58 | 59 | 18 | 65 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Female Reviewed | 58 | 15 | 15 | 45 | 45 | 22 | 57 |
| Positive |  | 15 | 15 | 45 | 45 | 22 | 57 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asian | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 7 |
| Positive |  | 1 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 7 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Black | 6 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| Positive |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 7 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 6 |
| Positive |  | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 6 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| International | 33 | 4 | 4 | 28 | 28 | 12 | 33 |
| Positive |  | 4 | 4 | 28 | 28 | 12 | 33 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White | 65 | 14 | 13 | 55 | 55 | 24 | 64 |
| Positive |  | 14 | 13 | 53 | 54 | 23 | 63 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Unknown | 7 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Positive |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Fourth-Year Review

At the time of the fourth-year review, 113 individuals ( $82 \%$ of the original cohort) started the review process, including three who were granted early tenure. As with the second-year review year, some individuals started but did not complete the review process.

Notably, five individuals took stays and/or extensions and have either not yet completed their fourth-year review or were in progress during the 2021-22 academic year.

Table 23: Fourth Year Tenure Reviews

|  | Distinct Individuals | Camp Comm | Chancellor | Dept Comm | Dept <br> Head | Coll Comm | Dean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Reviewed | 113 | 16 | 21 | 94 | 95 | 70 | 105 |
| Positive |  | 16 | 20 | 94 | 94 | 63 | 99 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 6 |
| Male Reviewed | 59 | 7 | 7 | 51 | 52 | 31 | 57 |
| Positive |  | 7 | 7 | 51 | 51 | 28 | 53 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Female Reviewed | 54 | 9 | 14 | 43 | 43 | 39 | 48 |
| Positive |  | 9 | 13 | 43 | 43 | 35 | 46 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| Asian | 7 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 6 |
| Positive |  | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 6 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Black | 6 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 6 |
| Positive |  | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Hispanic | 6 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 6 |
| Positive |  | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| International | 30 | 3 | 4 | 26 | 26 | 18 | 29 |
| Positive |  | 3 | 4 | 26 | 26 | 16 | 28 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| White | 57 | 8 | 11 | 47 | 48 | 35 | 51 |
| Positive |  | 8 | 11 | 47 | 47 | 32 | 48 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Unknown | 7 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Positive |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Sixth-Year Review

Seventy-nine individuals started their sixth-year review ( $57 \%$ of the original cohort) and either completed it or left before completion, either due to negative reviews or leaving the University.

At the time of this report, 18 individuals are either still on path or are currently under review.

Table 24: Sixth-Year Tenure Reviews-

| Distinct <br> Individuals | Camp <br> Comm | Chancellor | Dept <br> Comm | Dept <br> Head | Coll <br> Comm | Dean | Univ | Final |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Reviewed | 79 | 11 | 15 | 67 | 68 | 74 | 74 | 71 | 71 |
| Positive |  | 10 | 14 | 66 | 68 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| Negative |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Male Reviewed | $\mathbf{4 7}$ | 5 | 4 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 47 | 43 | 43 |
| Positive |  | 4 | 3 | 41 | 42 | 40 | 45 | 43 | 43 |
| Negative |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Female Reviewed | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | 6 | 11 | 25 | 26 | 32 | 27 | 28 | 28 |
| Positive |  | 6 | 11 | 25 | 26 | 32 | 27 | 28 | 28 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asian | $\mathbf{7}$ | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Positive |  | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Black | $\mathbf{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Positive |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | $\mathbf{1}$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Positive |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| International | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | 3 | 3 | 19 | 19 | 21 | 22 | 20 | 20 |
| Positive |  | 2 | 2 | 19 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 20 | 20 |
| Negative |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| White | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | 5 | 8 | 34 | 35 | 37 | 36 | 35 | 35 |
| Positive |  | 5 | 8 | 33 | 35 | 36 | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | $\mathbf{7}$ | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Positive |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Negative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## General Patterns within Faculty Cohorts

As noted previously, the seven-year tenure rate for the 2014 cohort was one of the lowest. This difference, however, does not emerge until the sixth-year review. The retention and successful annual reviews for years 2 and 4 are in line with those from 2011 through 2013. Fewer people from the 2014 cohort have gone up for their sixth-year review by the end of the seven-year period. With the onset of Covid-19 and the previous tenure stay policy, eighteen faculty members were either still on path or undergoing their sixth-year review during the academic year 2021-22.

Individuals taking tenure stays and still completing within seven years are included in the achievement rates. Those taking longer to complete remain within their cohort but are not included in the achievement rate, even if they achieved tenure after the seven-year period ended.

Table 25: Entering Counts at each Review Year

|  | Initial <br> Cohort | Year <br> $\mathbf{2}$ | Year <br> $\mathbf{4}$ | Year <br> $\mathbf{6}$ | Tenured |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Figure 5 and Figure 6 graph these counts and percentages, showing variations of exit timing within each cohort. Cohort 2014 closely tracks cohort 2013 for the second- and fourth year review numbers. If not for the pandemic, the sixth-year data point would likely also be similar.

Figure 5: Entering Counts at each Review Year


Figure 6: Percentages of Entering Counts at each Review Year*


* Note the scale change


## Summary

This report provides tenure achievement information for the cohort of 2014, which is the first cohort to span the Covid pandemic during its seven-year window. Consequently, stay and Covid extension data were also analyzed in anticipation that the pandemic may have negatively affected progression towards tenure.

## Tenure Stays

Prior to the pandemic, faculty members were already taking advantage of the tenure stays as needed. Thirty individuals in the 2014 cohort chose to exercise this right. The number of stays and extensions together indicate that, at least for those taking time out, a fear of negative consequences did not prevent them from stopping the clock. We do not know how many others, if any, might have stopped the clock but chose not to.

While we do not have numbers regarding the stay activity of previous cohorts, anecdotal evidence suggests that thirty individuals are normal for a cohort. Unfortunately, stay information has historically not been maintained in a centralized manner. It may be difficult to collect this information for previous cohorts even though doing so would allow for comparison between preand post-Covid-affected cohorts. Faculty members in the next few cohorts may opt for a Covid extension prior to considering a stay.

Additionally, stay reason was not captured consistently in the past. Doing so moving forward will provide valuable information as future cohorts are analyzed.

## Effect of Covid-19

A majority ( $83 \%$ ) of faculty members still in their probationary period during 2020 chose to take advantage of the extension and delay their clock one year. Although too early to tell, the extension will probably contribute to greater tenure achievement than may have otherwise occurred.

Moreover, preliminary data suggest that faculty members in future cohorts have also taken advantage of the extension in similar, if not greater numbers. The final number of extensions will illustrate the effect that Covid-19 had on progress towards tenure.

## Extensions, Stays, and Gender

More women than men took stays (19 versus 11) and extensions (12 versus 3), and fourteen out of the 18 individuals still on path as of Fall 2021 are women. Additional information is needed for past and future individuals who stop their clock for any reason. Were they and will they continue to be predominantly women? How is tenure achievement affected? When is the clock stopped and for how long?

At the end of seven years, the cohort of 2014 had one of the lowest tenure achievement rates since 2002, but the story was by no means complete. Eighteen individuals, or $14 \%$ of the cohort, were still on path. Moreover, the number of extensions alone suggests that the pandemic will continue playing a role in delaying tenure progression for future cohorts.

The gendered nature of stays and extensions calls for attention and more inquiry. This report marked the first time attrition was examined year by year. Opposite to expectations generated by lower tenure rates, women were not leaving the path in greater percentages than men. However, more women than men remained on path at the end of Year 6 and Year 7 as opposed to achieving tenure. Is this pattern an anomaly due to Covid? Or is this a pre-existing pattern that has only now come to light? Did women in previous cohorts also leave in lower proportions than did men? If so, what explains their lower tenure rates?

Future reports will continue tracking stay and extension statistics by group as well as tenure achievement beyond Year 7. Even though delaying tenure puts faculty members at a cumulative financial and professional disadvantage, taking a stay or extension has allowed seventeen faculty on the seven-year track to remain on path within the 2014 cohort (the eighteenth is on the 10year path). The pattern of exceeding seven years is likely to continue at least through the decade.

## Appendix A: Methodology of Cohort Constitution and Derivation

The advent of Workday in January 2018 introduced new human resources data formats and fields, making it impossible to use previously existing processes to study faculty progression. The Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research, with the advisement of the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, rewrote these processes and this section details how faculty are now identified for each cohort.

## Who is in each cohort?

Cohorts were created using the Tenure Anniversary Date within the old and new HR systems. This date marks the start of the tenure clock. For the 2014 cohort, this date was 07/01/2014. Each cohort included the following groups of people:

- Assistant professors starting in 2014 whose tenure clock started 07/01/2014.
- Faculty members hired as non-tenure-track who were later placed on the tenure-track and had their Tenure Anniversary Date updated to 2014.
- Librarians of equivalent rank having the same Tenure Anniversary Dates.
- Faculty members who were initially hired with another Tenure Anniversary Date but who were later assigned a new anniversary date of 07/01/2014. If their last Tenure Anniversary date before tenure achievement or exit was in 2014, they were included.


## Why does the data start at 2002-03 and not earlier?

The 2002-03 cohort was the first year in which detail-level data were available so each record could be verified.

## What if someone started in 2014 but their Tenure Anniversary Date later changed?

If an individual's tenure anniversary date changed to a later year, they were removed from their initial cohort and reassigned to the cohort of the new Tenure Anniversary Date. For example, if someone had started with a previous tenure anniversary of 07/01/2013 but was then reassigned to 07/01/2014, they were included in this study.

Conversely, if someone began in 2014 and then had their anniversary date set for 07/01/2015, they were removed from the 2014 cohort and will be picked up again when the 2015 cohort is reviewed.

If, for whatever reason, someone began with a 07/01/2014 tenure anniversary date but then was retroactively assigned an earlier date, they would not be included in this report. The one exception to this rule is a particular faculty member who was reported erroneously in 2013. They were included as part of the 2014 cohort and backed out of the 2013 numbers shown in this report.

## Does taking a tenure stay affect the cohort year?

No. Cohort year is determined by the Tenure Anniversary Date that each unit enters into the system.

## How were people with Tenure Credit handled?

Individuals who came in with credit and achieved tenure after Year 2 or Year 4 were still considered as part of the 2014 cohorts if their Tenure Anniversary Date remained 07/01/2014. They are reflected in the statistics for tenure achievement.

## What if someone changed their Gender or Race/Ethnicity?

The gender and race/ethnicity at the outset were kept because this study tracks the tenure outcomes of those entering the study. If demographics were changed halfway through, an entering group would have different numbers than the ending group.

## What if someone's tenure-granting unit changed?

If the Tenure Anniversary Date did not change, they were reported with their original cohort. If the Tenure Anniversary Year changed, they were removed from their original cohort and flagged to be placed in the cohort associated with the new Tenure Anniversary Date. For example, if the new Tenure Anniversary Date were set to 07/01/2016 their new cohort would be 2016.

How did you handle someone who might have stopped out for more than one year?
Since the study period is seven years, an individual stopping out for 2 or more years would be reported as not achieving tenure within seven years if their Tenure Anniversary Date remains unchanged. There were seventeen individuals (plus one individual on the ten-year track) still on path or going up for review during the 2021-22 academic year.

## How were other possible exceptions handled?

Source data for tenure achievement comes from either the IBIS HR system or Workday and records are reported as they are at the time of census snapshot (typically September $30^{\text {th }}$ ). This was reconciled with the list of review decisions compiled from the academic units. Although every effort was made to ensure a clean list, a number of discrepancies between the old and new HR systems was found, including differing tenure anniversary dates and individuals wrongly coded as on-path, or whose dates leaving the tenure track differed between systems.

## Why are some historical numbers different than in past reports?

The criteria for inclusion in this report has changed slightly over time. Depending on the year, some previous report tables only included individuals who achieved tenure and were still here in Year 8. Other reports provided only tenure rates. When actual counts were used in this report, some rounding differences occurred.

Were individuals receiving immediate tenure included in each initial cohort?
No. They are not included in the study.
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## Appendix B: Levels of Review for Promotion and Tenure

Administrative guidelines to support the implementation of the University's policy on promotion and tenure, AC-23, are available in the document entitled, "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines" (http://vpfa.psu.edu/files/2016/09/p_and_t_-guidelines-2i76gdt.pdf). Appendix B outlines the levels of review for promotion and tenure at Penn State.

LEVELS OF REVIEW FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE
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# SENATE COMMITTES ON FACULTY AFFAIRS, RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY, AND EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT 

Earning Tenure During COVID


#### Abstract

(Informational) During December 2021 and January 2022, an ad hoc committee created by the University Senate fielded a survey to all tenure-stream faculty regarding the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on their progress toward tenure. This is a preliminary descriptive report based on the data collected in that survey.


## Introduction

In July 2021, an ad hoc University Senate committee was formed to assess the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on tenure at Pennsylvania State University. That committee comprised members of the Senate's standing committees on Faculty Affairs (FA), Research Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA), and Educational Equity and Campus Environment (EECE). After some discussion, the committee elected to administer a survey to tenure-stream faculty and others in the Penn State community, as one means of assessing those impacts. This report briefly summarizes the contents and results of that survey. Please note that this is a preliminary report; the full report will contain additional analyses of the data examined herein, as detailed in the Conclusion.

## The Survey

The survey was drafted by Professor Christopher Zorn (College of Liberal Arts) and Geoffrey Mamerow (Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research) with input from other members of the committee. The survey was administered on-line, using the Qualtrics platform. The sampling pool was all tenure-stream faculty and staff (including tenure-track librarians and staff at the Applied Research Lab) at all Penn State campuses. Respondents were assured that their responses would be anonymous and confidential, and in the course of the survey no information was requested or recorded that would allow respondents' differential privacy to be compromised.

The survey contained a total of 21 items. The first asked individuals to score their progress towards tenure in the categories of research, teaching, and service between March 1, 2019 and February 29, 2020 on a scale ranging from 0 (lowest) to 100 (highest), and then to do the same thing for the period from March 1, 2020 to February 28, 2021. Respondents were then asked to indicate the overall impact of COVID-19 on their progress toward tenure, and to indicate the ways in which the COVID-19 pandemic affected their lives. This was followed by questions regarding respondents' utilization of the University's extension of pre-tenure probationary periods, and the reason(s) for their choice to take advantage of that extension. Respondents who
had not (yet) extended their pre-tenure probationary period were asked how likely they were to do so in the future. Survey respondents were then given the opportunity to provide additional (open-ended) comments, and to offer suggestions for how Penn State could minimize or ameliorate the impact of COVID-19 on tenure at the University. Those questions were followed by a battery of demographic questions which concluded the survey. The full text of the Tenure During COVID survey can be found here.

The survey went into the field in October 21, 2021, and was available for respondents until through mid-February 2022. During that time, a total of 532 responses were received, 395 of which were complete and provided usable data. Figure 1 illustrates the patterns of item-level nonresponse among demographic variables within the 395 valid surveys received. The highest levels of item-level nonresponse were to questions about race, family status, and sexual orientation. Validation is underway to ensure that item and survey nonresponse do not substantially bias the sample relative to the relevant population.


Figure 1. Itemwise Nonresponse and Missingness

## Descriptive Results

As noted above, the survey asked individuals to assess the overall impact of COVID-19 on their progress toward tenure, and to rate their progress toward tenure in research, teaching, and service for the calendar year pre- (March 2019-February 2020) and post-COVID (March 2020-February 2021). For purposes of the survey, respondents were instructed to define "progress toward tenure" to be those activities which fall under Part II, "Criteria for Promotion and Tenure" in University Policy AC23.


Figure 2. COVID's Impact on Progress Toward Tenure
Figure 2 plots the distribution of responses for the five-point scale assessing how COVID-19 impacted respondents' overall progress toward tenure. As that figure shows, the substantial majority of respondents indicated that COVID-19 affected their progress toward tenure "Somewhat Negatively" ( 51.6 percent) or "Extremely Negatively" ( 28.4 percent). An additional 16 percent of respondents indicated that the COVID-19 pandemic had neither a positive nor a negative effect on that progress.

Figure 3 shows kernel density plots* of the distribution of responses to the research-related components of the "progress toward tenure" items, pre- and post-COVID, for all respondents in the survey with valid responses on those items $(N=378)$. Figures 4 and 5 show the same plots for the teaching and service components, respectively. In an unsurprising result, all three component measures were, on average, rated lower post-COVID than pre-COVID, with the largest differences in the medians seen in the research component. In all three cases, Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests also reject the proposition that the pre- and post-COVID distributions are equal ( $D=0.4,0.2$, and 0.2 for research, teaching, and service, respectively, all $P<0.001$ ). While it is impossible to establish that these decreases were a direct result of the COVID-19 pandemic, given the pandemic's scale and seriousness, it is likely that it played at least some role in those declines.


Figure 3. Density Plots: Progress Toward Tenure (Research)

[^10]

Figure 4. Density Plots: Progress Toward Tenure (Teaching)


Figure 5. Density Plots: Progress Toward Tenure (Service)

Finally, Figure 6 shows density plots of the differences between each respondent's pre- and postCOVID self-rating for each of the three categories. These scores are calculated as (Pre-COVID Rating - Post-COVID Rating); higher values thus indicate greater negative impacts of COVID19. The distributions of those differences are markedly different for Research than for the other two. In particular, the former has higher typical values (mean $=24.4$, vs. 10.3 and 10.8 for teaching and service, respectively). This difference is most notable when considering median values; the median respondent's difference for Research is 22 , while the same medians for teaching and research are 3 and 1 respectively. This makes clear that the aggregate differences observed in Figures 3-5 are also generally reflected at the individual level. At least in this survey, the largest self-reported impacts of COVID-19 on tenure at Penn State appear to have been on respondents' research activities.


Differences in Progress Toward Tenure
(Pre- vs. Post-COVID)
Figure 6. Density Plots: Differences (Pre-COVID minus Post-COVID)

## Conclusion

This brief, preliminary report is designed to provide descriptive statistics for the survey component of the ad hoc committee's efforts to assess the impact of COVID-19 on tenure at Penn State. The committee anticipates completing a final report to the University Senate in Fall 2022. That final report will include, inter alia:

- additional descriptive data on the impact of COVID-19 on respondents' personal and professional lives, as well as on respondents' decisions to extend their pre-tenure probationary period, and on respondent demographic characteristics;
- multivariate analyses of the drivers of COVID's impact on progress toward tenure at the University, including analyses that consider the intersection of different demographic characteristics on those impacts;
- in-depth analysis of the survey's open-ended responses; and
- supplementation and integration of the survey's data with information from official records, gathered through the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and other sources.
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# SENATE COMMITTEES ON INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS AND FACULTY AFFAIRS 

Non-tenure-line Promotion Flow Report, 2020-2021

(Informational)

## Background/Introduction

Over the past several decades, the composition of Penn State's faculty has shifted such that the proportion of faculty members who are not on the tenure line has grown. Concomitant with that increase, non-tenure-line faculty members play an increasingly important role in the implementation of Penn State's mission as a "multi-campus public research university that educates students from Pennsylvania, the nation and the world, and improves the well-being and health of individuals and communities through integrated programs of teaching, research, and service."

In recognition of the central role non-tenure-line faculty members play at Penn State, Penn State instituted updated standardized ranks and a promotion procedure for non-tenure-line faculty via a revision to AC21 (formerly HR21) in academic year 2015-2016. Academic units were asked to create promotion processes consistent with policy during academic year 20162017. Simultaneously, current non-tenure-line faculty were retitled to be consistent with the revisions to faculty titles in AC21; retitling was to be completed by the end of 2017, though units were permitted to delay changing a faculty member's title if a new contract was issued. Promotion procedures in the vast majority of units were implemented during the 2017-2018 academic year and implemented across all units in 2018-2019.

## Distribution of Penn State Non-tenure-line Faculty

In Fall 2020, Penn State employed 6,466 full-time faculty members. At the University Park colleges and the 20 Commonwealth Campuses (not inclusive of the law and medical schools) the University employed 5,190 full-time faculty. Of these 5,190 faculty members, 1,947 (37.5\%) had been awarded tenure, $823(15.9 \%)$ were on the tenure track, and $2,420(46.6 \%)$ were non-tenureline faculty. The distribution of tenured, tenure-line, and non-tenure-line faculty was comparable between University Park and the Commonwealth campuses. Of the 3,573 full-time faculty who were employed at University Park, 1,356 (38\%) were tenured, 579 (16\%) were tenure-line, and $1,638(46 \%)$ were non-tenure-line faculty. Similarly, of the 1,617 full-time faculty members on the 20 Commonwealth Campuses, 591(37\%) were tenured, 244 (15\%) were tenure-line, and $782(48 \%)$ were non-tenure-line faculty.
Non-tenure-line faculty can have either term or no-term contracts (previously referred to as "fixed-term" or "standing"). As of fall 2020, $92 \%$ of non-tenure-line faculty were on term contracts and a small number of non-tenure-line faculty were on no-term appointments ( $\mathrm{n}=190$, $8 \%$ ). Of the 1,638 non-tenure-line faculty at University Park, 1,479 ( $90 \%$ ) were on term contracts. Across the Commonwealth Campuses, 751 out of 782 non-tenure-line faculty ( $96 \%$ ) were on term contracts. Of the 5,190 full-time faculty at University Park and the Commonwealth Campuses (not inclusive of law and medical schools), 2,231 (43\%) were on term contracts.

AC21 categorizes non-tenure-line faculty by degree earned (terminal or non-terminal degree) and title (teaching, research, clinical, or professor of practice). By Fall 2018, at University Park and the Commonwealth Campuses, the majority of non-tenure-line faculty had been transitioned to the new titles created by the policy. In Fall 2020, the number of non-tenure-line faculty who did not have the additional descriptor of teaching, research, or clinical stood at just 36. At University Park in Fall 2020, 944 full-time faculty members were classified as non-tenure-line teaching faculty, and at the Commonwealth Campuses, 736 faculty members were classified as teaching faculty. Non-tenure-line research faculty were found mostly at University Park (556 compared to 9 at the Commonwealth Campuses).

## Updates to this year's report

The 2020-2021 report contains information not included in previous reports. Specifically, data on the time spent in the previous rank before being promoted are discussed below and appear in Tables 23 and 24.

Data from the College of Medicine is again included separately in this report because the size of the college, differences in the employment relationship for Penn State Health employees with a faculty appointment, and the distinct nature of faculty promotions obscures the interpretation of trends in other academic units (see Appendix B). Data from Dickinson Law, Penn State Law, the Smeal College of Business, and Penn State Great Valley are not included this year because they had no promotions or denials.

Tables that combine both faculty with and without a terminal degree refer to ranks rather than titles, because for non-tenure-line faculty with a terminal degree, promotion to the second rank would indicate promotion to associate (research/teaching/clinical) professor, whereas for non-tenure-line faculty with a non-terminal degree, promotion to the second rank would indicate promotion to assistant (research/teaching/clinical) professor, as described in this chart:

| Non-Terminal <br> Degree | Rank 1: <br> Instructor/ <br> Lecturer | Rank 2: <br> Assistant <br> Professor | Rank 3: <br> Associate <br> Professor |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Terminal Degree |  | Rank 1: <br> Assistant <br> Professor | Rank 2: <br> Associate <br> Professor | Rank 3: <br> Professor |

## Promotion Rates

In 2019-2020, 136 non-tenure-line promotion dossiers were put forward for review at University Park and the Commonwealth Campuses. Of those 136, 131 (96\%) received a promotion. At University Park, about $96 \%$ of those up for promotion were promoted, and at the Commonwealth Campuses, about $98 \%$ of those up for promotion were promoted. University Park faculty promotions comprised $67 \%$ of the total number of promotions and Commonwealth Campus faculty $33 \%$ (see Table 1). The data in Table 1 show the percentage of faculty who were up for promotion who were promoted; this begs the question, "What percentage of faculty were eligible for promotion?" Unlike tenure-line faculty, non-tenure-line faculty are not in a cohort, and there is variability in terms of how non-tenure-line faculty pursue promotion. Therefore, the
percentage of faculty who are eligible in a given year is not easily measured or known. The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs is exploring options for how to best collect this information so it can be included in subsequent reports.
Of the 131 promotions, $88(67 \%)$ were promoted to the second rank and $43(33 \%)$ were promoted to the third rank (see Table 2). Eighty-three, or 63\%, of those promoted had a terminal degree and 48 , or $37 \%$, had a non-terminal degree (see Tables 3 and 4). For faculty with both terminal and non-terminal degrees, promotions to the second rank for University Park faculty were a higher proportion of total promotions than for Commonwealth Campus faculty. At University Park, $67 \%$ of terminal degree promotions were to the second rank, as opposed to $61.5 \%$ at the Commonwealth Campuses (see Table 3). Likewise, for non-terminal degree promotions, $76.5 \%$ of promotions of University Park faculty, and $64.5 \%$ of promotions of Commonwealth Campus faculty, were to the second rank (see Table 4). In 2019-20, by contrast, a higher percentage of Commonwealth Campus faculty were promoted to the second rank than University Park faculty.

Female faculty comprised $63 \%$ of all non-tenure-line promotions: 62\% at University Park and $66 \%$ at the Commonwealth Campuses (see Table 5). For those with a terminal degree, female faculty comprised $59 \%$ of promotions to associate or full professor (See Table 6). For those with a non-terminal degree, female faculty comprised $70.8 \%$ of promotions to assistant or associate professor ranks (See Table 7).

Faculty identifying as White comprised $77.1 \%$ of all promoted faculty, a decrease of $3 \%$ from 2019-20; faculty identifying as Black comprised $0.7 \%$, Asian faculty $5.3 \%$, Hispanic faculty $4.6 \%$, international faculty $6.1 \%$, faculty indicating multiple races $2.3 \%$, and $3.8 \%$ did not report (see Table 8). For promoted faculty with a terminal degree, $74.7 \%$ identify as White, $8.4 \%$ as Asian, $8.4 \%$ as international, $2.4 \%$ as Hispanic, $1.2 \%$ as multiple races, and $4.8 \%$ did not report (see Table 9). For those with a non-terminal degree, $81.3 \%$ identify as White, $8.3 \%$ Hispanic, $4.2 \%$ as multiple races, $2.1 \%$ as Black, $2.1 \%$ as international, and $2.1 \%$ did not report (see Table 10).

## Salary Increases

Consistent with AC21, all of those who were promoted received a salary increase that is separate from the university-prescribed general salary increase (i.e., GSI; per AC21 "All promotions should be accompanied by a promotion raise, in addition to a merit raise, to be determined and funded by the college"). The percent of salary increase associated with a non-tenure-line promotion is not prescribed by the university. Rather, the amount of the salary increase is determined by individual academic units. The data shown here reflect only the percent of salary increase associated with the promotion and not market/equity increases or general salary increases.

At University Park, salary increases received across all ranks ranged from 5 to $8 \%$, with a mean of $7.7 \%$ and a median of $8 \%$. At the Commonwealth Campuses, salary increases received across all ranks ranged from 3 to $8 \%$, with a mean of $7.2 \%$ and a median of $8 \%$ (see Table 11).

Mean and median salary increases were similar both across and within ranks. For all promoted faculty, the mean and median salary increases for promotions to the second rank were $7.2 \%$ and $8 \%$, respectively; for promotions to the third rank, the mean and median increases were $6.7 \%$ and
$8 \%$ (see Table 12). One notable date point is that for faculty without a terminal degree who were promoted to the third rank (associate professor), the median salary increase was $5.5 \%$ (see Table 15).

## Length of Contract

Per AC-21, a multi-year contract is recommended (i.e., "The contract lengths of faculty members vary both within and between ranks and reflect a myriad of factors such as unit need, budget, and the discipline of the faculty member. Unit leaders have the flexibility, and are encouraged, to offer the longest term contract that circumstances warrant at all ranks. Faculty members who are promoted shall be considered for a multi-year contract. Those promoted to the third rank shall be considered for the longest length of contract available to non-tenure-line faculty. If a multi-year contract is not granted, then factors that shaped this decision shall be communicated to the faculty member at the time when a new contract is offered"). A multi-year contract is defined as a no-term contract or a term contract of greater than one year.

It is important to note that some multi-year contracts were in place prior to the promotion; the data reported here reflect the length of the contract the individual currently holds.

Across all campuses, 20 ( $15.3 \%$ ) of the 131 faculty who were promoted received one-year contracts and 111 ( $84.7 \%$ ) received multi-year contracts (see Table 11). For University Park faculty, 69 of 87 contracts, or $79 \%$, were multi-year; for Commonwealth Campus faculty, 42 of 44 , or $95.5 \%$, were multi-year (see Table 11).

A higher percentage of faculty promoted to the third rank received a multi-year contract than those promoted to the second rank. Of the 88 faculty promoted to the second rank, about $81 \%$ received a multi-year contract. Of the 43 faculty promoted to the third rank, $93 \%$ received a multi-year contract (See Table 2).
For the 83 promoted faculty with a terminal degree, 14 (17\%) received a 1-year contract and 69 ( $83 \%$ ) received a multi-year contract (see Table 17). Of the 48 faculty with a non-terminal degree who were promoted, $12.5 \%$ received a 1 -year contract and $87.5 \%$ received a multi-year contract (see Table 18).
Beginning with the 2019-20 report, data on the length of each promoted faculty member's previous contract are provided. The data suggest that faculty with and without a terminal degree received a longer contract with their promotion than they previously held. For example, for promoted faculty with a terminal degree, $41 \%$ of contracts prior to promotion were 1 -year contracts and $59 \%$ were multi-year, but after promotion, only $17 \%$ of contracts were 1 year and $83 \%$ were multi-year. For both terminal degree titles (associate and full professor) combined, 2 -year contracts decreased from about $29 \%$ to $8.4 \%$ but contracts of 3 years or more increased from about $21.6 \%$ to about $66.3 \%$ (see Tables 19 and 20). For promoted faculty with a non-terminal degree, $40 \%$ of faculty contracts prior to promotion were 1-year contracts and $60 \%$ were multi-year; after promotion, just $12.5 \%$ of all contracts were 1 -year and $87.5 \%$ were multiyear. For all non-terminal degree titles combined, 2-year contracts increased from $12.5 \%$ to almost $19 \%$ of the total and the percentage of contracts that were 3 years in length or more increased from $48 \%$ to $69 \%$ (see Tables 21 and 22).

## Time in Previous Rank

For 2020-21, data about the time promoted faculty spent in their previous rank are provided. AC21 recommends "at least five years" in the first rank before consideration for promotion to the second rank, and "no fixed time period for promotion to the third rank." For faculty promoted to the second rank, about $18 \%$ of those with a terminal degree and $9 \%$ of those with a nonterminal degree had spent between 1 and 4 years at the previous rank, about 55\% of those both with and without a terminal degree had spent between 5 and 9 years at the previous rank, about $15 \%$ of those with a terminal degree and $24 \%$ of those with a non-terminal degree had spent between 10 and 14 years at the previous rank, and about $13 \%$ of those with a terminal degree and $12 \%$ of those with a non-terminal degree had spent 15 or more years at the previous rank (see Tables 23 and 24).

For faculty promoted to the third rank, about $29 \%$ of those with a terminal degree and about $20 \%$ of those with a non-terminal degree had spent between 1 and 4 years at the previous rank, about $32 \%$ of those with a terminal degree and $33 \%$ of those with a non-terminal degree between 5 and 9 years, about $29 \%$ of those with a terminal degree and $7 \%$ of those with a non-terminal degree between 10 and 14 years, and about $11 \%$ of those with a terminal degree and $40 \%$ of those with a non-terminal degree 15 or more years (see Tables 23 and 24).
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## Appendix A Summary Tables

Note: Tables do not include data from the College of Medicine or from units that had no promotions.

Table 1
Percentage of Non-tenure-line Faculty Promoted - 2020-2021

| College/Campus | Total Put Forward <br> for Promotion | - | Total Faculty <br> Promoted |  | Total Faculty <br> denied promotion |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| University Park | 91 | $=$ | 87 | $95.6 \%$ | 4 | $4.4 \%$ |
| Commonwealth | 45 | $=$ | 44 | $97.8 \%$ | 1 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Totals | 136 | $=$ | 131 | $96.3 \%$ | 5 | $3.7 \%$ |

Note: This table reflects the current contracts held by non-tenure-line faculty who were promoted. Some were in place prior to the promotion.

Table 2
Faculty Rank by New Contract Length - 2020-2021

| - | Rank \#2 ( $\mathrm{n}=88$ ) |  | Rank \#3 (n=43) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of 1 year | 17 | $19.3 \%$ | 3 | $7 \%$ |
| Percentage of 2 year | 19 | $21.6 \%$ | 1 | $2.3 \%$ |
| Percentage of 3+ years | 49 | $55.7 \%$ | 35 | $81.4 \%$ |
| Percentage of standing | 3 | $3.4 \%$ | 4 | $9.3 \%$ |
| Totals | 88 | $100.0 \%$ | 43 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of multi-year | 71 | $80.7 \%$ | 40 | $93.0 \%$ |

Note: This table reflects the current contracts held by non-tenure-line faculty who were promoted. Some were in place prior to the promotion.

Table 3
Promotions by New Rank and Campus Type - Terminal Degrees

| College/Campus | Rank 2 (n=114) |  | Rank 3(n=45) |  | - | Total Faculty Promoted |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| University Park | 47 | $67.1 \%$ | 23 | $32.9 \%$ | $=$ | 70 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Commonwealth | 8 | $61.5 \%$ | 5 | $38.5 \%$ | $=$ | 13 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Totals | 55 | $66.3 \%$ | 28 | $33.7 \%$ | $=$ | 83 | $100.0 \%$ |

Note: This table reflects the current contracts held by non-tenure-line faculty who were promoted. Some were in place prior to the promotion.

Table 4
Promotions by New Rank and Campus Type - Non-Terminal Degrees

| College/Campus | Rank \#2 = 33 |  | Rank \#3 = 15 |  |  | Total Faculty Promoted |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| University Park | 13 | $76.5 \%$ | 4 | $23.5 \%$ | $=$ | 17 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Commonwealth | 20 | $64.5 \%$ | 11 | $35.5 \%$ | $=$ | 31 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Totals | 33 | $68.8 \%$ | 15 | $31.2 \%$ | $=$ | 48 | $100.0 \%$ |

Note: This table reflects the current contracts held by non-tenure-line faculty who were promoted. Some were in place prior to promotion.

Table 5
Percentage of Promotions by Identified Gender - 2020-2021

| College/Campus | Total by Location | - | Female |  | Male |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| University Park* | 87 | $=$ | 54 | $62.1 \%$ | 33 | $37.9 \%$ |
| Commonwealth | 44 | $=$ | 29 | $65.9 \%$ | 15 | $34.1 \%$ |
| Totals* | 131 | $=$ | 83 | $63.4 \%$ | 48 | $36.6 \%$ |

Table 6
Promotions by Identified Gender - Terminal Degrees

| - | Female |  | Male |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank 2: Associate Professor | 35 | $42.2 \%$ | 20 | $24.1 \%$ |
| Rank 3: Full Professor | 14 | $16.9 \%$ | 14 | $16.9 \%$ |
| Totals | 49 | $59.0 \%$ | 34 | $41.0 \%$ |

Table 7
Promotions by Identified Gender -
Non-Terminal Degrees

| - | Female |  | Male |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank 2: Assistant Professor | 23 | $47.9 \%$ | 10 | $20.8 \%$ |
| Rank 3: Associate Professor | 11 | $22.9 \%$ | 4 | $8.3 \%$ |
| Totals | 34 | $70.8 \%$ | 14 | $29.2 \%$ |

Table 8
Number of Promotions by Identified Race/Ethnicity - 2020-2021

| College/Campus | Total by <br> Location | Asian | Black | Hispanic | Int'l | MLT | UDL | White |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| University Park | 87 | 6 | 1 |  | 3 | 7 | 3 | 4 |
| Commonwealth | 44 | 1 | - | 3 |  | 1 | - | 1 |
| Totals | 131 | 7 | $5.3 \%$ | 1 | $.7 \%$ | 6 | $4.6 \%$ | 8 |
| $6.1 \%$ | 3 | $2.3 \%$ | 5 | $3.8 \%$ | 101 | $77.1 \%$ |  |  |

INT = International Faculty, Non-Citizens and Faculty who are not Permanent Residents
MLT = Multiple, more than one race selected through self-identification
UDL = Undeclared

## Table 9

## Promotions by Identified Race/Ethnicity - Terminal Degrees

| - | Asian |  | Black |  | Hispanic |  | INT |  | MLT |  | UDL |  | White |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank 2: Associate Professor | 4 |  | - |  | 1 |  | 7 |  | - |  | 4 |  | 39 |
| Rank 3: Full Professor | 3 |  | - |  | 1 |  | - |  | 1 |  | - |  | 23 |
| Totals | 7 | 8.4\% | - | 0.0\% | 2 | 2.4\% | 7 | 8.4\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 4 | 4.8\% | 62 74.7\% |

INT = International Faculty, Non-Citizens and Faculty who are not Permanent Residents
MLT = Multiple, more than one race selected through self-identification
UDL = Undeclared

Table 10
Promotions by Identified Race/Ethnicity - Non-Terminal Degrees

| - | Asian |  | Black |  | Hispanic |  | INT |  | MLT |  | UDL |  | White |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank 2: Assistant Professor | - |  | - |  | 3 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 26 |  |
| Rank 3: Associate Professor | - |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 13 |  |
| Totals | - | 0.0\% | 1 | 2.1\% | 4 | 8.35 | 1 | 2.1\% | 2 | 4.2\% | 1 | 2.1\% | 39 | 81.3\% |

INT = International Faculty, Non-Citizens and Faculty who are not Permanent Residents
MLT = Multiple, more than one race selected through self-identification
UDL = Undeclared

## Table 11

Salary Increase and New Contract Length by Campus - 2020-2021

| College/Campus | \% Salary <br> Increase | Mean Salary Increase | Median Salary Increase | 1-year contracts |  | 2-year contracts |  | 3-year contracts |  | No-term contracts |  | Total multi-year contracts |  | Total faculty promoted |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| University Park | 5.0\% - 8.0\% | 7.7\% | 8.0\% | 18 | 13.7\% | 6 | 4.6\% | 56 | 42.8\% | 7 | 5.3\% | 69 | 52.7\% | 87 | 66.4\% |
| Commonwealth | 3.0\% - 8.0\% | 7.2\% | 8.0\% | 2 | 1.5\% | 10 | 7.63\% | 32 | 24.43\% | - | - | 42 | 32.1\% | 44 | 33.6\% |
| Totals | - | - | - | 20 | 15.3\% | 16 | 12.2\% | 88 | 67.2\% | 7 | 5.3\% | 111 | 84.7\% | 131 | 100.00\% |

Note: This table reflects the current contracts held by non-tenure-line faculty who were promoted. Some were in place prior to the promotion.

Table 12
New Contract Length by Faculty Rank - 2020-2021

| - | \% Salary <br> Increase | Mean <br> Salary Increase | Median Salary Increase | \% of 1 year$(n=20)$ |  | \% of 2 year$(n=20)$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of 3+ years } \\ & \quad(n=84) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\%$ of no-term$(n=7)$ |  | \% of multi-year$(n=111)$ |  | Total faculty promoted |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank 2 | 3.71-8.4\% | 7.2\% | 8.0\% | 17 | 13.0\% | 19 | 14.5\% | 49 | 37.4\% | 3 | 2.3\% | 71 | 54.2\% | 88 | 67.2\% |
| Rank 3 | 3.73-8.0\% | 6.7\% | 8.0\% | 3 | 2.3\% | 1 | 0.7\% | 35 | 26.7\% | 4 | 3.1\% | 40 | 30.5\% | 43 | 32.8\% |
| Totals* | - | - | - | 20 | 15.3\% | 20 | 15.2\% | 84 | 64.1\% | 7 | 5.4\% | 111 | 84.7\% | 131 | 100\% |

Note: This table reflects the current contracts held by non-tenure-line faculty who were promoted. Some were in place prior to the promotion.

Table 13
New Contract Length by Faculty Rank - Terminal Degrees

| - | \% Salary <br> Increase | Mean <br> Salary Increase | Median Salary Increase | \% of 1-year ( $\mathrm{n}=17$ ) |  | \% of 2-year(n=19) |  | \% of 3+ years ( $\mathrm{n}=55$ ) |  | \% of no-term$(n=6)$ |  | \% of multi-year$(n=80)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank 2: Associate Professor | 3.71-8.4\% | 7.3\% | 8.0\% | 11 | 78.6\% | 6 | 85.7\% | 35 | 63.6\% | 3 | 42.9\% | 44 | 63.8\% |
| Rank 3: Full Professor | 4.75-8.0\% | 7.1\% | 8.0\% | 3 | 21.4\% | 1 | 14.3\% | 20 | 36.4\% | 4 | 57.1\% | 25 | 36.2\% |
| Totals* | - | - | - | 14 | 100.0\% | 7 | 100.0\% | 55 | 100.0\% | 7 | 100.0\% | 69 | 100.0\% |

Note: This table reflects the current contracts held by non-tenure-line faculty who were promoted. Some were in place prior to the promotion.

Table 14
Faculty Rank by New Contract Length - Terminal Degrees

| - | Rank 2 (n=55) |  | Rank 3 (n=21) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of 1 year | 11 | $20.0 \%$ | 3 | $10.7 \%$ |
| Percentage of 2 year | 6 | $10.9 \%$ | 1 | $3.6 \%$ |
| Percentage of 3+ years | 35 | $63.6 \%$ | 20 | $71.4 \%$ |
| Percentage of standing | 3 | $5.5 \%$ | 4 | $14.3 \%$ |
| Totals | 55 | $100.0 \%$ | 28 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of multi-year | 44 | $80.0 \%$ | 25 | $89.3 \%$ |

Note: This table reflects the current contracts held by non-tenure-line faculty who were promoted. Some were in place prior to the promotion.

Table 15
New Contract Length by Faculty Rank - Non-Terminal Degrees

| - | \% Salary <br> Increase | Mean Salary Increase | Median Salary Increase | \% of 1 year$(n=11)$ |  | \% of 2 year ( $\mathrm{n}=7$ ) |  | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } 3+\text { years } \\ (n=34) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of no- } \\ & \text { term ( } \mathrm{n}=1 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ |  | \% of multi-year$(n=42)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank 2: Assistant Professor | 4.0-8.0\% | 7.0\% | 8.0\% | 6 | 100.0\% | 9 | 100.0\% | 18 | 54.5\% | - | - | 27 | 64.3\% |
| Rank 3: Associate Professor | 3.73-8.0\% | 6.0\% | 5.5\% | - | - | - | - | 15 | 45.5\% | - | - | 15 | 35.7\% |
| Totals* | - | - | - | 6 | 100.0\% | 9 | 100.0\% | 33 | 100.0\% | - | - | 42 | 100.0\% |

Note: This table reflects the current contracts held by non-tenure-line faculty who were promoted. Some were in place prior to the promotion.

Table 16
Faculty Rank by New Contract Length - Non-Terminal Degrees - 2020-2021

| - | Rank \#2 (n=33) |  | Rank \#3 (n=15) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of 1 year* | 6 | $18.2 \%$ | - | - |
| Percentage of 2 year* | 9 | $27.2 \%$ | - | - |
| Percentage of 3+ years* | 18 | $54.6 \%$ | 15 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of standing* | - | - | - | - |
| Totals* | 33 | $100.0 \%$ | 15 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of multi-year* | 27 | $81.8 \%$ | 15 | $100.0 \%$ |

Note: This table reflects the current contracts held by non-tenure-line faculty who were promoted. Some were in place prior to the promotion.

Table 17
Salary Increase and New Contract Length - Terminal Degrees

| College/Campus | \% Salary <br> Increase | Mean <br> Salary Increase | Median <br> Salary Increase | 1-year contracts |  | 2-year contracts |  | $3+$ year contracts |  | No-term contracts |  | Total multi-year contracts |  | Total faculty promoted |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| University Park | 5.0\%-8.4\% | 7.0\% | 8.0\% | 14 | 16.9\% | 5 | 6.0\% | 44 | 53.0\% | 7 | 8.4\% | 56 | 67.4\% | 70 | 84.3\% |
| Commonwealth | 3.7\%-8.0\% | 6.8\% | 8.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | 2.4\% | 11 | 13.3\% | 0 | 0\% | 13 | 15.7\% | 13 | 15.7\% |
| Totals* | - | - | - | 14 | 16.9\% | 7 | 8\% | 55 | 66\% | 7 | 8.0\% | 69 | 83.1\% | 83 | 100.0\% |

Note: This table reflects the current contracts held by non-tenure-line faculty who were promoted. Some were in place prior to the promotion.

## Table 18

Salary Increase and New Contract Length - Non-Terminal Degrees

| College/Campus | \% Salary <br> Increase | Mean <br> Salary Increase | Median <br> Salary Increase | 1-year contract |  | 2-year contract |  | 3-year contract |  | No-term contract |  | Total multiyear contracts |  | Total faculty promoted |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| University Park* | 5.0\%-8.0\% | 7.0\% | 8.0\% | 4 | 8.3\% | 1 | 2.1\% | 12 | 25\% | - | - | 13 | 27.1\% | 17 | 35.4\% |
| Commonwealth | 3.7\%-8\% | 6.7\% | 8.0\% | 2 | 4.2\% | 8 | 16.7\% | 21 | 43.8\% | - | - | 29 | 60.4\% | 31 | 64.6\% |
| Totals* | - | - | - | 6 | 12.5\% | 9 | 18.8\% | 33 | 68.8\% | - | - | 42 | 87.5\% | 48 | 100.0\% |

Note: This table reflects the current contracts held by non-tenure-line faculty who were promoted. Some were in place prior to the promotion.

Table 19
Percentage of New Contract Length by Faculty Rank - Terminal Degrees

| - | \% of 1 year |  | \% of 2 year |  | \% of 3+ years |  | \% of no-term |  | \% of multi-year |  | Total Promoted |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank 2: Associate Professor | 11 | $13.3 \%$ | 6 | $7.2 \%$ | 35 | $42.2 \%$ | 3 | $3.6 \%$ | 44 | $53.0 \%$ | 55 | $66.3 \%$ |
| Rank 3: Full Professor | 3 | $3.6 \%$ | 1 | $1.2 \%$ | 20 | $24.1 \%$ | 4 | $4.8 \%$ | 25 | $30.1 \%$ | 28 | $33.7 \%$ |
| Totals | 14 | $16.9 \%$ | 7 | $8.4 \%$ | 55 | $66.3 \%$ | 7 | $8.4 \%$ | 69 | $83.1 \%$ | 83 | $100.0 \%$ |

Table 20
Percentage of Length of Previous Contract - Terminal Degrees

| - | Previous <br> 1 year |  | Previous <br> 2 year |  | Previous <br> 3+ year |  | Previous no-term |  | Previous multi-year |  | Total Previous Contracts |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank 2: Associate Professor | 28 | 33.7\% | 15 | 18.1\% | 9 | 10.8\% | 3 | 3.6\% | 27 | 32.5\% | 55 | 66.3\% |
| Rank 3: Full Professor | 6 | 7.2\% | 9 | 10.8\% | 9 | 10.8\% | 4 | 4.8\% | 22 | 26.5\% | 28 | 33.7\% |
| Totals | 34 | 40.9\% | 24 | 28.9\% | 18 | 21.6\% | 7 | 8.4\% | 49 | 59.0\% | 83 | 100.0\% |

Table 21
Percentage of New Contract Length by Faculty Rank - Non-Terminal Degrees

|  | \% of 1 year |  | \% of 2 year |  | \% of 3+ years |  | \% of no-term |  | \% of multi-year |  | Total Faculty Promoted |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank 2: Assistant Professor | 6 | 12.50\% | 9 | 18.75\% | 18 | 37.50\% | - | - | 27 | 56.25\% | 33 | 68.75\% |
| Rank 3: Associate Professor | - | - | - | - | 15 | 31.25\% | - | - | 15 | 31.25\% | 15 | 31.25\% |
| Totals | 6 | 12.50\% | 9 | 18.75\% | 33 | 68.80\% | - | - | 42 | 87.50\% | 48 | 100.0\% |

Table 22
Percentage of Length of Previous Contract - Non-Terminal Degrees

|  | Previous 1 year |  | Previous <br> 2 year |  | Previous <br> 3+ year |  | Previous no-term |  | Previous multi-year |  | Total Previous Contracts |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank 2: Assistant Professor | 18 | 37.50\% | 5 | 10.42\% | 10 | 20.83\% | - | - | 15 | 31.25\% | 33 | 68.75\% |
| Rank 3: Associate Professor | 1 | 2.08\% | 1 | 2.08\% | 13 | 27.08\% | - | - | 14 | 29.17\% | 15 | 31.25\% |
| Totals | 19 | 39.58\% | 6 | 12.50\% | 23 | 47.91\% | - | - | 29 | 60.42\% | 48 | 100.00\% |

Table 23
Years in Prior Rank - Terminal Degrees

| Promoted to: | Mean | Median | Mode | 1-4 Years in Prior Rank |  | 5-9 Years in Prior Rank |  | 10-14 Years in Prior Rank |  | 15+ Years in Prior Rank |  | Total Faculty Promoted |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Associate <br> Professor | 8.0 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 18.2\% | 30 | 54.5\% | 8 | 14.5\% | 7 | 12.7\% | 55 | 100.0\% |
| Professor | 8.5 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 28.6\% | 9 | 32.1\% | 8 | 28.6\% | 3 | 10.7\% | 28 | 100.0\% |
| Totals | - | - | - | 18 | 21.7\% | 39 | 47.0\% | 16 | 19.3\% | 10 | 12.0\% | 83 | 100.0\% |

Table 24
Years in Prior Rank - Non-Terminal Degrees

| Promoted to: | Mean | Median | Mode | 1-4 Years in Prior Rank |  | 5-9 Years in Prior Rank |  | 10-14 Years in Prior Rank |  | 15+ Years in Prior Rank |  | Total Faculty Promoted |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assistant Professor | 8.9 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 9.1\% | 18 | 54.5\% | 8 | 24.2\% | 4 | 12.1\% | 33 | 100.0\% |
| Associate Professor | 9.9 | 8 | 15 | 3 | 20.0\% | 5 | 33.3\% | 1 | 6.7\% | 6 | 40.0\% | 15 | 100.0\% |
| Totals | - | - | - | 6 | 12.5\% | 23 | 47.9\% | 9 | 18.8\% | 10 | 20.8\% | 48 | 100.0\% |

In the College of Medicine, 60 dossiers were put forward for review and 58 were promoted (see Table 27). About $78 \%$ of promotions were to the second rank and about $14 \%$ were to the third rank (see Table 27). Fifty percent of those promoted in the College of Medicine were female (see Table 25). College of Medicine faculty identifying as White comprised $69 \%$ of promoted faculty, faculty identifying as Hispanic comprised $5.2 \%$, faculty identifying as Black comprised $6.9 \%$, and faculty identifying as Asian comprised $18.9 \%$ (see Table 26). Salary increases ranged from 4 to $8 \%$ with mean and median increases of $8 \%$ (see Table 28). Seven faculty employed by the College of Medicine received term contracts (six 1-year and one 3-year), while the 51 faculty who are Penn State Hershey Medical Center employees did not receive a contract, as their faculty appointments are dependent upon their primary PSHMC appointments.

Table 25
Promotions by Identified Gender

| - | Female | Male |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Associate Professor | 22 | 23 |
| Full Professor | 2 | 3 |
| Other = Title Outside AC21 | 2 | 3 |

Table 26
Promotions by Identified Race/Ethnicity

| - | Asian | Black | Hispanic | INT | UDL | White |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Associate Professor | 9 | 4 | 3 | - | - | 29 |
| Full Professor | 1 | - | - | - | - | 7 |
| Other = Title Outside AC21 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 4 |

INT = International Faculty, Non-Citizens, and Faculty who are not Permanent Residents; MLT = Multiple, more than one race selected through self-identification; UDL=Undeclared

## Appendix S <br> 4/26/22

Table 27
Promotions by New Rank and Campus Type

| College/Campus | Total Faculty Promoted | Rank \#2 = 76 |  | Rank \#3 = 21 |  | Rank = Other <br> (Title outside of AC21) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| College of Medicine | 58 | 45 | $77.6 \%$ | 8 | $13.8 \%$ | 5 | $8.6 \%$ |

Note: This table reflects the current contracts held by non-tenure-line faculty who were promoted. Some were in place prior to the promotion.

Table 28
Non-tenure-line Salary Increase and Length of New Contract

| College/Campus | \% Salary Increase | Mean Salary Increase | Median Salary Increase | 1-year contracts |  | 2-year contracts |  | 3-year contracts |  | No-term contracts |  | Total faculty promoted |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| College of Medicine | 4\%-8\% | 8.0\% | 8.0\% | 6 | 10\% | - | - | 1 | 2\% | 51 | 88\% | 58 | 100.0\% |

Note: This table reflects the current contracts held by non-tenure-line faculty who were promoted. Some were in place prior to promotion.

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON GLOBAL PROGRAMS 

Role of Sustainability in Penn State Global

(Informational)

## Introduction

In the era of climate change, Penn State faces the pressing question of how to reconcile its commitment to sustainability with its dedication to global learning through study abroad, global intellectual exchange, and recruiting-as well as ensuring the success of-a diverse and international body of students, staff, and faculty. On this topic, the Global Programs Committee has conducted conversations with Roger Brindley (Vice Provost of Penn State Global), Brian Brubaker (Assistant Vice Provost for Global Learning), Kate Manni (Director of Education Abroad / Global Learning), and Matt Lockaby (Campus Associate for Education Abroad). We have also received feedback from Michele Halsell (Assistant Director, Sustainability Institute) and Peter Buck (Academic Programs Manager, Sustainability Institute). We present here our findings regarding the University's current approach.

## Report

At present, less than $25 \%$ of Penn State students participate in study abroad programming. It is imperative to broaden access to international/global experiences for all students, and especially for those from minoritized and historically underrepresented communities. At the same time, more study abroad participants translate into greater carbon emissions, which in turn contributes to the warming of the planet. Air travel also contributes to the destruction of habitats, cultural displacements, and disease transmission. These detrimental effects, too, must be reined in. As our committee noted in its Advisory/Consultative report from March 2020, best practices should draw on existing offerings that provide deep engagement with sustainability in terms of content, in addition to the structure of the study abroad offering. Future study abroad offerings need to consider the impacts for local settings and populations, the type of learning that occurs for participants, and the carbon footprint of travel.

The current definition of sustainability that the Pennsylvania State University uses is the simultaneous pursuit of human health and happiness, environmental quality, and economic wellbeing for current and future generations. Penn State views this challenge through several lenses, including the 17 United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which serve as a universal call to action to end poverty, protect the planet, and ensure that all people enjoy peace and prosperity. The SDGs align with the University's commitment in the strategic plan to "Advancing Inclusion, Equity, and Diversity"; "Enhancing Global Engagement"; "Ensuring a Sustainable Future"; and "Stewarding Our Planet's Resources." Penn State Global has been selected as the inaugural (2021) winner of The Forum on Education Abroad's award on "Advancing the SDGs through Education Abroad," and the recent rebranding of "Global Programs" to "Penn State Global," aiming to foreground "global" rather than "international"
experiences, is part of these efforts as well. The distinction underlying the name change is that Penn State students can establish "global" connections without ever leaving Pennsylvania.

At the same time, there has not been a formal endorsement of the UN SDGs. The Strategic Plan touches on the UN SDGs but does not officially commit to its targets and indicators. The University's commitments also fall short of the benchmarks set in the Paris Climate Agreement.

It would make sense to set targets for learning outcomes related to sustainability, number of faculty who engage in professional development for sustainability education, and number of course offerings dedicated to sustainability, as well as to create sustainability certificates.

We list below some further ongoing and envisioned changes and developments:

- Where traditional learning abroad is to continue, it must continue to involve serious pedagogical objectives in order to justify its effect on the planet. Indeed, and in line with our previous recommendations, sustainability education is itself becoming a critical part of sending students to other countries. Existing programs in the College of Arts and Architecture, Agricultural Science, Earth and Mineral Sciences, and elsewhere can serve as models for other units. We would point again to this committee's Advisory/Consultative Report from March 2020. Working directly with Penn State Global (then: the Office of Global Programs), the report conducted a review of existing study abroad programs with a particular focus on those that engage with sustainability in a broad sense and listed numerous examples of programs that are models for how to infuse sustainability within the content of a study abroad programs.
- Penn State Global has audited its 400 existing education abroad programs for significant sustainability-related content so that it may more easily direct interested students to these programs. Furthermore, it continues to work with faculty and departments interested in developing new programs.
- Efforts to more effectively assist non-UP campuses in offering sustainable study abroad programming are likewise underway. For example, with the support of the Office of the Vice President of the Commonwealth Campuses, Education Abroad is working with various faculty to develop cross-campus, embedded courses. This takes some of the work burden off individual faculty as they design curricula and recruit participants from more than one location, thus making the programs financially viable. It also increases the likelihood that the program will be able to run in consecutive years as it will be supported by a larger population of faculty and students. Non-UP campuses also display greater diversity among their faculty and host higher percentages of students of color, non-traditional students, and students with financial need. The changes will accordingly serve to diversify study abroad's profile more broadly. They also contribute to attempts at engaging local communities and involving them in sustainability efforts.
- There is strong support for new study abroad program development within the western hemisphere, thereby heightening awareness of global issues closer to the United States while simultaneously broadening access by cutting costs (travel to/within Central America tends to be less expensive than travel to the traditional destinations in Western Europe).
- Penn State Global is also encouraging multi-campus cooperation in planning off-shore Alternative Spring Break (ASB) trips. Several non-UP campuses have developed such opportunities that aim to build relationships of mutual trust with a community.
- In collaboration with the Sustainability Institute, Penn State Global is conducting faculty workshops that train program leaders in the relevant SDG objectives and in how to embed sustainability-oriented learning outcomes into their curricula.
- Among further alternatives to traditional travel-based study abroad, Penn State Global has adopted the project-based international virtual exchange program EDGE (Experiential Digital Global Engagement, https://global.psu.edu/EDGE), conceived at SUNY's Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) program and piloted at Penn State Beaver.
- PSU Global is also pursuing further virtual exchange options with many institutions, including several of its partner institutions. Furthermore, several virtual projects have received outside grant funding, including a recent initiative with Moscow State University.
- In other carbon-reduction efforts, Penn State Global has retained remote-work options and moved its Study Abroad Fair into a hybrid format, thereby simultaneously expanding access and reducing emissions.
- Penn State Global is also pointing out carbon-offset organizations to students to potentially offset their travel. Generally speaking, however, there is skepticism whether carbon-offset programs actually work, and the University prefers to focus on curricular reform, operational changes, and its own sustainability projects. David Hughes in the College of Agricultural Sciences recently obtained a grant focused on increasing the accuracy, traceability and accountability of carbon sequestration projects that are often used as carbon offsets, in an effort to increase confidence that the offsets are real and have the intended impact on reducing/sequestering carbon. Our Advisory/Consultative report from March 2020 includes a table providing an assessment of the carbon impact for flights between State College, Pennsylvania and six world regions.
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## SENATE COUNCIL

# Report on Spring 2021 Academic Unit Visits 

(Informational)
The Senate Officers visited six academic units in Spring 2021: College of Education (February 8, 2021), The Graduate School (March 1, 2021), Dickinson Law (March 2, 2021), College of Engineering (March 23, 2021), College of Medicine (March 30, 2021), and the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences (April 13, 2021). During these visits, the Senate Officers met with staff, students, faculty, and administrators in that order except for three units: College of Education, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, and College of Medicine. Each group met separately to encourage open and frank discussions.

As a reference, Spring 2021 continued under COVID-19 restrictions, and all six visits were conducted virtually.

## Executive Summary

Each academic unit varied in their enrollment, their academic programs, and the nature of their student populations. They did however share common praise for the units and the University as well as common concerns.

Many of these praises and concerns were also voiced during the Spring 2020 and Fall 2020 academic unit visits.

## Consistent praises

Concern for the students: This was a common theme across all groups. It was very evident that the students were of top priority in all situations whether the conversations focused on mental health, equity, physical safety, or quality education.

Smooth transitions during remote learning: There were three main themes in this category (communication, information technology, and housing and maintenance).

- Communication - Overall a good job was done on providing services, providing information, and communicating what was expected. However, as the University moves into the "new normalcy" more detail is needed in the communications. This is especially evident for those that have to implement policies and procedures.
- Information Technology - All agreed that continuous transition would not be successful without the information technology departments.
- Many stated that working remotely allowed for more interaction with individuals. Travel was not an issue, there was increased safety during inclement weather, and meetings were more convenient. It was also easier to communicate with other campuses, alumni, and donors.
- Remote connections provided greater flexibility for multigeneration families. The workday hours were skewed and there were tradeoffs (please see below in Consistent Concerns) but the flexibility was greatly appreciated.
- Additional services were able to be offered for students. These offerings allowed for personalized experiences for full time and part time students. Zoom allowed for more consistent experiences for all students in terms of availability and access.
- Housing and Maintenance - A wonderful job was done focusing on the health and safety of the campus. Individuals felt safe in the classrooms and buildings. Protocols were maintained, cleaning supplies were readily available, and there was room for social distancing.


## Consistent Concerns

Workload: There was a deep concern for the amount of additional work hours.

- There is an increasing amount of additional paperwork, programing, training, and activities.
- With remote capabilities meetings are scheduled on all days (holidays, mental health days, etc.), at all times of the day, and on weekends.
- Individuals are exhausted and overwhelmed with no boundaries between personal and professional lives. There is no work/life balance.
- With a heavier load and immense preparation time for the changing strategies there is extreme trepidation for burnout. Fatigue, anxiety, and depression were high on the list of concerns.

Remote format: This was one category in which staff, faculty, and student generalizations somewhat differed. The overall agreement was that every situation is different and individualized.

- Staff generally liked, and wanted to keep, the flexibility of working remote.
- Because of workload issues the faculty generally wanted the students to either be completely remote or completely face to face. Special exceptions for large groups of students increases workload exponentially. However, the value of using the resources and materials created during times of remote learning was recognized with the intent of incorporating these resources into future courses.
- The students felt as if they missed some experiences of the face-to-face format but liked the flexibility and choices of being remote. Students stated that they were able to gain a quality education while fulfilling other responsibilities. They stated that they now had opportunities that were not previously available. Students wanted to keep the remote resources (recorded lectures, materials, etc.) independent of the class modality.

Recruiting and retention: Many individuals, especially minority students, worried about their roles in recruiting and retention. Many units are relying on students for these functions and the students state that this process is not sustainable.

Communication issues: There were concerns about uneven distribution of information, decision making without input from stakeholders, and incomplete answers. While some praised their unit's administrators for good leadership and communication, many people described communication gaps and a lack of decision input. There were concerns of communication overload which made it harder to find information and resources. A need for transparency at all levels of decision making and accountability were high on the list of concerns as well.

Access and Equity: Many students, staff, and faculty described various home-life complexities.
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion: Students, staff, and faculty expressed concerns about diversity, equity, and inclusion in their respective colleges. Administrators described various recent efforts to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion. Many units felt their limited success to attract diverse faculty was due to strong competition for top talent with peer institutions and the private sector.

Assessment: Faculty, staff and students voiced concerns as to how assessment will be adapted moving forward. Of special concern were student ratings of teacher effectiveness (SRTEs), promotion and tenure processes in the wake of COVID-19. Issues revolved around diversity and inequality in research since some academic fields have been affected much more than others. Developing a new way to evaluate each other and recognizing the work of non-tenure track and research faculty as it relates to teaching and service was readily discussed. Conversations revolved around assessment, evaluation, and recognition along with the varied and complex interaction between those processes.

Hiring: New systems have made it more difficult to hire individuals (faculty, staff, and students) in a timely manner. We heard concerns regarding unnecessary redundancies in the system, frustrations over increased length of time to complete tasks, and a need for more direct staff and administrative access to WorkDay to improve communications and reduce data entry errors. Not only is it frustrating and time consuming but affects workloads, student funding, and research.

Belief in Staff and Faculty Expertise: Concern and anxiety was consistently expressed over the feeling that administrators may not value staff and faculty expertise. During a pandemic and a time in which all individuals were asked to continuously do more employees felt insulted, undervalued, and underappreciated.

One Penn State 2025: As we move toward 2025 the tone is "we are all not the same." Individuals are hearing that Penn State is one geographically dispersed university but when trying to maintain and recruit some academic units and individuals "feel like their own island." There were many questions on the push for new programs but how to develop and run those new programs were in question without additional staff. The process of granting faculty graduate status was also a concern.

## Unit Summaries

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

## College of Education

(February 8, 2021; Attendance per meeting group - staff 33, student 29, faculty 44)

The administrative meeting took place first. The session focused on shared governance, AC14, and the roll of University Faculty Senate. There were concerns about understanding shared governance. Communication across the four departments is not as robust as they would like, and the goal is to reach a level of collaboration. They voiced concerns of University Faculty Senate training and worried senators would vote with their hearts and not as representatives for the faculty. Administrators were also concerned about AC14, annual reviews. They stated it was a very difficult time for department heads. Strategic plans are being determined at a higher level, but department heads are the ones to carry out the plans. Administrators were not sure what they were being evaluated on and worried that anyone, even individuals with no current interaction, could participate in the annual review. They did not understand the logic in that portion of AC14. The Senate officers offered that questions about AC14 rollout should be directed to Kathy Bieschke. This led into further discussion on the role of the University Faculty Senate. Administrative concerns about grade forgiveness, administrative reviews but no SRTEs for faculty, administrative evaluations during the pandemic, and confidentiality were mentioned. Again, it was explained that the University Faculty Senate makes policy recommendations and AC policies are not Senate policies.

Although staff members were very happy that there seems to be a focus on faculty and student wellbeing, they were concerned that they did not see as much focus for staff. Modified work situations were another area of inequity. Questions of remote work (assessment - my analytics, hiring, maintaining talent through competitive salaries, the footprint of the University as a whole, shared spaces, and equipment - internet, desks, phone, etc.) were discussed as well. University surveillance concerning advising and students was also discussed. Elevate tracks Canvas interactions and the questions asked were, "Who uses the information? and "Are there intervention expectations?" Staff stated that not much guidance was given to students about Canvas interactions and there doesn't seem to be as robust of a safety net for students compared to other universities. With the College of Education's large numbers (both graduate and undergraduate) another student concern was the varying advising styles especially between the four departments.

The group of students during the student session was very full-bodied from all levels of undergraduate and graduate students to student leaders. Undergraduate students voiced numerous concerns. The students stated it was hard to declare their majors unless or until they were at University Park. The need for major prerequisites on a broader scale and more flexibility in general education courses were stressed. Along those lines was the need for better outreach and advising. Students would like more formal training options. They stated that many important items tend to be "water cooler chats" and students do not know what to ask if they do not fall into these conversations. They mentioned that there seems to be a reliance on upperlevel students to provide information to other students. Undergraduate students were also worried about the equity in teaching placements which are very limited. For instance, Math Education is placed in Pittsburgh and Special Education is placed in Altoona. This makes it very difficult for some students to travel and find housing. Graduate students focused on financial appointments. They stated that there needs to be advanced notice and better coordination for the financial appointments. In many cases the students stated that they are hearing about their appointments in late April, May, and sometimes summer which creates an issue of rent, adult students with children, and Visa issues to name a few. They stated that other institutions seem to
have twelve-month contracts where Penn State has ten-month contracts. In some cases, teaching assistantships occur on a semester-to-semester basis and other times the funding is pulled unexpectedly. The process of finding funding is also disjointed. Positions are posted in different areas, expectations are not specified in some cases, and there seems to be a wide gap in pay that seems to break in racial lines. This is further complicated by the fact that international students usually do not have the opportunity to work off campus. Audits of research assistant positions would also be helpful for transparency. There is currently a survey in place to investigate levels of graduate funding at https://pennstate.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV 3qIEBYkz64WXdit. Graduate students stated that all of this leads to a "wild west mentality" on and off campus as well as graduate student exploitation.

The faculty conversation began with a concern that students may not be receiving accommodations they are certified to receive through the Americans with Disabilities Act especially the ADA Amended Act (Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act). The next topic was the economic impact from COVID-19. Questions were asked if there is follow-up on University revenue issues and the impact of COVID-19. Has the University reviewed or benchmarked its administrative salaries and staffing with other universities of the same category? Has reduction of administrative positions and/or wage freezes for upper administration been considered as a cost-cutting measure? Along the same lines, faculty members voiced concerns for fixed term faculty. A question posed by the faculty to the Senate officers was, "What do you all see as current needs for fixed term faculty and how is Faculty Senate planning to address these moving forward?" Faculty members were assured that Senate is very active with fixed terms items especially salary equity and close attention is being paid to the Big Ten Academic Alliance. It was discussed that the University Faculty Senate is advisory and consultative only on these items. The conversation then continued with pressures between faculty and administration. There were questions of pushback, pressure, and consequences. Faculty would also like clarification on AC 14 and the interpretations of AC14. One major question was the clarification whether anyone can survey faculty other than Penn State administration and if so who could see the anonymous survey responses. Senate officers directed these questions to Faculty Affairs. Communication seems to be a continuing problem. Faculty asked for consistency in notifications and other communications plus a need for a faculty list serv that is not administratively owned. The faculty conversation ended with the acknowledgement of a gradual decrease in graduate assistantship funding across all the College of Education departments. This will ultimately lead to a "major shift in the understanding of our mission for graduate education."

## The Graduate School

(March 1, 2021; Attendance per meeting group - staff 22, student 33, faculty 50)
The staff conversation focused on communication, working remotely, and students. They stated there was a need for different methods of communication especially in these times of highvolume information rollouts. Staff would like to be more engaged at a higher level. They would like to make sure resources are available, have information on how to find them, and a listing to their content. This is very important in situations of graduate program staff turnover and
enforcing policies that have been developed by the Graduate Council. Policies and procedures are sent out, often by the Dean's Office, but others have to interpret the policies and procedures as well oversee their implementation. This all interfaces with units, programs, departments, and students. The staff expressed a need for clarity in those policies and to need for understanding the intent of those policies. Since the staff workforce is sometimes small, it would be appreciated to understand what time limits are meant to be helpful guides and which ones strongly need enforced as to these policies and procedures. The conversation then moved to working remotely. Some of the challenges listed were PDF documents, how time consuming they are to manipulate, and the problems involved with signatures on those documents. They spoke of a need for more training with online workflow and online forms. They acknowledged that some tasks seem to require paper versions such as transcripts but with trickle-down delays in working with other institutions this has become cumbersome. Students are also asking for more exceptions whether those exceptions exist or not. This is also creating workflow issues.

The student session covered a multitude of topics. The conversation started with a discussion about the Equity and Inclusion Committee. They were praised for new curriculum, handbooks, and training. They did state that first generation students needed more support and First Generations Advocate (FGA) will hopefully provide that support. As for research, students expressed a need for more resources and knowledge and there seems to be inequality in some student experiences verses others. The mentor/mentee program in chemical engineering was mentioned as a potential program that might be spread across the Graduate School. Course selection was next. There seems to be gaps in offerings (recent faculty exits, sabbaticals, etc.) as well as a lack of course varieties. Some programs were also marketed as "working persons' programs" but more and more of the class offerings are being placed during working hours. Students thought that some programs were outgrowning their funding and faculty resources (Acoustics as an example). As for qualifying exams, some students stated that they were like a "hazing or rite of passage." Students stated the exams were "ridiculously hard." They mentioned this barrier might be more problematic for minorities and may be no longer useful for their programs. There seems to be discrepancies in exam requirements, some that are asking for literature reviews to help with their dissertation proposal and some that are not reflective on ability to learn and analyze. Students stated that it does get confusing, clarity is needed, and maybe a course would be useful to help specify graduate exam requirements and the overall process. Zoom was mentioned as a positive. The students liked the transition and would like to see more hybrid classes moving forward. This would allow them more opportunities like back-to-back classes. They did mention that zoom isn't as good for collaboration and did seem isolating at times. Students stated that Penn State was very good at teaching and research training even though teaching loads for teaching assistants can be high. As for workload, students also stated that graduate students are taking on more and more of a role in student recruitment along with participating in committees and meetings. While most students are happy to help with the programs, they do not want to be responsible for such a large bulk of it, but do not feel they can reduce their participation because of systematic reasons. The conversation ended with the students requesting a need for more communication especially during transition periods and extended time to complete teaching evaluations.

Faculty members began the conversation with Penn State 2025 especially with needing to make the process of becoming a graduate faculty member and offering graduate courses easier and
more open. They asked for a universal policy for all faculty to become graduate faculty as they join Penn State and that this status be applicable across all campuses. In some cases, colleges must reapply for faculty graduate status on a yearly basis. The need is for inclusivity. This led to a lengthy section on faculty interactions with the graduate school. Faculty felt that at times interactions seem adversarial and problematic with the faculty feeling that their expertise is not respected or trusted. It was mentioned that there is a cultural issue in not believing the faculty and the mindset needs to change. New faculty leadership in the Graduate Council seems to be a wonderful step in that direction. The conversation then moved to decisions about students taking into consideration all students. One major concern was in the area of online students. Faculty felt that policies were being written without thinking of online student needs. This includes support for graduate coordinators and staff that interact with these students. It was mentioned that clarification needs to also be made between graduate students and undergraduate students in all realms but specifically mentioned was communication. The conversation ended with a request of a focused effort to disseminate best practices or strategies for graduate student attraction and recruitment to departmental graduate admission committees and ultimately faculty.

## Dickinson Law

(March 2, 2021; Attendance per meeting group - staff 20, student 9, faculty 17)
Staff thought that Penn State has handled issues concerning COVID-19 very well. They stated that concerns have been met and events have been anticipated. This ranged from announcements, testing, educating faculty and staff, etc. They agreed it has been a large amount of extra work. They credited information technology individuals for going above and beyond. This included Zoom support, classroom technology, software integration, Canvas and course liaisons, help with guest speakers, sustaining external partners, and heightened engagement with alumni. They did have a certain amount of anxiety for the future and how issues will be address moving forward especially returning to campus. However, staff stated that the Dean of Dickinson Law leads by example and inclusion. They feel there is a sense of community with a natural leader and a fresh perspective. There is an established vision of priorities that provide a drive to work together on items such as student future funds, student emergency funds, and an increase in therapy and counseling sessions. They state they are also very happy with the support to add social equity into curricular programing. Staff were proud that in addition to teaching and learning in accordance with antiracist principles, the diversity of Dickinson Law faculty, staff, and students has increased drastically. They mentioned that continued support in areas of diversity is very important not only within Dickinson Law but in the surrounding community as well.

Students began their session discussing ways in which they feel supported in equity. This included Dean Conway's initiative for minority students. It also included flexibility during COVID-19 and an understanding of the serious nature of COVID-19. When individual issues arose, students stated they were treated professionally and kindly. They also mentioned a feeling of overall support through alumni informational interviews and welcoming community which included the town, school, professors, and staff.

The faculty conversation began with communication and inclusivity. Dickinson Law is in an interesting position as both a Commonwealth campus and a graduate entity. They are starting to see more interdisciplinary courses and research opportunities but would like to see more connections and interactions especially with the law students at University Park. Faculty suggested that there be a way for junior faculty to learn about service opportunities. They also suggested additional external collaborations for mentoring. Along this same conversation thread of losing their independence when it comes to University decisions. This is in terms of faculty transitioning back to their offices and not seeming to have significant input as to their goals of instruction. Faculty stressed that problems in units are sometimes different than problems at University Park, but the processes are dictated by University Park. As COVID-19 was discussed, faculty hoped there was equity for those receiving the vaccine. They also hoped Dickinson Law could help make an impact on the community with educational information and community access to Penn State facilities for vaccinations. Faculty asked about the current status of Penn State's budget and were given a link to President Barron's address on the budget: https://news.psu.edu/story/648971/2021/02/25/administration/penn-state-president-addresses-pennsylvania-house. They also asked about University Faculty Senate's function within the University. It was mentioned that faculty appreciated the analysis done to reach the alternative grading decision since burdens are distributed unequally among students.

During the administrative session, Dean Conway had three main focus areas for continued improvement. The first was continued support for minoritized students. This involves understanding what it means to be a minoritized student. As the administration looks into how individuals define their professional identity, there needs to be an authentic way to help develop the professional identities of the students. The second is to bridge the gap between extraordinarily seasoned faculty and faculty that are very new. Dean Conway listed the third as a need to work on the brand confusion between Dickinson Law (https://dickinsonlaw.psu.edu/) and Penn State Law (https://pennstatelaw.psu.edu/). There can be confusion around the fact that they are actually two separate law schools.

## College of Engineering

(March 23, 2021; Attendance per meeting group - staff 30, student 16, faculty 15)
Much of the staff session focused on lessons learned and moving forward. Staff began with the positives for working remotely. In terms of student engagement, staff stated that it worked very well - especially with students from other campuses. It also allowed for Career Envoy visits, campus visits, and engagement events. It was mentioned that before the pandemic there was very little interest in virtual career events both from students and employers. Now, staff are seeing increase collaboration. They are not working in silos, the issues of electronic signatures are finally worked out, and they are appreciative of how helpful peers have been especially for new individuals. A major staff frustration during this time has been with communications. Staff understand that higher level administrators had to make decisions very quickly, but were frustrated that decisions were being made without speaking to key shareholders (individuals running certain programs). They felt some of the rules were very general and did not take into consideration students working nationally and internationally. This was also frustrating for international students. They stated it was very hard for companies and students to understand
and follow the guidelines and clarification from the task force was hard to achieve. This led to additional time spent on forms, exemptions, etc., which led to a conversation on workload and return to campus. Staff stressed that the eight to five workday seems to have disappeared. There is a need and expectation to answer emails outside of workday hours. This is partly due to students in different time zones and the need for flexibility based on families and living situations. Staff stated that it was harder to draw the line between personal and professional lives. There seems to be a fine line between connectivity (customer service) and personal space and time. The concern is the difference between being able to do something and being expected to do something. Students and employers in other states and countries want immediate responses so now work continues into the evenings and weekends. All the above being stated, many staff do not want to lose this hybrid opportunity. They discussed that because decisions on flexible work environments were pushed to individual academic units it has been unequitable. This will ultimately lead to non-equitable recruiting. Subject matter experts are now in demand and those experts can be hired nationwide. Certain units that are not able to offer remote jobs will not be as attractive than other units in the University that can. Other concerns are space issues. The Office of Physical Plant provides space guidelines, but they need to be more granular (for instance there is a maximum space limit for offices but not a minimum space limit). Staff stated that space issues need to be standardized and equitable. Staff also discussed the enrollment controls for transfer criteria. They stated that that the transfer policy needs to be thought out. It creates barriers for students that could benefit from more support. The policy is problematic especially if the University is trying to diversity the student population.

The students' conversations also focused on issues that either help or marginalized certain groups of students. Students recognized the effort that has been put forth to help individualized student learning. For instance, through Zoom, faculty can provide guided study sessions and having recordings available has allowed for more student participation. The students would like to keep this as we return to face-to-face instruction. This would allow for flexibility and equity for students that are shy, have anxiety, have disabilities, etc. To the argument that students would then not show up, students discussed that high attendance isn't always the best indicator for learning. Students stated that the pros outweigh the cons for most students, and providing education for all students is the most important aspect. Some students stated that they needed the flow and narrative of the class and that sometimes students come to Penn State for the big classes. They definitely wanted and thought they needed a face-to-face environment for laboratory sessions. Some students thought that a compromise would be to only receive recordings if you could not attend class. On this subject, students stated a need for standardizing recordings, looking into privacy issues (intellectual property as well as consent to be in the video), and the process of making recordings accessible. Students discussed wellness days as a good idea, but class exemptions were a huge issue. They did stress the need for making mental health a priority. Individuals in student groups stated it was difficult to access funds through Penn State. Many did not feel supported by the University which led to a need to work with outside sponsors. Flexibility in coursework was mentioned next. Due to very strict coursework sequences, some students stated they were "held back unnecessarily" because they were out of sequence. They also said conceptually credit windows are not a concern but practically they are keeping students from taking other courses. These other courses may be outside of their major, but students feel those courses are important. They wish they had more time to explore minors and they feel this is an equity issue. Based on this advising was listed as an issue. Students
stressed a need for more academic advisors especially with engineering degrees. The common thought was that some majors were ill-equipped with academic advisors.

The faculty session was filled with issues and concerns but also information gathering. ARL (Applied Research Laboratory:
https://pennstate.pure.elsevier.com/en/organisations/httparlpsuedu) and the College of Engineering are tied together as one unit. ARL is not a degree-granting entity. Individuals have to fill out timecards for billable hours and are accountable to the US government and the US defense auditing agency. However, they do not have a budget to do some of the service items that are needed for the University. Faculty stated the need to change or adapt the culture between the two. With over 1,200 employees and 108 research faculty (non-tenure track faculty) they would like to be treated like other faculty members. Engineering faculty spoke of their promotion and tenure guidelines as being wholistic and they were very grateful for this process. As for diversity, equity, and inclusion, all faculty were committed to make this happen. They are seeing the College of Engineering investing in resources and changes are slowly happening. As for staff, faculty are seeing a dichotomy between those that are bored and those that are overworked. They state that if everyone uses communication tools, the communication is much better between staff and faculty. Faculty like the continuity of communication channels and are trying hard to figure out the culture of how staff like to do certain things. They also mentioned that the information technology individuals have been wonderful even with non-Penn State equipment. The conversation then moved to University Faculty Senate involvement. Faculty asked how much the Senate is involved with general decisions (an example used was commencement). At the beginning of the pandemic things were moving so fast that it seemed as if University administrators were informing faculty of decisions. Faculty emphasized the need for deeper consultation. Faculty also asked about diversity, equity, and inclusion curriculum changes. They stated a need for a broader look than the general education curriculum. They wanted to know where the University was with the required curriculum. The Senate officers shared that a taskforce would be charged on April 1, 2021. They will be working over the summer on recommendations for fall but realistically the work will continue into Fall 2022. Faculty also wanted to how the teaching modalities of the Commonwealth Campuses compared to the teaching modalities of University Park. The faculty conversation ended with faculty members thinking of the following items: vaccinations, international travel, supply chain control at state and federal levels, the open access policy, workday approvals especially for peer tutors, and Simba approvals.

## College of Medicine

(March 30, 2021; Attendance per meeting group - staff 64, student 11, faculty 31)
The student session was conducted first. The students stated that they were remote in the summer, hybrid in the fall, and are now moving more toward a face-to-face format. They said things were going much better now that they are back in person. During this time, students thought overall communication was good. They were given four weeks to get back on campus and they knew what was expected of them (requirements and protocols) before coming to campus. They also had outreach and volunteering opportunities during this time that made them feels as part of the University. This included helping with Pennsylvania vaccinations at local
clinics, online trainings and shadowing, as well as regular Zoom meetings. Students stated that there were open lines of communication and items are corrected as they go. Once a month they have a one-hour fireside chat to voice concerns. They listed some positive items to come out of these conversations: one on one meetings for clinical placement, evaluations effecting curriculum, mentor/mentee assignments (developed a Lion Guide packet), and a board preparation resource program called Exam Master. Students also enjoyed numerous other interaction activities. Anatomy teaching assistants are very active. There are three interprofessional events (IPEs) in which students can interact with individuals in different fields within the College of Medicine. Students (PT, OT, MD, etc.) also work together on patient treatment plans. As last suggestions for improvement, students suggested that the flow of lectures is sometimes not there, and lectures could be a little more organized. The lectures also seem as if newer information is added to older lectures, but faculty need to take another look at the transitions.

Faculty mentioned several difficulties especially relating to pandemic conditions. The first is the isolation and not knowing the direction of the future. At the moment, the College of Medicine is looking for a Dean. There was also a separation from the hospital in July 2019 which led to a concern about how to align more with the University. The College of Medicine is now illfunded in respect to its peers at the University. Faculty state that there are some inherent problems. Faculty state that standard expectations and requirements are not available. Faculty engagement functions differently. This is evident in clinical and educations rolls, different hats with different metrics, there is no formal space to interact with students outside of the clinical rolls, and it is hard to reach out to preclinical groups. They stated that across Hershey there are a large variety of individuals that appear to be doing the same things, but they are really vastly different. Fixed-term faculty seem to be treated like tenure track faculty by being held to the same standards but are not compensated the same. Faculty said there was a survey conducted last year (2020) about these large disparities. They stated that the disparities are not sustainable and create inequalities. This leads to questions on how to work toward promotion. However, faculty were disheartened when the faculty organization only gave approximately eight minutes to this issue. Faculty said that the structure of requiring clinical, education, research and service needs to be clarified for not only the faculty but for the faculty chairs. All of this, along with the faculty members roles seemingly changing from designing course material play a role in losing faculty. They stated a need for faculty list serves to communicate with one another to address issues in a public context. Faculty stated that this would provide advocacy for the interest of the faculty. There was also some frustration on how to train the students on clinical issues if clinical spaces are not available.

The staff began their discussion by stating the leadership of the College of Medicine has done an excellent job at managing issues surrounding the pandemic. There have been multiple town hall meetings and for some individuals the working remotely has become a permanent option. They stated that there have been pros and cons to working remotely. Some staff loved working from home. They said it is more convenient than hybrid working for the fact of having materials all in one space. They said they were more effective and efficient and it some cases the flexibility takes the stress and pressure off of parents with children. Those staff members also like the lack of travel to work. Some staff did not like working from home. Their work area was not as comfortable and equipped as on campus. Unless they get printing rights (which because of
security can take two months or more) staff had to go into the office to print documents. The workload also seemed to increase. Staff stated that there were more questions directed through email than phone calls. These questions thus took much longer to answer. There was also a lack of certain supplies needed to work from home. The work/life balance was not there, and it became mentally, emotionally, and physically draining. As the session came to an end, the staff mentioned concern for the information technology gap between Penn State and Penn Health. They wanted to know if there was a way for part time individuals to pay into benefits and they were worried about budget cuts. They stated they were having to do more with less resources. They felt there was a hesitancy to invest in infrastructure. This alone with time-consuming hiring processes made them question the future of the College.

The administrators of the College of Medicine stated that they have 25 departments, five categories of students at the College of Medicine, and 130 administers that conduct annual reviews. They are in the process of making reviews more uniform and starting to look at departmental criteria as well as what it means to be an academic. They stated that the College of Medicine just completed a self-assessment. This assessment helped to evaluate certain programs. The administrators hoped the feedback gets directed to those programs. They also highlighted their program for underrepresented students:
https://www.psu.edu/news/medicine/story/program-provides-support-underrepresented-college-medicine-students/

## College of Earth and Mineral Sciences

(April 13, 2021; Attendance per meeting group - staff 26, student 9, faculty 13)
The EMS faculty began the conversation with positive Penn State aspects to the COVID-19 response. They credited the safety officers, staff, and information technology individuals for working so hard during this time. Ninety percent of their research is up and running and they are now able to continue hands on experimentation. The faculty did say that there are still setbacks with the social sciences and international components of their research. They also stressed the wonderful quality of students, faculty, and leadership in EMS and see a continuation of excellent recruiting classes. There were some areas of concern. Faculty worried that too many new operating programs are added in a yearly basis, not only for faculty but for staff. Document transfer dates, versions, and tasks have been difficult during box migration. SIMBA is definitely another problem that has hampered research. Faculty mentioned that contracts may not be renewed based on embarrassing budget issues. Workday compounds the problem by what seems to be punishing for having carryover for rainy day funds, paying individuals especially for state projects, and taking the power away from individual units for startup money and general allocations. These issues carried over to the topic of renovations. Some thought that OPP (Office of Physical Plant) was not efficient and as fiscal years were crossed, money was lost because of holding the carryover. The conversation then moved to concerns about students. Faculty worried that even though there are resources for students, faculty, and staff, individuals need to function as social workers due to continuous stress. This leaves faculty worried about the years to come. For instance, annual reviews will probably not look good. There has been quite a bit of additional effort placed into teaching, but the system seems broken. Research also may not look as good based on a backlog of items, having a hard time finding journal reviewers,
etc. Penn State also seems to be falling behind in federal funds based on items such as policy changes, spin off of administrative tasks, running departments out of residential homes, and the round the clock work of faculty and staff. The faculty conversation ended with concerns over international student and faculty. Faculty stated that some international students have problems with their Visas when the interdisciplinary aspect of the unit does not match up with the program listed. International faculty are also having problems with compliance. There is a need for simple and easy-to-understand compliances. Department heads should be briefed on how to advise faculty to meet federal compliances, which best practices should be posted, and support groups needed.

Staff voiced a concern about new general education curriculum. They stated that it gets harder and harder to explain the requirements to students. This reduction of flexibility seems to be disproportionally affecting the higher-level students that are coming into the program, especially with interdomain courses. As with the faculty, staff also mentioned system fatigue. Transitions such as workday, Microsoft, and SIMBA do not seem to be tested completely (they suggested piloting programs for at least a year). This means that staff cannot learn one system before they have to learn another system. When there were no events and travel at the beginning of the pandemic this was a problem, but now that activities are added back to the workday they say the stress is unbearable. Working from home during this time has had positive and negative aspects. Some staff have stated they feel more connected to teams since they have been remote. However, staff with health problems are "petrified" about going back to work and exhausting their sick leave. Many staff also worry about the new workload expectations, especially for advisors. New programs such as Raise Your Hand have been implemented. There also seems to be an imbalance in the number of advisees on a roster. A suggestion was to standardize the number of advisees across the University. Staff also worry about bureaucracy around faculty member positions. This involved the visiting scholar process, research contracts, budgets for young faculty members, and frustrating Penn State systems that may deter venders. The staff session ended with a rundown of the best things in EMS. These included the people (collaboration and teamwork), the connection to the students (dedication to undergraduate and graduate students), the feeling of a community, and the College leadership (very aware and communitive).

The student session had a very nice mix of undergraduate and graduate students. Both groups of students voiced concerns about field related internships. They stated that the career fairs were not able to provide many options for positions related to their major in which they could gain experience. The students also found it hard to find paid internships outside of a laboratory, summer funding was usually different than semester funding, and they would like to have opportunities to work in laboratories at other universities. Students also mentioned having trouble finding visiting scholar positions, fellowships, and graduate assistant teaching positions. The students did discuss EMS in a very positive light. They stated that department leaders provided space for students to voice concerns and worries. Not only was the space provided, but they could see implemented changes. An example of this is continued outreach efforts for diversity, inclusion, and equity. However, the same faculty, staff and students are asked to provide the answers when they are the ones feeling left out. They would like to freely be students and not have to advocate for their natural rights. They feel professionals are needed to provide guidance. In the end, the students stated the faculty, staff and administrators were very
supportive and provide critical support. They felt that EMS stressed academic achievement but also mental health beyond the classroom. They loved the quality of the education and the individuals.
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## SENATE COUNCIL

Report on Fall 2020 Academic Unit Visits

## (Informational)

The Senate Officers visited nine academic units in Fall 2020: Penn State Schuylkill (September 21, 2020), Penn State Scranton (September 22, 2020), Penn State Altoona (September 22, 2020), Penn State Wilkes-Barre (September 24, 2020), Smeal College of Business (October 8, 2020), the Division of Undergraduate Studies (October 19, 2020), Penn State Hazleton (October 27, 2020), Pennsylvania College of Technology (November 5, 2020), and Penn State Fayette (November 17, 2020). During these visits, the Senate Officers met with staff, students, faculty, and administrators in that order except for three units: Penn State Schuylkill, Division of Undergraduate Studies, and Pennsylvania College of Technology. Each group met separately to encourage open and frank discussions.

As a reference, Fall 2020 began the first full academic calendar under COVID-19 restrictions and seven out of nine visits took place before the 2020 Presidential Election.

## Executive Summary

Each academic unit varied in their enrollment, academic programs, and the nature of their student populations. They did however share common praise for the units and the University as well as common concerns.

## Consistent praises

Concern for the students: This was a common theme across all groups. It was very evident that the students were of top priority in all situations whether the conversations focused on mental health, equity, physical safety, or quality education.

Smooth transition to remote learning: There were three main themes in this category: communication, information technology, and housing and maintenance.

- Communication - Overall a good job was done on providing services, providing information, and communicating what to expect. Individuals were impressed with procedures and policy and how well individuals followed the procedures and policies. Credit was given to staff, faculty, and students.
- Information Technology - All agreed that remote transition would not have been successful without the information technology departments.
- Many stated that working remotely allowed for more interaction with individuals. Travel was not an issue, there was increased safety during inclement weather, and meetings were more convenient. It was also easier to communicate with other campuses, alumni, and donors.
- Remote connections provided greater flexibility for multigeneration families. The workday hours were skewed and there were tradeoffs (please see below in Consistent Concerns) but the flexibility was greatly appreciated.
- Additional services were accessible for students. These services allowed for personalized experiences for full-time and part-time students. Praise was
especially given for multicampus registration, temporary change of campus, shared tutoring, and advising. Zoom allowed for more consistent experience for all students in terms of availability and access across all campuses.
- Housing and Maintenance - A wonderful job was done focusing on the health and safety of the campus. Individuals felt safe in the classrooms and buildings. Protocols were maintained, cleaning supplies were readily available, and there was room for social distancing.


## Consistent concerns

Many of these concerns were also voiced during the Spring 2020 academic unit visits (9/15/2020, Appendix K - Senate Council Report on Spring 2020 College Visits).

Workload: There was a deep concern for the amount of additional work hours. The majority of individuals now work a minimum of 14-15 additional hours per week with most having 10-14hour days.

- There is an increasing amount of additional programing, training, and activities.
- With remote capabilities, meetings are scheduled on all days (holidays, mental health days, etc.), at all times of the day, and on weekends.
- Individuals are exhausted and overwhelmed with no boundaries between personal and professional lives. There is no work/life balance.
- With a heavier load and immense preparation time for the changing strategies there is extreme trepidation for burnout. Fatigue, anxiety, and depression were high on the list of concerns.

Remote format: This was one category in which staff, faculty, and student generalizations somewhat differed. The overall agreement was that every situation is different and individualized.

- Staff generally liked, and wanted to keep, the flexibility of working remote.
- Because of workload issues, the faculty generally wanted the students to either be completely remote or completely face to face. Special exceptions for large groups of students increases workload exponentially. However, the value of using the resources and materials created during times of remote learning was recognized with the intent of incorporating these resources into future courses.
- The students felt as if they missed some experiences of the face-to-face format but liked the flexibility and choices of being remote. Students stated that they were able to gain a quality education while fulfilling other responsibilities. They stated that they were able to do things and now had opportunities that were not previously available.

Recruiting and retention: Many individuals, especially on the smaller campuses, worried about recruitment. The large draw for the Commonwealth Campuses is physically showing the students their campus via tours. The lack of social interaction has been the most hurtful in their opinion.

COVID-19 testing and reporting: Early in the semester, the issues of equal testing plus the accuracy of Penn State's COVID-19 dashboard and individual campus numbers were of concern.

Communication issues: There were concerns about uneven distribution of information, decision making without input from stakeholders, and incomplete answers. While some praised their unit's administrators for good leadership and communication about COVID-19 transition needs, many people described communication gaps and a lack of decision input. As the semester continued there were concerns of communication overload which made it harder to find information and resources. A need for transparency at all levels of decision making and accountability were high on the list of concerns as well.

Access and Equity: Many students, staff, and faculty described various home-life complexities. There were reports of a lack of dependable, fast, and high-capacity internet services in certain areas. There were also disruption issues stemming from lack of private space and caregiving needs.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion: Students, staff, and faculty expressed concerns about the lack of diversity, equity, and inclusion in their respective colleges. Administrators described various recent efforts to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion. Many units felt their limited success in attracting diverse faculty was due to strong competition for top talent with peer institutions and the private sector.

Assessment: Faculty voiced concerns as to how assessment will be adapted to the "new reality." Of special concern were student ratings of teacher effectiveness (SRTEs) and promotion and tenure processes in the wake of COVID-19. Issues revolved around diversity and inequality in research since some academic fields have been affected much more than others. Developing a new way to evaluate each other and recognizing the work of non-tenure track faculty as it relates to teaching and service was readily discussed. Conversations revolved around assessment, evaluation, and recognition along with the varied and complex interaction between those processes.

Hiring: New systems have made it more difficult to hire individuals in a timely manner. We heard concerns regarding unnecessary redundancies in the system, frustrations over increased length of time to complete tasks, and a need for more direct staff and administrative access to WorkDay to improve communications and reduce data entry errors. Not only is it frustrating and time consuming but also affects workloads, student funding, and research. We were told that there is a new Workday recruitment/hiring module set to debut in Spring 2020 but due to COVID-19 has not had the opportunity to live up to its potential.

Contract language: Concern and anxiety was consistently expressed over language that appeared in 2020 fixed-term contracts without warning. During a pandemic and a time in which faculty members were asked to continuously do more, faculty members were insulted, undervalued, and underappreciated.

One Penn State 2025: As we move toward 2025 the tone is "we are all not the same." Individuals are hearing that Penn State is one geographically dispersed university but when trying to maintain and recruit, some academic units and individuals "feel like their own island." There were many questions on the push for new programs but how to develop and run those new programs were in question without additional staff.

## Unit Summaries

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

## Penn State Schuylkill

(September 21, 2020; Attendance per meeting group - staff 28, student 0 , faculty 13 , administration 13)

In all meetings it was very evident that faculty, staff, and administrators were extremely dedicated to the students.

Staff were pleased that the shift to remote was relatively smooth. High praise was given to individuals working in IT that made this happen. Administration provided wonderful services and information during this transition as well. It was mentioned that the campus became integrated based on weekly meetings, more participation, and convenience of meetings without travel. The drawbacks to this were an increase in the hours worked on a daily and weekly basis, no work/life balance, zoom overload, a lack of mental health reprieve, and anxiety concerning the process of returning to campus. The fear was that the process would not be consistent.

The faculty also focused on situations caused by the pandemic. Many faculty members were surprised that they loved remote instruction. Months of remote instruction has caused them to rethink how they will deliver courses in the future. They appreciated that students were able to choose course delivery systems, but worried students may lack the awareness and understanding of what that means. Faculty praised individuals in IT and stated that remote formats would be of great benefit during inclement weather. There were additional concerns of continuing their global awareness and international travel programs, interruptions, and inequalities in areas of their research based on serious interruptions (limited research students, missing supplies, access to research subjects). While faculty appreciated all the educational opportunities offered since March 2020, similar workload concerns heard in the staff meeting were also mentioned: no boundaries between personal and professional lives, assumptions that individuals are always available for meetings, information overload, anxiety, and burnout. Of major concern was the fear of losing their jobs if they did not attend every meeting or activity. Faculty members felt as if they were under intense scrutiny with the administration viewing remote teaching or not being on campus as not working as much as others that were on campus. Communication seemed unclear as well. Large amounts of information were being disseminated, but the information seemed vague. Campus differences were mentioned in the same discussion thread. Lastly, in respect to campus differences the faculty mentioned that students did not understand why students at University Park could play sports and students at other campuses could not.

The administration was not surprised that the staff and faculty were so dedicated to the students. They feel that the strength of their campus is the dedication to the students. They were shocked about meeting overload and fear for jobs if attendance is missed. They have been trying to send
fewer emails, less inform to avoid excess overload. They also recognize the need of clarity of one's tasks and recognize that there is a question of how assessment will adapt to the new reality.

## Penn State Scranton

(September 22, 2020; Attendance per meeting group - staff 20, student 2, faculty 11, administration 15)

The staff mentioned that they are a small campus thus collaborative and very dependent on one another. This forms what seems like a family and a "great place to work." They were very proud of their students and their student programs, their administrators and the health and safety of the campus, and their accommodating faculty who they view as colleagues and coworkers. Although they miss being on campus the process of working remotely has been seamless. They enjoy working remotely and like the flexibility, the ability to work with individuals across campuses, and the ability to offer services or expand existing services to nights and weekends. Technical services individuals were praised for helping make all of this a reality from equipment to training. They miss going on campus but when they do need to go into work they feel very safe with the social distancing, cleaning supplies, and protocols. They would like to continue with a hybrid version of remote and in person work when things go make to "normal." Staff did have concerns about hiring. The system for hiring is very confusing and time consuming. Anxiety was also expressed with the uncertainty of upcoming semesters.

The students had slightly different views on remote verses face to face instruction. One student enjoyed working from home where they could spend more time in their homes with family and support which, in turn, gave them more time to work and study. They did say that it was hard to make friends and would like a few events that would provide online students the opportunity to come to campus and/or peer activities. The other student was very thankful to have an in-person class but mentioned that many students do not come to class and there is not much to do while on campus. They found it easier to learn in-person with a professor and were easily distracted trying to work online. It was also mentioned that if their webcams are turned off they multitask, are less focused, and feel a disconnect with their courses.

A concern for international trips was the only pandemic concern voiced by faculty. Other concerns revolved around student course overloads, reducing student late fees, interdomain courses, and contract language. Faculty felt that not only were student course overloads against pedagogy but holding seats from other students was unfair. Of student concern was also reducing student late fees since Scranton is the second lowest income campus in the Penn State system. Even though multiple disciplines were represented in the meeting with faculty, all of them strongly supported arts and humanities and voiced concern over the significant drop in arts and humanities courses after the implementation of interdomain course requirements. They also questioned who was teaching those interdomain courses. The last item of concern was the new contract language. Individuals received a "scary letter" with no conversation about the process which was "extremely upsetting." It was acknowledged that Pennsylvania was an at-will state but there was concern that verbal language (we value you) does not match the actions.

The administration acknowledged that a new Workday recruitment and hiring module was developed for Spring 2020. Due to COVID-19, that module has not had the opportunity to reach its potential. The program will allow for some individuals to look at the status of the application. A concern for credit overload was also voiced. This was the first time the administration heard about the interdomain course issue and will look further into the matter. An enrollment trend study was recently conducted thus the drop in arts and humanities courses was not linked to a decrease in campus student numbers. Senate will follow up with a study on the implementation of interdomain courses across the university and how the implementation might have shifted offerings, enrollment, and faculty positions.

## Penn State Altoona

(September 22, 2020; Attendance per meeting group - staff 45, student 9, faculty 14, administration 17)

The staff had quite a few human resource questions and concerns. Staff are worried with financial issues and how financial cuts will affect staff. One item was moving fixed-term staff to standing-term staff. The major difference is if individuals were laid off. Fixed-term staff would receive four weeks while standing-term staff would receive four weeks plus one week for every year of service. They have not heard anything about this issue stating it is hard to communicate with human resources via the WorkLion platform. This is taking slower than they hoped and delivery queries are directed to individuals that don't have the answers. Holidays were discussed, such as Martin Luther King Day, with the concern that days off are not fair and consistent. Benefits were in question as well since there are no raise increases. Staff were in hopes of a freeze on what needs to be paid when choices are made in November. Staff would also like a transparent strategic plan for staff issues such as being understaffed, increases in student need, advanced notice of long-term strategies such as Simba and semester information for advising purposes, and clarification on where they should take questions and concerns. There were conversations on working remotely. Staff did like the flexibility of working from home. Some were more productive at home, and it was especially beneficial if the office was short staffed. Some found that working from home was harder with more interruptions. The consensus was that every situation was different and individualized, but these conversations might provide insights on how campus space could be used.

Student concerns varied but many revolved around COVID-19 such as the "magic number" for campus shut down, reporting any professors who are not following COVID-19 procedures, and not being able to control Nittany Point student conduct. Students were upset that their COVID-19 testing kits were labeled for research use only and not for diagnostic use. They wished they were getting direct notifications on COVID-19 numbers on their campus. Students that had been in quarantine or knew students in quarantine stated it was hard to find food and resources especially for those off campus, but multiple organizations reached out to those students to provide personal items.

Students mentioned faculty are providing a mix of in-person and zoom education but recognize that it is hard to provide services for everyone. A question of whether a professor has to provide multiple services for students if those students began their course as face to face and now do not feel comfortable in that situation arose many times. Other student concerns focused on campus food choices, limited parking, library services, and resources. Students were concerned about
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the rising cost of food on campus with only one option with a limited menu plus Penn State Eats was not advertised well. The library closes at 8 pm and is closed on Saturdays which poses a problem for students who don't have many options for internet access or computers. Commuter students had concerns about wireless access around campus. WIFI extensions are limited and spotty, parking lots are completely full. Rooms are provided for the students to use Zoom; however, privacy issues are a problem. Finally, the issues of student resources, lack of internet and computers, were raised. A few students had questions about laptop rentals and potentially only being able to use them in the library.

Faculty members would like to see more transparency of levels of decisions and accountability. An example of football decisions was mentioned. Questions were raised on how to operationalize questions and concerns and how the local Senate could help coordinate issues. As for COVID-19, faculty had resources to gather and discuss what was working in the classroom and what was not. There were also questions as to what would cause the University to go completely remote. There was then a discussion on campus-by-campus decisions based on items such as rate of infection, capacity for isolation, capacity of the local hospitals, and Board of Trustee decisions. Some of this discussion was based on the overload of quarantine facilities and the overflow to hotels in the Altoona area. The other portion was based on Dashboard inconsistencies. The inconsistencies included the lack of Dashboard numbers for off campus students, limited contract tracing, and survey results on random testing. Multiple faculty were concerned that desks and standing dots were not six feet apart and were worried about contact tracing follow-ups. The rest of the faculty time revolved around felling pressured to discuss individual circumstances to superiors if they did not feel comfortable teaching face to face and feeling forced to teach face to face. Many items led to these feelings including thank you letters only to those faculty members teaching in person, being told that parents expect in-person classes and students want in-person classes, feelings of being a team player, and feelings of not meeting expectations. This all came at the same time that faculty were offended by a change in contract language.

Administrators responded to many of the issues listed above. In response to the staff issues with fixed term verses standing term, Human Resources is working on the current postings first then will be moving backward and transition over time. In response to the student COVID-19 test wording, a picture of a student test kit was sent to the administration. In response to Altoona campus COVID-19 information, there might be a possibility to place a more direct link on the student website or campus website. Yes, testing is overloaded. Yes, campus quarantine areas are full and two local hotels are being used for overflow. Administration has been working with multiple individuals to receive the needed support and testing and the campus is directing what they need and what they do not need. The Dashboard is woefully behind, but without the testing and support from the University and local resources the campus could not have been prepared. In response to student areas for WIFI and in room computer areas, 187 seats are for interior options, but the administration does understand privacy needs. In response to Penn State Eats/Port Sky (on and off campus delivery service) communication, the information was sent out to students, but administration stated they will send it out again via a listserv and the student newsletter. In response to laptop availability, OIT can provide laptops for students. In response to library hours and food services, unfortunately those decisions are not in under campus control. They are aware of the issues. Students have been concerned for quite some time and the
information continues to be forwarded to decision making individuals. In response to desk distance, some desks are moved in the evenings by individuals and if someone has a concern to please note the room and report to that information to administration and maintenance. In response to communication with faculty, the administration routinely meets with local Senate officers, but some issues are not determined at the local level. In response to individual teaching concerns, administration has never asked for justification for remote teaching. A survey was sent out to faculty but stated to not share confidential information on the form. The administration has been very accommodating on modality of courses, but will reflect on the language of Altoona's communication to try to avoid the feelings of not being a team player or not meeting expectations.

## Penn State Wilkes-Barre

(September 24, 2020; Attendance per meeting group - staff 18, student 1, faculty 14, administration 14)

Staff were very grateful for the ability to work from home and felt that their personal safety was important. They did feel that there was an overload of emails. However, they embraced Teams felling more connected, finding it easier to video chat, and easier to communicate with other campuses and individuals such as alumni and donors. SIMBA was mentioned as a "nightmare" and, even though there was plenty of training, much of the training did not apply to the staff or their situations. Many thought the program did not understand the nuance of the Penn State system and discovered resources and answers were hard to find, concluding that more campus direction would be helpful. Other concerns were frustrations they have heard from students and alumni. Students wanted more interaction especially on the weekends. Students were frustrated that they could sit in classes with more than ten students but could not have meetings of clubs and organizations. Alumni have also voiced concerns of being frustrated. Alumni voiced to staff that you can gather with your friends, but you can't put the Penn State name on it. Another comment was restaurants are operating at fifty percent capacity so alumni should be able to gather. On a positive note, the Staff Advisory Council, in its third year, seems to be operating well. They have been meeting frequently and trying to be collaborative with faculty. Engagement seems to be of top priority with professional development programing. The campus is supported well through endowments such as a two-million-dollar endowment for faculty, staff, and students. Five thousand dollars of the endowment has been set aside for staff development. Lastly, kudos and recognition went out to IT (which was down two employees) plus Maintenance and Housekeeping.

Students stated that the campus feels like it is a home and there is a sense of community. They mentioned that campus resources were very good. They also thought their experiences were very personalized. However, with COVID-19 and staff not being as readily on campus, students said they could not get as much of their paperwork accomplished. Other concerns were pressures on individual groups of individuals (staff, food services, faculty, students). They were surprised with the new food partnering with METZ. They felt the decision was based on business instead of people and students miss the relationships and bonds they formed with the former employees. Students also wanted to fight for lower food prices but felt it was "useless." In their worry for staff, if professors have a choice to be on campus they wanted staff to have that
same decision-making right. Students mentioned that some faculty were not familiar with resources and platforms, Canvas was used as an example. The students thought it was frustrating even if problems eventually get fixed. Their last voiced concern was on student responsibility to get individuals involved with the campus community. Students stated that they felt a heavy push, pressure, and weight to be involved and to get people involved. The ruling of needing six individuals for an organization to make a quorum is difficult and they are trying to make constitutional changes or suspending portions of the constitution to help with this problem. Incentives to be active such as credits to write for the paper are now gone.

Faculty worried about privacy during COVID-19. Faculty worried that the university now has more personal information than they did before. It was stated with randomized testing there was a choice to opt out of providing personal information. However, if an individual opted out the system would not allow you to move forward in the process. Any information given was kept in the system for three years. There was a concern that under the Care Act Penn State can release personal information to whomever they feel should have that information. Other concerns related to COVID19 and online education were on faculty's minds. One concern was the lack of reliable and widespread internet in rural areas of Pennsylvania. Another concern was on instruction modalities. Some faculty felt pressure at the time of choosing instruction modes, especially fixed-term lines with no tenure for protection. Pressure was felt by subtle hints such as the back to Penn State campaign, "three criteria" when looking at what is best for students, the fact that there would be a conversation if you wanted to teach remotely, and the threat of declining student numbers. Simultaneously with these pressures was an absorption of a faculty staff assistant position. This position absorption led to a lack of support and a redistribution of tasks. It was mentioned that adjunct faculty now had little to no support and it was difficult to know who to call when faculty needed help. Faculty stated that the impact of giving faculty additional tasks has begun to impact classes, research, and students. Faculty recognized that campus administration was always willing to meet and listen to concerns but it did not seem as if chancellors had the authority to make decisions. Without a known system-wide administrative hierarchy, faculty mentioned that it seemed as if there was no action being taken which led to frustration and difficulties. There was University communication, but only of broad policies across campuses, and faculty were concerned about the implementation of those broad policies at a campus level. To continue with administrative concerns, faculty recognized that everyone was working over their capacity. There were a few administrative systems put in place four years ago and the nuances are not fully worked out. The system consists of the Chancellor and two other administrative assistants (one tenured individual, one fixed-term individual). Faculty stated that the two administrative assistants have a course release to do the administrative work, but faculty are concerned that there is a conflict of interest between business and education. Faculty thought the administrative framework needs to be revisited.

The last faculty concern was that the health insurance provider (Aetna) has not been good on campus and that some providers did not have Aetna in their list of insurers. Faculty asked the likelihood that an insurance company supported by more providers would be selected to serve Penn State.

In response to staff conversations, administrators were going to check on SIMBA help, check with staff to see who wants to be on campus, and give periodic kudos and recognition to groups
such as IT, Maintenance, and Housekeeping. In response to student involvement concerns, the administration was not surprised with student involvement on campus. Since most students are on campus for two years, most student leaders revolve out on a yearly basis. However, administration stated that the campus has a robust welcome week and campaign for student organizations. Student organizations have staff that help with organization structure and functions especially during COVID-19. Administration listed that currently there were 12 organizations with more than six members in each. In response to the administrative hierarchy, administrators said that it is a complex issue. The administration has been busy trying to execute certain decisions. These decisions are hard to implement thus less resources are being used for clarification and more resources are being focused on execution and implementation. In response to teaching modality choices, administrators stated that faculty members were not forced into specific modalities. Decisions were made for the health of faculty, staff, and students along with obligations to provide services students were told they were going to have. Administrators said they responded in a very personal way to individual concerns. A large amount of time was spent on being attentive, getting materials out early, providing access to instructional designers, and conversations to ensure faculty had all the resources needed. Administrators did acknowledge that anxiety was at a very high level for faculty. Administrators stated that the vacant faculty staff assistant position had been recently filled. A concern of the administrators was that a faculty member that also had administrative duties would be seen as "the enemy."

## Smeal College of Business

(October 8, 2020; 32 staff, Attendance per meeting group - 20 student, 15 faculty, 9 administration)

The staff session began with a conversation about Penn State 2025. Staff liked the expanded reports but worried that individual units were not the same. They did not want differences to be overshadowed by Penn State 2025. SIMBA was next in the conversation. Staff thought SIMBA was rolled out better than LionPATH and WorkLion plus communication between units has been better than in the past. They did worry that items such as student scholarships have been held up in the process of SIMBA. Staff mentioned WorkLion has been challenging to onboard full and parttime employees. Some functions have not been intuitive and shared services have been a challenge. Staff worried about student advising as well. They stated that condensing the scheduling into three weeks is not conducive to getting students into the advising offices. However, staff discussed many positive things. Staff felt safe in the University buildings and gave credit to staff, faculty, and students for COVID-19 instructions. Staff gave a shout-out to leadership and administration for how they handled COVID-19. The focus has been on strong relationships and sharing information. Hot-topic videos have been a way to preserve a sense of community, a quick way to share information, and provide perspective on a specific topic. Staff stated that Friday emails and weekly community calls have been wonderful as well. The information for weekly community calls is known weeks in advance and allows for updates from Provost and College, staff to ask questions in the chat, and fun things during these meetings as well (alpacas, virtual tour/field trip). Staff stated these weekly community calls have been "fantastic." A version of these activities was done before COVID19, but not as frequent. Staff also gave a shout out to leadership and administration for how they have handled diversity. Staff
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feel the administrators are committed to diversity with the Dean and Assistant Dean charging a task force to bring about additional training, action, education focusing on best practices. Staff thought Smeal College of Business might have less diversity in faculty, staff, and student populations than some others but there was a significant amount of buy in, enthusiasm, question asking, and taking initiative. Staff stated that leadership is not afraid to admit when they are wrong or when they do not know something. Staff felt as though they were members of a team with a great sense of loyalty and community. To attest to this sense of community, staff mentioned that Smeal had wonderful travel and fundraising partnership with a recent five-million-dollar gift and over thirty-two million dollars raised in 2020.

Students also mentioned fantastic support. Students state that the overall research, travel, and collaboration support are wonderful. They stated that there is fifteen thousand dollars from the College's funds to be utilized for Smeal College student organizations. Students stated that College communication has been very good. Weekly emails and video snippets have helped the students hear from the Dean on the direction he is trying to take the College. They stated things have become more transparent to the faculty and student council. Many student have also reached out to receive communication from multiple people for different types of information. This information includes institutional mechanisms to see what successful student practices were used previously, what has Smeal done in the past, and what workshops the College provides for students to name a few. Students listed the Corporate Career Office as a "wonderful place to communicate opportunities." The office continuously finds new platforms to allow personal and professional growth through cocurricular activities such as virtual career fairs and demonstration videos. As for advising, students felt advisors were very accessible, resourceful, provided nonmandatory sessions over the summer and some even attended student activities. Students thought an area of need would be more of a bridge between Smeal College and change of campus students entering Smeal College. Another concern was that there was a Diversity Task Force started in the summer of which students have heard very little to this point. Students also want to be in more meetings for administration can see their perspectives. Student Council is working on this to open more lines of communication and collaboration.

Faculty began the conversation with a concern about the new fixed-term faculty contract language and would like that language rescinded. There were also small conversations about specific communications for things such as specific timelines. Faculty also asked about the status of Penn State 2025. The rest of the faculty conversations involved COVID-19 in some form. First was promotion and tenure in the COVID-19 years. Faculty worried that businesses and firms are not making the same decisions as the University. Research and creative accomplishments for tenure track faculty it was mentioned. Faculty stated that interdisciplinary research is difficult to publish and there is difficulty in gaining tenure based on the current categories for promotion. Faculty would like to be able to highlight interdisciplinary in the promotion and tenure process siting engaged scholarship as a separate process. Faculty want rethinking on what we value and how we recognize that work. Similar faculty discussions were mentioned for the non-tenure track committee. Faculty would like the development of a new way to evaluate each other and recognizing the work of non-tenure track faculty as it relates to teaching and service (evaluate, assess, and recognize). In support for faculty, the Global Programs Office was mentioned. Faculty thought more support for international faculty was needed. They thought this need was both a systemic problem and a business problem. Faculty
felt that the process needs to be streamlined. Examples given: Graduate students cannot seek an appointment until paperwork is approved; Faculty immigration paperwork needs to be processed quickly; Permanent residency is a very slow process. Faculty listed these items as major topics that create great stress. It was mentioned that in some cases individuals are given misinformation thus having one person to shepherd an individual through the whole process would be recommended. Adding to the stress is the fact that COVID-19 has taken away normal interactions between graduate students and faculty. Faculty suggested enrichment luncheon series and creative engagement through novel uses of technology to bridge this disconnect. Faculty stated that Zoom as well as pedagogical supporting engagement and training has been a huge help however the amount of screen time for extra systems is adding to overall stress and frustration. Faculty thought the University rolls out too many operating changes all at once.

Administrators pointed out that Smeal College of Business has one of the longest serving deans at University Park as well as long term administration and staff. It was stated that the college has a high level of participation and quality of study abroad programs. This led into the conversation of fundraising with the recent five-million-dollar gift as the third largest give in Smeal College history. In response to diversity comments, administrators stated they are continuously working on this and just has an inclusive classroom luncheon on October 7, 2021. In response to communication with student organizations, there was recently a new hire as student works coordinator. There was also a suggestion for student organizations to add a historian to their officers. In response to the Corporate Career Office, it is now called the Business Career Center. In response to advising, administers stated there is a Bridge Ambassador Program already in place but they do worry about those students transferring to Smeal. Administrators wonder if those students feel a sense of community and if virtual mediums provide the connection and network of support. Administrators mentioned a new course to help strengthen the connection to Smeal College and a student organization to help those students in transition. In response to SIMBA, administrators stated that based on weekly group discussion-based SIMBA meetings by the College ended recently. In response to faculty and graduate student interactions, faculty network lunches continue once a month and groups used to go to restaurants, but this has been suspended due to COVID-19.

## Division of Undergraduate Studies

(October 19, 2020; Attendance per meeting group - 26 staff, 16 student, 9 administration)
Staff conversations started with positive University items and ended with areas that need work. Staff were very pleased with students having many options for registration including multicampus registration and temporary change of campus options. Students now also have flexibility in student meetings and NSO is able to now give individual hour appointment. Staff thought this was wonderful but worried about staff becoming overworked. Staff flexibility has been wonderful as well and they want to continue this flexibility. They felt Zoom allows for a more consistent experience for all students in availability, access, and across all campuses. Staff state that advising conferences have been very successful with people from all over the world attending. Staff liked the collaboration across institutions. Wellness is also very important for the staff and students. They work hard as a staff to stay connected and provide multiple opportunities to stay connected. Staff stated that DUS also has its own wellness initiative, and
they are happy that wellness days are going to be worked into the spring semester. For student wellness, staff said intentional support is given to students who are not doing well. This includes resources for advisors and meetings every three weeks. There is also a new program, academic peer program where students are given consistent contact. Staff also shared that the administration team has been wonderful. Staff feel very supported and praised by administrators and leadership. They feel fortunate in the way DUS is run.

Staff had concerns about the timing of the upcoming presidental election. Students are going home on November 20, 2021, and staff have concerns for the students. The main concern is that the University does not have enough in place for physical and mental safety. In addition, COVID-19 is creating a new form of loneliness. Staff stated students need the ability to meet with people and they are especially concerned for first-year students. The hope is that there are enough communities (spiritual, academic, etc.) and spaces that the students can be heard, seen, and feel safe. None of the individuals in DUS have faculty appointments, thus staff feel that there is a lack of communication across the University. Staff state there is a feeling of isolation and a need for more open communication. Staff suggest looking at communication lines and seeing where they are broken. For instance, students are told to talk to their academic advisor, but advisors did not have certain information until much later. There is a feeling of being set up for failure. Staff say this divide does not help during COVID-19. Most communication revolves around faculty, but students are told to see an academic advisor who is asked to do the work but is excluded from the conversations and decision making. Staff also stated it would be helpful to have a University wide way to text students and asked if there was one official way to send students text messages. Staff also worry about communications with first-year students. They state it is difficult to help them figure out how to communicate with the faculty and their classes. Language placement is a perineal issue with Spanish not meeting the first week of classes when it is too late to add a course. Another example mentioned was the completion of starfish notes and flags. A third example, staff say some faculty have policies that students should not email them and will even take points off if a student emails them. Staff say this comes across as unfriendly and makes it hard to get first-year students comfortable. Staff state faculty openness as a key for first year students. There is also a need to help faculty understand that these are large issues. Staff were concerned about students who have missed the grade forgiveness deadlines and the full petitions as well as general education new curriculum. They say some divisions are overprescribed on their general education requirements and worry that students may have to overtake general education courses to graduate if they change majors. Of staff concern was the lack of equal opportunities. One example was enrollment-controlled majors that are unfair on social and financial levels. Richer students can "work the system," take summer courses to make the enrollment requirements, and get into the major. Staff would like a reexamination for those majors so they are more open to individuals. The grade forgiveness policy is another example. Staff state that this policy is only for Penn State students. Transfer students are not able to make the decision to transfer in a grade or not. The ALEKS test for new student orientation was their last example with remedial classes mostly in the evenings and three hours long which are not a good academic strategies for individuals in those courses. As for DUS structural concerns, DUS is not a college thus it does not have the resources of a college inhouse. Staff state this leads to underuse resources when the students get to their college and sets them up with long-term disparages. Support services are needed and are exceptionally inconsistent across the institution. Students leave DUS to gain access to financial resources such
as scholarship opportunities and stray away from the lack of freshman first year seminars. Staff say DUS cannot have their own truly exploratory first year seminars. The last two areas of staff concerns were paid parental leave and career growth. Staff are very thankful for paid parental leave but note there are differences in flexibility across the University. As for career growth, staff say leaders in DUS are doing a tremendous amount of work with human resources to work on a ladder for career growth.

Students listed DUS as welcoming and reassuring. They stated that many of them were worried to come into the University undecided, but advisors are willing to work with students to understand their situations, and encourage them to find and join clubs, and always find time for them. Students say advisor availability is greatly appreciated. Advisors reached out to the students in the spring and took the time to walk through the processes of the University thus making them feel individualized. This gives them one-on-one attention and the students feel like the advisors remember their exact situations and goals. Students state that there are also DUS student leaders. Students "find it nice" to talk to a student that went through the college process. Student leaders provide an opportunity for the students to discuss thought processes and share stories and experiences. Students also discussed they liked the personal interaction with the professors, thought they were able to reach out to the faculty, and that most professors have been very accommodating. As for areas of concern, students listed that it is now harder to find and use resources. They state that all advisors do their best to help explore majors but there are so many options and new students could use more help in finding some of the smaller programs. They also have trouble with lack of communication about new programs. An example of this is the course sharing Big Ten initiative. Students felt there was no communication about this program. Students stated they had trouble transitioning into a major. Certain opportunities, such as internships, cannot be accessed until they declare a major. Students specifically listed Eberly College which seems to have a "bubble" around it, and nothing can be accessed until you are in the College. Students would like to take more classes as a DUS student and have access to different courses in different colleges. Neuroscience and Smeal College were mentioned. Students list it is hard to navigate on their own to keep track of opportunities and timeframes. They find they have to advocate for themselves in instances of high school credits and enrolling with prerequisites. Students feel they have to be very active in their own scheduling and would like more specialized advisors for exploration into certain majors. Also listed as something that would help students is having advisors in other colleges understand what it means to be in DUS which might lead to a smoother transition. Student liaison programs would also be nice. Students understand that some of these resources may be in place already but are not advertised well. Examples listed are weekly postings about majors or open houses, the Bank of America Career Center (help confirm the direction they want to go) and PSU 6 as a resource for Smeal College of Business. Students finished the session with some of the hardest things during COVID. Students listed trouble finding nice work environments, missing professor and student interaction, trouble staying motivated, building connections with classmates, exploring internships, and class time usage of getting into breakout rooms in Zoom.

Administrators state that DUS does not attract large numbers of students because many people do not understand DUS. One of the main goals is to help teach students about higher education and how they as individuals have to challenge their assumptions and make changes. As for first year seminars, staff (DUS) are excluded from teaching first year seminars thus faculty members
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are needed as lead instructors; however, it is very hard to find instructors. Additional challenges listed were large advisee rosters, need for more staff for office visits, and lack of a range of resources. DUS is currently made up of academic advisors so if an advisor is taken out of their position to complete another task this goes against the primary mission of DUS. There was a Senate informational report to address some of these issues and an undergraduate education task force to look at the ALEKs recommendations. Administrators wanted Senate to be aware of what DUS does with starfish, flags, etc. in working toward student success. DUS sees good uses of the programs at commonwealth campuses but not at University Park especially in foundational courses with horrible DFW rates. They question how to shape the environments around the University to move toward more equitable environments for the students. Administrators state that with a lack of shared governance at the staff level there is also inequity between staff and faculty. In many cases DUS functions differently thus the situation is a little different. As for a lack of a clear career ladder, administrators say that many of the DUS staff tend to continuously develop their career goals especially in education. About the lack of communication of faculty verses staff, they say again that most of the information is directed to faculty, but the faculty send the students to advisors that did not get the information. This situation leaves DUS trying to react in a way that does not reflect negatively on the University. Administrators also want to clarify some of the function of DUS. They list that DUS does "really great work" with students that are not academically successful. They do this by pulling those students together in an academic peer mentoring program offering students a success plan to provide an opportunity to the peer to help share in the academic success of the student and reenrolling students with a GPA below two to name a few. There is a need to understand that DUS students are not undecided but exploratory and there is need to offer an exploratory Penn State course to talk through that process and get a chance to play with majors. To help these problems there is a question of whether there should be a name change for DUS. Administrators reiterated that DUS stands for the Division of Undergraduate Studies with the U not standing for undecided, https://dus.psu.edu. They also state that DUS also gets confused with the academic unit of the Office of Undergraduate Education.

## Penn State Hazleton

(October 27, 2020; Attendance per meeting group - 20 staff, 6 student, 18 faculty, 14 administration)

Staff began the conversation with the worry of student retention after the COVID-19 forced change in course delivery. They asked if there were any faculty development programs to help with pedagogical practices based on this type of change. Staff then transitioned to staff representation on University Faculty Senate. They stated that Senate is the only shared governance body at Penn State. Students have representation and staff are invited to sit on certain committees, but staff do not have voting representation. Staff stated that the current staff advisory council consists of all staff members with elected officers and non-voting union staff. They say the advisory council very active in information sharing and engagement, but it is only advisory. As of March, due to COVID-19, staff feel very connected. They felt the communication was well done and conveyed in a timely manner. The organization was: here is what the university is going to do, here is what the campus is going to do, but you have the freedom to determine how you are going to do that. During this time staff said individuals took
on things that they normally did not do, and they saw cross department interaction with all individuals stepping up to help. Staff admit some things are harder to do at home (internet connections, equipment needs) and they do miss the student interaction and physical presence. They said it is harder to get to know the students well enough to know if they are having a problem. However, staff appreciated the flexibility and new resources that come from the switch such as sharing tutors across campuses.

The students mainly focused on COVID-19 related topics. Students stated that the campus is doing well. Of the things students do not like were lower numbers of students on campus, COVID-19 protocols, not being able to meet with a small number of individuals in a large space, the courses going from in person to remote during the semester, and the lack of places to study to name a few. The students stated that most places close between 10 pm and 12 am but were happy that the library just announced extra hours. Students said because of many of the COVID19 protocols mental health issues have increased with many students seeking counselors. This led to a campus resource discussion in which the students stated the campus had very good resources. They stated areas such as student affairs, nursing, and student engagement as being very supportive with an abundance of resources. Students also listed their concern that a few emails they thought were non-Penn State related have been coming through (political, dog walking service) and would like a more official channel to be used when telling students not to report to class or work.

Faculty started the conversation with a question about COVID-19 testing before the campus community leaves for Thanksgiving break. They were concerned for students on campus and their families once those students went home. As for COVID-19 on campus, faculty viewed the campus as clean and safe. They thought the campus was very responsive to covid concerns and provided any supplies needed. Faculty also stated that the administration had been very good at not pressuring faculty to teach in person if they are not comfortable with that situation. Faculty did list some struggles with classroom interactions. Faculty stated it was hard to know the students that attended classes. Students with masks made the in-person students hard to identify and students without video capability or choosing not to use the video capability made it hard to identify remote learners. Faculty also stated they did not know if the student is going to show up or not and with not much control over who is in the Zoom room it was getting harder to get through classes. Classroom professors stated many students were switching to more mixed or remote which they called a "slide into remote." As faculty tried to make extra accommodations for the students they stated it was hard to keep up with the grading, communication, and researching new teaching techniques as they got busier and busier. Faculty stated that not only are mental health issues increasing for students but for the faculty as well. In addition to the items listed above international faculty members were being told that even if they were teaching remotely they had to be in the United States and similarly even if faculty members were in the United States there were struggles for needed support systems such as caregivers for elderly parents, children, and other dependents. Faculty were also having trouble hiring students because of new University operating software and were concerned about the mental health break dates not being listed in a timely manner to prepare for the semester. Faculty were also very worried about the students. Faculty state that the student center is deserted and the number of students seeking services is very low. They list that student grades are down, many students are not engaging in classes, many students are multitasking while on Zoom, many freshman and
nontraditional students are struggling, and more and more students are turning to mental health services care and concern team.

Administrators acknowledged the feelings of isolation from the students and faculty as well as stated they sometimes feel isolated as well. They did feel the level of communication from the senior levels of the University was very good which has allowed them to pass down critical information. Administrators have also been meeting with the student government president to get maintain the perspective. They are grateful to faculty and staff on what they are doing. Administrators stated that the faculty and staff are amazing at working through issues while respectfully and politely asking for more communication. They feel this has allowed them to work through this a very strong community. In response to the slow hiring process, administrators acknowledge there might be some internal issues but individuals not reading their emails and not checking in workday slow the process as well. They stated they would continue to work on these issues and assist faculty in hiring students. Administrators stated sabbatical proposals were down but there is good justification for late submissions. They also stated a concern for faculty that struggle to regain research momentum and question what reviews might look like in the future.

## Pennsylvania College of Technology

(November 5, 2020; Attendance per meeting group - 3 student, approximately 15 faculty, approximately 6 administration)

There was not a staff meeting session.
The students listed Penn College of Technology as a value driven institution with two main components: a hands-on approach to education and student-centered. They stated that the College makes a constant investment to equipment to be nimble and adaptive to industry needs. There is also an overall student governance with representation across all student governance committees with an at-large student representation as well. Student governance conducts town hall meetings supporting conversations with the president, dining services, and counseling services to name a few. Students stated that the design of Pennsylvania College of Technology allows unique programs to be offered to students. They are happy to not take "a lot of needless classes" and they feel like experts in their fields. As for core ethical values students say the College is sensitive to student costs while maintaining a high placement rate with employment within six months. Students value the adaptive approach of the College. Students state that the College is very receptive to the concerns of the students. There was recently a change to the educational schedule. Students stated they were not happy with the decision but said they were included in what the decision may be and why the change was made. After this decision administrators partnered with student government to communicate decisions before they are made and there is more data collection, for instance through surveys, to hear student voices. Student list the relationships between students and faculty as solid. They say the average class size is sixteen and since most faculty tend to come from industry this helps with networking. Students also list student services as being very successful and accommodating for the students. There were three key areas that students would like to change: legitimacy of student organizations, bias, and potential opportunities. Students felt that the faculty and staff view
student organizations as legitimate, but students struggle with student organization legitimacy outside of the College. Students listed three key areas to help address this issue. The first area listed was role performance in being a democratic presence for students. This would include creating such things as a training program for Senate, spearheading topics such as fair wages and inclusive housing, elevated townhall meetings where organizations have been given the forum to communicate student needs, and creating an infrastructure for sustainable change. The second area listed was isomorphism which would include such things as marketing, branding, responding to students through social media. Students stated that many students come in, get their degrees, and get out with not much discussion on how to make it the College better for the people that come after them. The third area listed was relationship building which would include such things as strategic partnerships, more collaborative with student organizations, and trying to form a solid bridge for these relationships. Also listed by students was a need to work on issues of bias. That stated that many students just don't feel welcome at their College even with efforts with inclusion and antibias task forces and inclusive housing. Students stated that there is a need for more diverse hiring and education so students do feel welcome when the get on campus. Students want to see more people that look like them from fellow classmates, faculty, staff, student government, and counseling services. The last area of student discussion was the need for more opportunities. Even though many of their professors help in networking there is not a clear path to make this happen. Students would also like to have more communication and interaction with other student organizations across Penn State.

Faculty listed many positive aspects of the College. They stated that they meet with the administration regularly to fix potential problems before they arise. As for COVID-19, they thought the administration handled the situation well. Faculty are impressed with procedures and policy and how people are following them. That feel that the administrators have been as accommodating as they can during this situation by allowing flexibility to adjust and providing support for those adjustments. Faculty do have concerns about enrollments and industry especially if there is a transfer to training on the job. They also worried about meeting federal requirements during COVID-19 interruptions and layoffs. COVID-19 situations have resulted in heavier workloads and prep time for changing strategies has been immense. This has also led to a concern of instructor burnout. Faculty state their College Council is a very strong governance structure that may help in these times even though it is probably underutilized. Faculty state that the College council is composed of not only faculty but everyone. The Council is composed of four standing committees which are not "siloed." This allows for interaction with individuals from all sections of the campus thus changes can be made very quickly. The vast majority of the members are very supportive of the union. The faculty ended their session with listing the multiple benefits of being a faculty member in the college. They state that the college invests in them, they hear more yesses than nos, and there is an inflow of technology, materials, and funding. Faculty also list opportunities to advance in knowledge with grants for continuing education, academic freedom, and respect for them as curriculum experts.

Administrators responded to student concerns of bias and inclusion with acknowledging that this is a key issue. They have been trying multiple initiatives, some listed by the students. They are meeting on a regular basis and constantly analyzing what they are doing as a College. For instance, the inclusive task force is trying to respond to why some students might not feel as if they are included and increase retention rates. As for staff and faculty positions, administrators
feel that the more they share the Pennsylvania College of Technologies story the more visible the college will become with more people understanding the College direction. They say that when you can get individuals on campus "you can blow away some of the stereotypes."
Administrators really want individuals to see and understand the function of the College. At the time of the interview, the following highlights were listed below in no particular order.

Pennsylvania College of Technology https://www.pct.edu

- College of applied technology with a focus on problem solving and workforce development
- Became a special mission affiliate of Penn State in 1989
- 11 Board Members
- 1 unionized group - faculty
- President meets with the association president every two weeks
- Offers associate, baccalaureate, and master's degree programs
- Offer 2-year degrees with the option to finish 4 year online - every 2-year degree has a direct pathway to a 4 -year degree
- More evening and weekend classes and services - to attract nontraditional students
- Open enrollment college
- Average class size is 16
- 100+ programs on campus - programs are industry/career driven
- Divided into three academic schools to allowed for streamlining
- Nursing and Health Sciences - examples include Master of Education, paramedic, physical therapy assistant
- Business, Arts and Sciences - examples include business, graphic design (international placement), homeland security
- Engineering Technology - largest school
- Separate campus for earth sciences, aviation, material sciences, cyber security
- Students are in class 30-40 hours per week
- Many students work outside of college
- Most majors have an internship component
- 1400 new students this year (fall 2020) - most were traditional age
- Don't measure faculty hiring by advanced education
- $98 \%$ graduation placement rate
- Majority of students from Pennsylvania - do have international and out of state students as well
- $17 \%$ of budget is from state - rest is tuition and fees
- 156 million operating budget
- Have athletics teams
- Work with 3000 to 4000 clients a year
- 1700 beds on campus and verbal agreements with local landlords - will not house more than $25 \%$, have a nice balance, all apartments - one building for isolation and quarantine

Administrators stated that moving forward, the College will keep up with new technology and every five years programs will be reviewed to see where the programs are in relationship to
where the industry is going. Administrators say there is a connection with industry at everything level and they eliminate majors as much as they add them with a continual focus on future pacing and evolution. The administrators stated that the students are becoming more resilient, more committed, more engaged, and more empathetic. They do stay in touch with students had to depart because of economics and they are working on increased accessibility. Administrators are also looking into preparatory math courses needed for the STEM fields. The last item discussed was how to get more students and parents to value careers in applied technologies. It is hard to persuade individuals until they visit the College.

## Penn State Fayette

(November 17, 2020; Attendance per meeting group - 33 staff, 9 student, 26 faculty, 14 administration)

The staff began their conversation with things that were done very well on their campus. When discussing working remotely they were thankful they had the chance to do so. They stated that in many cases they were able to serve more students remotely because students would more readily use Zoom then come in for a physical visit. Students and staff can also become more engaged in the material as websites and services are shared. Staff stated that all offices worked well together. Examples being IT for making sure they had equipment and basic materials before going remote, facilities managers for safe and secure return to campus and continue on campus, and faculty and administration for helping all the offices in speaking with students and assisting staff on projects. Staff listed faculty as very positive and adaptable. Townhall meetings on a weekly basis also allowed individuals to see each other on a regular basis to provide quick responses. Staff then moved to challenges and concerns. Once of the first challenges listed was showing students their "wonderful campus." Staff stated that an advantage of a smaller campus is being able to visit and see everyone working together. Because of this they were working on creative ways to reach out to students to show them how great the Fayette campus and faculty really were. Staff were also developing ways to meet with current students without physically seeing them in person. They stated that the students were usually fully engaged. They listed the lack of social interaction as being the most hurtful. One of the areas of focus were off campus engagement trips and relationship building programs. Staff stated that students are not coming in for help from services, freshman are not able to meet friends, and students are not getting to know professors. Staff were concerned about student wellbeing and worried about keeping track of struggling students as they transitioned home for Thanksgiving. They worried about course delivery methods impact on enrollment as well as faculty and staff positions. Staff concluded their conversation with the topic of increased stress for the students and staff. They noted that wellness days were for faculty and students but not staff. Staff wanted to make sure they were taken care of as well. They stated a hiring freeze is hurting some offices and adding to the stress levels. Staff stated that they need more transparency, specifically on what is going on and which positions have priorities. Staff have been taking on other jobs with no end in sight and no compensation.

The students stated they were very appreciative of the Senate visit and could not say enough about how wonderful their experiences have been at Fayette. Students said the faculty have been there for the students and are not only interested in their academics but building character in their
fields (consciousness, morals, professional attitudes). They say that professors are really tough on students but show they care by wanting them to do the very best that they can. Students stated the Chancellor takes student comments to heart, has been there for the students, and is doing a great job. They also thought the campus has great organizations and clubs. Students stated that the campus is always open to forming new organizations and clubs and the Student Affairs office really helps the students "blossom." They said the campus did a very good job at providing student activities within COVID-19 restrictions. They listed Penn State sweatpants from the student success center, a crash course for registering for next semester with a walk through of LionPATH and schedule builder to name a few. Zoom also allowed them to move more activities online with Zoom sessions during common hours. Interactive activities listed were cell phone smack downs, murder mysteries, plus diverse and inclusive speakers. Twenty to thirty students interacted regularly with these activities focusing on involvement, engagement, diversity, and inclusion. The students were also very happy with their athletic teams. They stated the teams were very competitive and the coaching staff is "wonderful and solid." Students said athletics was a major part of the college experience, but coaches and staff understand that education comes first. They said there are freshman studies tables as well as a minimum number of hours they have to spend in the student success center. There is also an organization called SAGE (Student Athletes Graduate and Excel) for student athletes. On the topic of COVID-19, students liked randomized testing and stated that it helped keep individuals safe. They said students were wearing their masks, but it was hard to keep six feet apart. Students were more worried about bringing COVID-19 onto campus than getting infected on campus. This brought the conversation to their love of the campus. They stated that the F in Fayette means family with smaller class sizes and one on one connections. Students listed examples of "wonderful things" on campus. Some items included were leadership trainings, a campus garden, and a food pantry. The students stated that the professor that takes care of the garden takes produce from the garden, shows students how to use/cook items from the garden, and even gives them little seed packets so they can plant their own garden. They also listed a student lounge, student club rooms, and three gymnasiums. Students did list challenges with WIFI, printing, and certain applications that need to run on campus machines. Their last comments were on the food services. Students stated that the options do not seem to change, and the prices have increased.

Faculty began the conversation with positive topics. SAGE (Student Athletes Graduate and Excel) which was mentioned by students was also mentioned by faculty. Faculty stated it was a wonderful program that has helped student athletes and has the support from faculty, staff, and administration. Faculty then gave a "shout out" to individuals that were able to help faculty become remote. The IT department was praised as being very available to faculty, staff, and students as well as providing valuable resources on teaching methods. Faculty have also heard positive feedback on how Fayette has protected the students during COVID-19. The students seem to feel safe on campus and state that the faculty are doing a wonderful job with the teaching methods and delivery during this time. Faculty praised the students for their adaptability and resilience. Faculty then transitioned into concerns. The first concern was the hiring freeze. Faculty stated that program coordinators were needed. They also stated that faculty were worried about students paying for a Penn State degree and worried about the number of adjuncts that were being hired because of the freeze. This adds to the additional faculty workload because adjuncts are not required to have office hours. On top of all of this faculty are still supposed to do research, service, and teaching. In a time of minimal salary raises, concern of contract
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language, and the hiring freeze it was also mentioned that Penn State's investment in real estate was not "sitting well." All of this led into a conversation on morale. Faculty stated that since many individuals were remote it was getting harder to keep up morale. They said they are seeing increased fatigue, anxiety, and depression across the campus. Add the lack of Spring Break in March and the added work without fulltime faculty and morale begins to decrease even more. To help combat moral issues with students, faculty are thinking of doing focus groups for the students to work through issues other than education. They say there is a need to have critical conversations, but this would add to more Zoom meetings and there are already so many trainings. Faculty wanted more information on wellness days. They were hoping more guidance will come from academic leaders because certain majors cannot take the time off (those with clinicals and practicums). Faculty conversations ended with multiple questions. How is all of this going to affect enrollment? Faculty mentioned that the admissions staff has been "awesome" providing such experiences such as virtual school visits. However, faculty are trying very hard to maintain current enrollments and are not able to go out and physical meet the students. What is Dr. Hanes decision on the campus budget? Faculty state that the preface is one university geographically dispersed. Faculty said Fayette is trying to maintain and recruit students, but they feel like "their own island." They struggle to develop new programs without additional staff. Where do we see Penn State a year from now? What can we expect looking down the road? How is COVID-19 affecting the Fayette community?

Administrators began by clearing up a common misconception about their campus. They are listed as Penn State Fayette, The Eberly Campus. Students, faculty, and staff tend to call it the Fayette Campus, but the administrators wanted to make the clarification. The name change occurred in 2004 to honor the philanthropic and leadership contributions of the Eberly family. With the dedication of the Eberly family the administrators stated they viewed their campus as the most beautiful campus in the Penn State system. They also stated the individuals at their campus were resilient that they were glad they shared their concerns. They said their community is small and they communicate well thus most of the concerns were on their "radar." Administrators stated that they to be very honest with employees. At this moment they do not know how big of a "hit" the university is going to take during these times of COVID-19 and that really worries the administration. There is a fear that "one more big hit" might place them in trouble. Currently when the campus loses a person or resource there is no mechanism to put it back in place thus the campus has to be very flexible. As for staff, the administrators stated that a new enterprise system went live in July which is responsible for nonstop working and fatigue. They stated they lean on staff to provide great services but if they lose people they lose those services. They gave a "shout out" to admissions listing that they were a few student up from last year and retention rates were up five percent since last fall. Administrators are looking into dual enrollment opportunities and new strategies for teaching and learning. They have initiated lightening rounds which consist of five-minute colleague discussions on how they improve their pedagogy. Administrators stated that townhall meetings have been successful with high participation rates and are going to occur on a regular basis even when campus returns to normal.
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(Informational)

## Abington

SENATORS (5)
Term Expires 2023
Calore, Gary
Ozment, Judith
Term Expires 2025
Cohen, Stephen
Term Expires 2026
Chewning, Lisa Volk
Yang, Yi

## Agricultural Sciences

## SENATORS (9)

Term Expires 2023
Harte, Federico
Marshall, Megan
Weld, Jennifer

Term Expires 2024
Demirci, Ali
Holden, Lisa
Term Expires 2025
Grozinger, Christina
Perkins, Daniel
Term Expires 2026
TBA (2)
Altoona

SENATORS (6)
Term Expires 2023
Seymour, Elizabeth M.
Term Expires 2024
Brunsden, Victor
Term Expires 2025
Adu, Kofi
Findley, Samuel

Term Expires 2026
Hayford, Harold S.
McKinney, Karyn D.

## Arts and Architecture

SENATORS (6)
Term Expires 2023
Davis, Felecia
Kenyon, William C.
Term Expires 2025
Higgins, Jeanmarie
Shapiro, Keith
Term Expires 2026
Costanzo, Denise
Gross, Charlene

## Berks

SENATORS (4)
Term Expires 2023
Snyder, Stephen J.
Term Expires 2024
Mahoney, Joseph
Term Expires 2025
Bartolacci, Michael
Pfeifer Reitz, Dawn

## Business

SENATORS (5)
Term Expires 2024
Bansal, Saurabh
Iliev, Peter
Term Expires 2025
Slot, Johanna
Wright, Suzanne
Term Expires 2026
Lenkey, Stephen
Communications
SENATORS (3)
Term Expires 2023
Simmons, Cynthia

Term Expires 2024
Jordan, Matthew
Term Expires 2025
Shea, Maura

## Earth and Mineral Sciences

SENATORS (7)
Term Expires 2023
King, Elizabeth F.
Taylor, Ann H.
Term Expires 2024
Robinson, Brandi
Term Expires 2025
Baka, Jennifer
Bowley, Kevin
Term Expires 2026
Emam-Meybodi, Hamid
Mauro, John C.

## Education

SENATORS (6)
Term Expires 2023
Frank, Jennifer
Riccomini, Paul J.
Term Expires 2024
Taylor, Jonte
Term Expires 2025
Mccloskey, Andrea
Term Expires 2026
Fuller, Edward
Prins, Esther Susana

## Engineering

SENATORS (15)
Term Expires 2023
Lang, Dena
Lear, Matthew
Wolfe, Douglas E.
Zhang, Qiming
Term Expires 2024
Gayah, Vikash
Melton, Robert

Suliman, Samia
Term Expires 2025
Griffin, Christopher
Yamamoto, Namiko
Term Expires 2026
Asadi, Somayeh
Krane, Michael H.
Moore, Jason
Sinha, Alok
Urbina, Julio
Wang, Yong

## Erie

SENATORS (8)
Term Expires 2023
Warner, Alfred
Term Expires 2024 Blakney, Terry
Swinarski, Matthew TBD

Term Expires 2025
Champagne, John
Noce, Kathleen
Term Expires 2026
Halmi, Tracy
Luttfrig, Sara

## Great Valley

SENATORS (2)
Term Expires 2024
Sangwan, Raghu
Term Expires 2025
Potosky, Denise

## Harrisburg

## SENATORS (7)

Term Expires 2023
Rhen, Linda
Strohacker, Emily
Term Expires 2024
Sprow Forté, Karin
Tavangarian, Fariborz
Term Expires 2025

Joseph, Rhoda
Term Expires 2026
Rios, Catherine
Strickland, Martha
Health and Human Development
SENATORS (8)
Term Expires 2023
Belanger, Jonna
Kramer, Lauren
Sharma, Amit
Shurgalla, Richard
Siegel, Susan Rutherford
Term Expires 2025
Duffey, Michele
Stine (She/Her), Michele
Term Expires 2026
Thomas, Kristin
Information Sciences and Technology
SENATORS (3)
Term Expires 2024
Glantz, Edward J.
Term Expires 2025
Tapia, Andrea
Term Expires 2026
Wilson, Shomir
International Affairs
SENATORS (1)
Term Expires 2026
Jett, Dennis C.

## Liberal Arts

SENATORS (22)
Term Expires 2023
Browne, Stephen H.
Hardy, Melissa
Linch, Amy
Linn, Suzanna
Page, B. Richard, Jr.
Term Expires 2024

Bird, Douglas
Kadetsky, Elizabeth
Makoni, Busi
Shriver, Mark
Wagner Lawlor, Jennifer
Wede, Joshua
Term Expires 2025
Braman, Valerie
Frederick, Samuel
Furfaro, Joyce
Love, Jeff
Mccoy, Heather
Zorn, Christopher
Term Expires 2026
Baumer, Eric
Eckhardt, Caroline (Carey)
Jolly, Rosemary
Mendieta, Eduardo
Schrauf, Robert

## Dickinson Law

SENATORS (2)
Term Expires 2023
Skladany, Martin
Term Expires 2024
Groome, Dermot

## Libraries

## SENATORS (3)

Term Expires 2024
Tallman, Nathan
Term Expires 2025
Novotny, Eric
Term Expires 2026
Hughes, Janet

## Medicine

SENATORS (30)
Term Expires 2023
Abendroth, Catherine
Chetlen, Alison
Karpa, Kelly
Kass, Lawrence E.
Malysz, Jozef
Palmer, Timothy W.

Whitcomb, Tiffany
Term Expires 2024
Alexander, Chandran
Allen, Steven
Anderson, Brian
Hauck, Randy
Kass, Rena
Ruggiero, Francesca
Swallow, Nicole
Wong, Jeffrey
Term Expires 2025
Liu, Dajiang
Mets, Berend
Saunders, Brian
Scalzi, Lisabeth
Walker, Eric
Williams, Nicole
Zacharia, Thomas
Term Expires 2026
TBA

## Nursing

## SENATORS (3)

Term Expires 2025
Berish, Diane
Term Expires 2026
Barton, Jennifer
Paudel, Anju
Penn State Law
SENATORS (2)
Term Expires 2023
Scott, Geoffrey
Term Expires 2025
Baumer, Mandee

## Eberly College of Science

SENATORS (13)
Term Expires 2023
Byrne, Christopher
Nousek, John A.
Shen, Wen
Williams, Mary Beth

Term Expires 2024
Bourjaily, Jacob
Fox, Derek
Strauss, James
Term Expires 2025
Brown, Nate
Malcos, Jennelle
Purdy Drew, Kristin
Term Expires 2026
Costantino, Daniel
Keller, Cheryl
Sirakaya, Beatrice
University College (29)
Beaver
SENATORS (2)
Term Expires 2024
Pierce, Mari
Term Expires 2026
Bower, Robin

## Brandywine

SENATORS (3)*
Term Expires 2023
Fredricks, Susan M.
Term Expires 2024
Blockett, Kimberly (Senate Chair 22-23)
Signorella, Margaret (for Kimberly Blockett Senate Chair)
Term Expires 2025
Gallagher, Julie
DuBois

SENATORS (2)
Term Expires 2025
Parizek, Heather
Thomas, Emily

## Fayette

SENATORS (2)
Term Expires 2023
Precht, Jay

Palma, Julio

Greater Allegheny

## SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2024
Grimes, Galen

Term Expires 2025
Kahl, Alandra

## Hazleton

## SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2023
Petrilla, Rosemarie
Term Expires 2026
Marko, Frantisek
Lehigh Valley
SENATORS (2)
Term Expires 2024
Egolf, Roger A.

Term Expires 2026
Jackson, Daniel
Mont Alto

SENATORS (2)
Term Expires 2023
Borromeo, Renee L.
Term Expires 2025
Nurkhaidarov, Ermek
New Kensington
SENATORS (2)
Term Expires 2023
Amador Medina, Melba
Term Expires 2026
Hammond, John
Schuylkill
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2023
Wang, Ping
Term Expires 2024
Aurand Jr., Harold

## Shenango

## SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2024
Petricini, Tiffany
Term Expires 2025
Saltz, Ira

## Wilkes-Barre

SENATORS (2)
Term Expires 2024
Chen, Wei-Fan

Term Expires 2022
TBA

## Scranton

SENATORS (3)
Term Expires 2023
Bishop-Pierce, Renee
Term Expires 2024
Frisch, Paul
Term Expires 2025
Kim, Agnes

## York

SENATORS (2)
Term Expires 2023
Nesbitt, Jennifer P.

Term Expires 2026 TBD
*Where a unit has a faculty senator who has been elected to an officer position, there will be one additional faculty senator to "replace" them on senate while they serve as officer.

## REPORT OF 2022-2023 SENATE ELECTIONS

## Senate Council

- Stephen Cohen, Penn State Abington
- To be determined, College of Agricultural Sciences
- To be determined, Penn State Altoona
- To be determined, College of Arts and Architecture
- To be determined, Penn State Berks
- To be determined, Smeal College of Business
- To be determined, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences
- To be determined, College of Education
- To be determined, College of Engineering
- To be determined, Penn State Erie
- Marth Strickland, Penn State Harrisburg
- To be determined, College of Health and Human Development
- Carey Eckhardt, College of the Liberal Arts
- To be determined, College of Medicine
- Daniel Costantino, Eberly College of Science
- To be determined, Units with fewer than four senators: Communications, Great Valley, Information Sciences and Technology, International Affairs, Dickinson Law, Penn State Law, Libraries, Military Science, and Nursing
- To be determined, University College


## Senate Committee on Committees and Rules Elected for two-year terms

- Judy Ozment, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Penn State Abington
- Beth Seymour, Teaching Professor, Penn State Altoona
- Keith Shapiro, Associate Professor of Art, College of Arts \& Architecture
- Amit Sharma, Professor of Hospitality Management, College of Health and Human Development
- Nathan Tallman, Digital Preservation Librarian, University Libraries


## Senate Committee on Faculty Rights \& Responsibilities

## Faculty

To fulfill the requirements of the Standing Rules, two members were elected from University Park (UP) to balance location. Elected two members and two alternates who will serve two-year terms (Terms end 2024)

- Valerie Braman (NTL/UP) - Member, Assistant Teaching Professor, College of the Liberal Arts
- Sue Rutherford Siegel (TL/UP) - Member, Research Professor of Human Genetics, College of Health and Human Development
- Mark Gough, (TL/UP) - Alternate, Associate Professor of Labor and Employment Relations, College of the Liberal Arts
- Laura Leites (TL/UP) - Alternate, Associate Research Professor, College of Agricultural Sciences


## Deans/Chancellors:

- Justin Schwartz - Member, Dean, College of Engineering
- Marwan A. Wafa - Alternate, Chancellor, Penn State Scranton


## University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee

Plurality ballot: Senators voted for three members (terms expiring in 2024)

- Linda Patterson Miller - Member, Distinguished Professor of English, Penn State Abington
- Pauline Thompson - Member, Professor of Psychology, Penn State Brandywine
- Linghao Zhong - Member, Professor of Chemistry, Penn State Mont Alto
- Peter Dendle - Alternate, Professor of English, Penn State Mont Alto
- Qiming Zhang - Alternate, Distinguished Professor of Electrical Engineering, College of Engineering
- Can S. Hakan - Alternate, Professor of Administration of Justice, Penn State Schuylkill


## Standing Joint Committee on Tenure

Plurality Ballot: Senators voted for two members.. The two receiving the most votes will serve as the members; the two receiving the third and fourth most votes will be the alternates through 2024.

- Leland Glenna - Member, Professor of Rural Sociology and Science, Technology, and Society, College of Agricultural Sciences
- Christopher Zorn - Member, Liberal Arts Professor of Political Science, College of the Liberal Arts
- Daniel Cahoy - Alternate, Professor of Business Law, Smeal College of Business
- Delia Conti - Alternate, Associate Professor of Communication, Arts, and Sciences, Penn State Fayette


## Faculty Advisory Committee to the President

Preferential ballot: Person who received the most votes is the member. Person who received the second most votes is the alternate. Both members and alternates will serve a three-year term ending in 2025.

- Julio Palma - Member, Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Penn State Fayette
- Kent Vrana - Alternate, Elliot S. Vesell Professor and Chair of Pharmacology, Penn State College of Medicine


## Senate Secretary for 2022-2023

- Josh Wede, Teaching Professor of Psychology, College of the Liberal Arts


## Senate Chair-Elect for 2022-2023

- Michele Stine, Associate Teaching Professor, College of Health and Human Development

MINUTES OF SENATE COUNCIL

Tuesday, April 5, 2022 - 1:30 p.m.
In person and Remote via Zoom
Members Present: V. Brunsden, W. Coduti, M. Duffey, F. Marko, S. Maximova, B. Seymour, J. Strauss, B. Szczygiel

Members by Zoom: K. Blockett, C. Eckhardt, W. Kenyon, B. King, L. Mangel, L. Posey, J. Ozment, A. Sinha, S. Snyder, K. Sprow-Forte, M. Swinarski, D. Wolfe

Guests/Others Present: K. Bieschke, E. Eckley, R. Egolf, R. Engel, N. Jones, L. Pauley, K. Shapiro, S. Stine,

Guests/Others by Zoom: K. Austin, , R. Bishop-Pierce, A. Taylor, K. Vrana, M. Whitehurst

Absent: P. Birungi, L. Kitko, T. Palmer

A. CALL TO ORDER. Chair Szczygiel, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 5, 2022.

## B. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF February 15, 2022

Senate Council Minutes were approved on a Ozment/Kenyon motion

## C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

## Chair Szczygiel.

The Faculty Advisory Committee to the President met this morning. The topics covered were:

1. Campus visits by the Provost
2. Covid, Enrollment and Budget
3. 2015-2025 Strategic Plan and the impact of Covid

Please submit any topics for FAC consideration to any of the Senate or the elected FAC members: Renee Bishop-Pierce, Judy Ozment, and Doug Wolfe.

## Provost, Nicholas Jones

Beginning March 23, all campuses now have a mask optional mode inside, except in areas required by law. There has been positive feedback from the mask-off policy. Starting March 26, Penn State paused the required Covid testing for students, faculty, and staff. The Covid testing site at the White Building will be closed and moved to 101 Atherton Street. The BA2 Variant is being watched carefully and Covid policies may change in the future if needed.

Admissions applications for Fall 2022 show a $27 \%$ increase from 2019. But the population of high school senior age students is not going up. It appears that students are now applying to more schools. This might indicate a lower yield rate. The current applicant pool is more racially diverse and includes a greater percentage of $1^{\text {st }}$ generation students. Paid accepts are also up.

There are currently searches for CIO and Chief Information Security Officer. Some candidates who were invited to visit withdrew their application.

The Provost has visited campuses in the last three months. Many campuses have buildings under construction. Staff commented on the advantages and disadvantages of the remote work arrangements. There were some faculty concerns the rules and contracts.

There has been a change in the way that the budget is being managed. The Senior Vice President for Finance and Business is now the University Budget Executive in charge of the E\&G budget.

## Vice Presidents' and Vice Provosts' Comments

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Kathy Bieschke

## Searches

- Dean, Penn State Law and Dean, School of International Affairs-working to bring this search to a close
- Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School-we have retained Witt Kiefer as the search firm, met last Friday and recharged the search committee. Thanks to Kent Vrana for representing the University Faculty Senate
- Dean of the College of Medicine-Witt Kiefer is the search firm, we have a draft of the profile, and we're close to launching the recruitment process.
- Executive Director, University Faculty Senate-the committee reported out to the provost and we are in the process of arranging on-campus visits. Jonna Kulikowich, a past chair of the Senate, chaired the search and was great.


## Policies

- Received an A\&C from the Senate requesting a revision of HRG18, Paid Parental Leave for Faculty, we will be sharing with the Benefits and Faculty Affairs committees. Biggest
changes: will apply to both parents, will include NTL and TL faculty. Our plan is to have this in effect by July 1. Many thanks to Denise Costanza and the benefits committee for their leadership and for working closely with us on the revision of this policy.
- The annual review of administrators process as specified in AC14 has concluded and seemed to go smoothly. Administrators will receive their results soon. Once the process has concluded we'll meet to debrief and determine what changes to make to the process next year. Many thanks Ed Fuller for participating in the revision of the annual review process on behalf of the Senate.


## Interim Vice President and Executive Chancellor for Commonwealth Campuses, Kelly Austin

- Enrollment Update
- Advisory Board Chairs Meeting (Nick, Dave K. Zack Moore, roundtable, and students)
- Annual budget conversations with the campuses throughout the spring (enrollment trends and planning, academic program mix and prospective new programs, carryforward, capital projects).
- Campus Visits (F/S, external groups, students, and a tour)
- Chancellor Searches (Hazleton and Great Valley) Wilkes Barre and Altoona
- Commonwealth Campuses Financial and other key metrics dashboard


## Vice President and Dean of Undergraduate Education, Yvonne Gaudelius

No report.

## Vice Provost for Educational Equity, Marcus Whitehurst.

There is a university-wide anti-bias training program being developed.

## Vice Provost of On-line Education, Renata Engel

Since our last meeting, we are shifting our attention to the graduation celebration of our Spring 2022 graduates. Briefly, there are 1,535 students graduating this semester having earned their degrees through the World Campus: 7 Doctoral, 764 Master's, 686 Bachelor's and 78 Associate degrees will be awarded. Collectively, the students come from 48 states, the District of Columbia, and 1 US territory and 20 countries. Additionally, 249 graduates have a military connection. Some additional graduate numbers to report: 62 are earning their second degree
through WC and 127 of the graduate degrees are earned by students who earned their bachelor's degree at any Penn State campus.

The trends associated with applications and enrollments are as follows: undergraduate applications for fall are up and graduate applications are down compared to last year, which was an unusual increase relative to the previous year. Numbers are beginning to look more like preCOVID years. The UG and GRAD application-enrollment funnel has been consistent with respect to the percentages of students who complete applications, our offered admissions have been consistent.

The 2022 Hendrick Best Practices for Adult Learners Conference will be held virtually this year on May 10 and May 11. It is the signature event of the Penn State Commission for Adult Learners. The national conference showcases best practices involved with supporting adult learners. Best practices come from classroom and online faculty, administrators, counselors, researchers, and other persons involved with making life more fulfilling for adult students.

## Senate Officers: None

## Interim Executive Director, Laura Pauley:

The Senate elections will be opening later this week. Laura thanked Erin Eckley for her efforts in getting the ballot prepared in a new elections system and getting bios for the large number of candidates on the ballot.
D. ACTION ITEMS: Unit Constitution Changes for Abington (This document can be found in the Faculty Senate - Senate Council TEAM space in the folder "Agenda for April 5, 2022/Constitutions")
The changes were approved.

## E. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

## F. REPORT OF GRADUATE COUNCIL

The search committee for the Dean of the Graduate School has been recharged. The chair of the Graduate Council, Ken Davis was added to that search committee.

Policy GCAC101 is being reviewed by an ad-hoc committee. This policy defines the process for becoming a graduate faculty member. IAC and FA are having a listening session to discuss the process for graduate faculty status.

Graduate Council will again be led by Ken Davis next year. He will then be the Past-Chair of Grad Council and an election will be held.

## G. SENATE AGENDA ITEMS FOR April 26, 2022

## FORENSIC BUSINESS:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
Making General Election Day a Non-Instructional Day
Approved on a Brunsden/Vrana motion.

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.

## LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEES ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID and EDUCATION
Revisions to Policy 48-40 Deferred Grades - Clarifying Language
Approved on a Seymour/Brunsden motion.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Revisions to Bylaws, Article III, Election to the Senate
Approved on a Duffey/Seymour motion.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Revision to Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6(a) - Establishing Subcommittees
Approved on a Brunsden/Ozment motion.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Revisions to Senate Standing Rules, Article I, Section 12(e) - Tellers
Approved on a Duffey/Brunsden motion.
SENATE COMMITTEES ON COMMITTEES AND RULES and CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Revision to Standing Rules, Article II - Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(c) Addition of DEI to Curricular Affairs Committee
Approved on a Ozment/Duffey motion.

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Rescind Policy 44-40: Proctoring of Examinations
Approved on a Brunsden/Ozment motion.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GLOBAL PROGRAMS
Revision to Standing Rules, Article II - Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(h) Committee on Global Programs
Approved on a Eckhardt/Ozment motion.

## ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS:

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS

Guiding Principles for the Design of Health Care Plans
Approved on a Ozment/Eckhardt motion.

## INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID

2021 Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program
Approved on a Duffey/Ozment motion. This report will be web only.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID

Annual Report on High School Students Enrolled Nondegree in Credit Courses
Approved on a Brunsden/Ozment motion. This report will be web only.

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Summary of Petitions by College
Approved on a Seymour/Ozment motion. This report will be web only.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS and INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS Tenure Flow Report
Approved on a Duffey/Ozment motion. The committee has requested 10 minutes for presentation and questions.

SENATE COMMITTEES ON FACULTY AFFAIRS, RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES, and EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT Earning Tenure During COVID
Approved on a Seymour/Duffey motion. The committee has requested 10 minutes for presentation and questions.

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON GLOBAL PROGRAMS

Role of Sustainability in Penn State Global
Approved on a Maximova/Seymour motion. The committee has requested 5 minutes for presentation and questions.

## SENATE COMMITTEES ON INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS and FACULTY AFFAIRS Non-Tenure Line Promotion Flow Report <br> Approved on a Brunsden/Ozment motion. The committee has requested 10 minutes for presentation and questions.

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

 Commonwealth Campuses Research ProgramApproved on a Seymour/Brunsden motion. This report will be web only.

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING

PSU COVID Financial Impact
Approved on a Marko, Seymour motion. The committee has requested 15 minutes for presentation and questions.

## College of Medicine Budget Report

Approved on a Marko/Ozment motion. The committee has requested 15 minutes for presentation and questions.

## SENATE COUNCIL

Report on Spring 2021 Academic Unit Visits
Approved on a Duffey/Marko motion. The committee has requested 5 minutes for presentation and questions.

Report on Fall 2020 Academic Unit Visits
Approved on a Brunsden/Eckhardt motion. The committee has requested 5 minutes for presentation and questions.

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA FOR April 26, 2022

E. Eckley displayed the requested presentation times and all requested times were approved by Senate Council. B. Szczygiel requested that two University Planning Reports be put at the beginning of the Informational Reports. The Informational Report on Tenure Flow, Earning Tenure During Covid, and the Non-Tenure Line Promotion Flow Reports will follow. The requested time limits for all Informational Reports were approved. No time limits were placed on the Legislative Reports. The Plenary Agenda with these changes in report order was accepted on an Brunsden/Ozment motion

## NEW BUSINESS: None.

## ADJOURNMENT

On an Eckhardt/Ozment motion, the meeting was adjourned at 2:54 PM
Minutes respectfully submitted by Laura Pauley, 4/14/2022.

Date: April 14, 2022
To: Commonwealth Caucus Senators (includes all elected Campus Senators)
From: Frantisek Marko and Judith Ozment, Caucus Co-Chairs

## Commonwealth Caucus Forum

Monday, April 25, 2022, 8:15 p.m. - 9:15 p.m.
In Room 102 Kern

Senators driving to Kern for the Forum meeting should park in the Nittany Lion Inn Parking Deck.
Please pick up a sticker to affix to your parking tag from Erin at the meeting.
Zoom connection is also available: https://psu.zoom.us/j/92989520449 (details below)
Panel Discussion:

## Handling Situations Involving Social or Political Unrest

Panelists:

- Michael Bérubé - Professor of Literature, College of the Liberal Arts
- Stephen Dunham - Vice President and General Counsel
- Brian Patchcoski - Assistant Vice President for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
- Mari Pierce - Associate Professor \& Program Coordinator for Criminal Justice programs at Penn State Beaver, Penn State Shenango, and Penn State New Kensington
- Danny Shaha - Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs

```
Zoom Connectivity Information:
Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS, or Android: https://psu.zoom.us/j/92989520449
Or iPhone one-tap (US Toll): +16468769923,92989520449# or +13017158592,92989520449#
Or Telephone:
    Dial:
    +1 646 876 9923 (US Toll)
    +1 }3017158592\mathrm{ (US Toll)
    +13126266799 (US Toll)
    +16699006833 (US Toll)
    +1 253215 8782 (US Toll)
    +13462487799 (US Toll)
    Meeting ID: 929 89520449
```

101 Kern Graduate Building

University Park, PA 16802
Phone: 814-863-0221

Date: April 14, 2022
To: Commonwealth Caucus Senators (includes all elected Campus Senators)
From: Frantisek Marko and Judith Ozment, Caucus Co-Chairs

# Commonwealth Caucus Business Meeting 

Tuesday, April 26, 2022, 11:15 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

Room: HUB-Robeson Center 233-A\&B
link to HUB $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor map

It is strongly recommended that CC Senators consider checking out of their hotel rooms in the morning and move their vehicles to the Nittany Lion Inn Parking Deck before their committee meetings, then plan on walking to various meeting locations on campus.

Senators driving to the HUB for the CC Business meeting will need to submit HUB Parking Deck charges on their reimbursement request.

Zoom connection is also available: https://psu.zoom.us/j/92989520449 (details below)

## Agenda of the meeting:

## I. Call to Order

II. Announcements
III. Committee Reports
IV. Other Items of Concern/New Business
V. Comments For the Good of the Order
VI. Adjournment

Box lunches will be provided immediately after the meeting for all senators who attend in-person.
Senators will have the ability to recharge electronics during the HUB meeting and lunch.
If you park in the Nittany Lion Inn Parking Deck, please pick up a sticker to affix to your ticket from one of the senate staff at the plenary meeting.

Zoom Connectivity Information:
Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS, or Android: https://psu.zoom.us/j/92989520449
Or iPhone one-tap (US Toll): +16468769923,92989520449\# or +13017158592,92989520449\#
Or Telephone:
Dial:
+1 6468769923 (US Toll)
+1 3017158592 (US Toll)
+1 3126266799 (US Toll)
+1 6699006833 (US Toll)
+1 2532158782 (US Toll)
+1 3462487799 (US Toll)
Meeting ID: 92989520449


[^0]:    "Instructors also should provide, within reason, the opportunity to make up work for students who miss classes on an election day due to participation in local, state, and federal governmental elections. Students should make every reasonable effort to inform the instructor prior to the election day of their anticipated absence in advance and make appropriate arrangements to make up work."

[^1]:    *We want to thank former Senate Chair Michael Bérubé (2018-2019) for his contribution to this document. He offered additional valuable insight into the history of shared governance at PSU in an essay prepared in advance, and found here. -Senate Chairs: Bonj Szczygiel (2021-2022), Beth Seymour (2020-2021)

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Faculty members who were on path during 2020 have the option to take a one-year extension during any time before April $1^{\text {st }}$ of the penultimate year of their probationary period. More information can be found at https://vpfa.psu.edu/promotion-and-tenure/.

[^3]:    ${ }^{2}$ Includes Hershey affiliate faculty.
    ${ }^{3}$ Fall 2014 is retrieved from the Official Human Resources table.
    ${ }^{4}$ Fall 2019, 2020, and 2021 are from HR Data Digest, https://datadigest.psu.edu/faculty-and-staff/

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ Individuals taking a tenure stay are still considered as part of their original cohort unless their unit makes a change to their Tenure Anniversary Date within the HR system. Attachment A details how faculty are identified for each cohort. ${ }^{6}$ Excluding the Pennsylvania College of Technology.

[^5]:    ${ }^{7}$ One faculty member was erroneously reported for the 2013 cohort rather than the 2014 cohort. They have been backed out of 2013 and the tables represent the adjusted numbers.

[^6]:    ${ }^{8}$ See the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs website at https://vpfa.psu.edu/promotion-and-tenure/ for the guideline document and FAQ.
    ${ }^{9}$ The cohort of 2014 is the first group to overlap 2020 during their seven-year period. Those from 2013 would have been under review during the first part of 2020 and ineligible for the extension.

[^7]:    ${ }^{10}$ Source: March 2021 Faculty Tenure-Flow Rates https://opair.psu.edu/institutional-research/projects/faculty-tenure-flow-rates/

[^8]:    ${ }^{11}$ Changes are detailed in the March 2021 Tenure Flow Report along with estimates of earlier numbers based on application of the 2010 rules

[^9]:    ${ }^{12}$ College of Medicine faculty are reported using the 2,4 , and 6 -year tables even if some are on a 10-year track. Those still on track at year six are mentioned in the corresponding section as still pursuing tenure.

[^10]:    * Density plots are similar to histograms, and show the distribution of values of a variable over a range of values as a continuous distribution. In the plots, higher values of the density correspond to larger numbers of respondents reporting values at or around that specific number on the horizontal axis. A simple description can be found here.

