THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

The University Faculty Senate

AGENDA

Tuesday, March 12, 2019 – 1:30 p.m.
112 Kern Graduate Building

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

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

A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Minutes of the January 29, 2019 Meeting in The Senate Record 52:4

B. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report of February 19, 2019 Appendix A

C. REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL - Meeting of February 19, 2019

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

E. COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

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

G. FORENSIC BUSINESS

Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid, and Education

The Future of Academic Advising at Penn State Appendix B
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology

Senate Policy on Open Access Appendix C
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]
H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

I. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid

Revisions to Registration Policies: 34-20 Undergraduate Registration and 34-87 Course Add Appendix D

Committees and Rules

Revisions to Bylaws; Article I – Officers, Section 2 & 6 Appendix E

Revisions to Standing Rules; Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (k)

REPORT POSTPONED UNTIL THE APRIL 23, 2019 MEETING

J. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Educational Equity and Campus Environment

Response to the Academic Integrity Task Force’s Final Report and Recommendations Appendix G

Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations

Revision to AC-21 Definition of Academic Ranks Appendix H
(Focusing on Internal Ranks)

Revision to AC-21 Definition of Academic Ranks Appendix I
(Focusing on Contract Length)

Faculty Benefits

Clarification of Applicability of Short-Term Disability Policies to Faculty Appendix J

Global Programs

Supporting International Students and Scholars at Penn State University Appendix K
K. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Committees and Rules

Committee on Committees and Rules Nominating Report for 2019-2020 Appendix L
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Senate Council

Senate Council Nominating Committee Report for 2019-2020 Appendix M
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid

Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program* Appendix N
Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded to Undergraduates* Appendix O

Intra-University Relations and Faculty Affairs

Promotion to the Rank of Professor Appendix P
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology

Courseware FERPA Agreement Appendix Q
[5 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

L. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

None

M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, April 23, 2019 at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate Building.

All members of the University Faculty Senate are asked to sit in their assigned seats for each Senate meeting. The assignment of seats is made to enable the Senate Chair to distinguish members from visitors and to be able to recognize members appropriately. Senators are reminded to wait for the microphone and identify themselves and their voting unit before speaking on the floor. Members of the University community, who are not Senators, may not speak at a Senate meeting unless they request and are granted the privilege of the floor from the Senate Chair at least five days in advance of the meeting.
DATE:    February 20, 2019

TO:      Michael Bérubé, Chair, University Faculty Senate

FROM:    Michele Duffey, Chair, Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs

The Senate Curriculum Report dated February 19, 2019 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 March 21, 2019.

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 ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING AND STUDENT AID, AND THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

The Future of Academic Advising at Penn State

(Forensic)

Background

On January 29, 2019, the University Faculty Senate passed an ambitious legislative report entitled “Revision to Policies on Academic Advising: Changes to Policies 32-00 Advising Policy; 32-10 The University’s Advising Program; 32-20 The Nature of the University Advising Program; 32-30 Responsibilities of Advisers and Advisees; 32-40 Assignment of Adviser; and 32-50 Audit of Unfulfilled Requirements” (hereafter, “Advising Report”). As part of its rationale, the report stated that academic advising is far more than a matter of making sure that students check the right boxes on their way to their degrees:

This core component of academic advising at Penn State is challenged … by the increasingly complex curricular and administrative procedures that effectively become a major focus of advising instead of more substantive and far-reaching conversations about scholarship within disciplines and the overall value of higher education. Additionally, student needs in support of academic success are becoming broader and more varied, creating a growing need for more comprehensive academic advising that goes beyond the specifics of given academic disciplines. This complexity requires a more team-based organizational structure that ensures student access to both faculty and staff who serve as academic advisers—effectively creating a sustained conversation among the student and multiple advisers.

Realizing the vision of the Advising Report, in which academic advising is an ongoing conversation about the purpose and value of each student’s education at Penn State, will require substantial dedication of faculty and staff time, effort, and resources. And there are three urgent reasons why this vision should be realized.

The first is the even more ambitious vision known as One Penn State 2025. If the University is to fulfill its goals under this initiative, the student experience must be made as seamless and frictionless as possible—particularly for students who move from one campus to another. That will require highly professional, individualized advising by faculty and staff, both with regard to disciplinary knowledge and with regard to broader University requirements.

The second and third follow from President Barron’s recent and much-welcomed emphasis on the educational, social, and economic functions of the Commonwealth Campuses, as well as the University’s abiding concern with access and affordability.

The Commonwealth Campuses, jointly and severally, serve a very different student demographic than University Park, drawing students from more diverse backgrounds and more precarious financial circumstances. For those students, Penn State is a powerful engine of social
and economic mobility—an increasingly important data point amidst reports that the most elite universities in the United States are overwhelmingly catering to the most elite segments of the population. Penn State should be justly proud of its capacity to accept students from less competitive high schools and economically distressed circumstances—but in order to serve those students well, especially when they are not well versed in the practices of college prep more elite students have come to take for granted, the University will have to be prepared to offer them ongoing, meaningful, and personalized academic advising.

Similarly, with regard to access and affordability, President Barron has often remarked that the single most important factor in the accumulation of student debt is time to degree. This is entirely true, and because it is true, it behooves the University to make sure it can deliver the kind of detailed and knowledgeable academic advising that will allow students to graduate in four years no matter how bewilderingly complex our curricular and administrative procedures become.

For all these reasons, academic advising is critical to student success—and to the larger educational and social mission of the University.

Question

How can we improve and expand academic advising so that it meets the goals of the Advising Report—and the needs of all Penn State students?
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Summary
The Open Access Task Force has been charged to provide an Open at Penn State recommendation to follow on the unanimous 2015 Faculty Senate Open Access Resolution. In March 2017, Provost Nick Jones and Dean of University Libraries and Scholarly Communications Barbara Dewey charged the Penn State Open Access Task Force to investigate and recommend opportunities to promote open and free access to Penn State scholarly output to maximize impact and availability of research and establish Penn State as a leader in the international Open Access Movement. The task force was asked to: 1) draft a policy statement on Open Access for Penn State; 2) recommend procedures for implementing the policy; and 3) recommend a suite of strategies to advance the Open at Penn State Initiative.

There are two primary motivations for open access to scholarly outputs:
1. Increasing access to research and scholarship
2. Addressing the unsustainable rising costs of academic journal subscriptions

Open at Penn State promotes and supports Penn State activities in pursuit of providing openly available scholarly output, including research outputs such as data and publications. Open at Penn State engages in the international conversation and efforts to promote open access to scholarly research with peers in the Big Ten, such as Illinois, Indiana, Purdue, and Rutgers, across the United States such as Harvard University, MIT, and the University of California System, and internationally with Cambridge University, JISC (UK), University of Freiburg, Project Deal (Germany), and the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU). As of July 2018, 130 Open Access policies have been implemented in the United States. (ROAR MAP: http://roarmap.eprints.org/ A Harvard Open Access Model Policy is available complete with explanatory annotations and is freely available for adoption by other institutes: https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/modelpolicy/). In addition to open access policies from individual institutions, funding agencies have also increasingly enforced open access as part of the conditions of financial support. Examples of funders with open access mandates include: National Institute of Health, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Science Foundation, U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Gates Foundation, Wellcome Trust, and the World Bank.

The purpose of this forensic discussion is to further engage Faculty Senate members with issues of open access and address desires for and concerns with engaging in the open access worldwide efforts. This discussion will inform the upcoming recommendations that the Open Access Task Force will propose to Faculty Senate.
Questions

1. Should the University Senate support a policy (similar to those in place at other major research institutions) that would enable the majority of research articles produced at Penn State to be distributed freely to researchers and citizens worldwide? PSU authors would retain copyright in their works and the policy would be in full compliance with copyright laws.

2. How should the University further encourage faculty to consider publishing in appropriate and respected open access journals in their discipline building on The Senate OA Resolution of 2015?

3. How can the University modify P&T Procedures/Expectations to clarify that contributions to open access publications can be of equal (or greater) value to contributions to non-open access publications; and that faculty contributions should be evaluated on impact to the profession, not the business model of the publication (open access vs. traditional subscription)? Is this a university or department-level discussion?

4. How can the University support a sustainable financial model for disseminating scholarly research and output?
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Revisions to Registration Policies: 34-20 Registration and 34-87 Course Add

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate and development of procedures when applicable

University Faculty Senate has defined an academic expectation for the amount of work both in and out of the classroom that is represented by a credit hour: over the time period of a semester, one credit hour represents a total of 45 hours of student work over the semester (42-23 Credit Requirements by Types of Instruction). This expectation is based on our collective understanding that learning takes time and effort, and that faculty design courses to promote student learning via a range of assignments, activities, etc. that allow students to meet the course learning goals and objectives.

A full-time credit load is defined by Senate policy (34-52 Definition of Full Time Students) as 12 – 19 credits per semester, which represents ~40 – 60 hours of academic work per week for a full-time student. Our current policy permits students to register for more than a full-time credit load (i.e., a credit overload) after “consultation with an adviser”; in practice, there is no limit on the number of credits that students may register for after the regular drop/add period has begun.

To understand the implications of this practice on the outcomes for students who register for credit overloads, data was provided by analyst Andrew Watters in the Office of Undergraduate Education. This analysis revealed predominantly negative outcomes, defined as courses that were not completed successfully (dropped, failed, or withdrawn), when students registered for more than 30 credits per semester, or when students with a cumulative grade point average of less than 2.0 attempted a credit overload. There is also substantial concern about academic integrity when students attempt and complete 30+ credits per semester, given our academic expectations for credit acquisition.

Of related concern is our current policy on late addition of courses after the regular drop/add period. Late addition of credits is academically appropriate when students have opportunity to complete all of the course assignments in the semester, and also is important for students who may add independent study, research, internship or other work that does not align with the normal semester calendar, and for students who may need to add credits to maintain full time status for the purposes of financial aid. However, our current policy permits students to late add a course up until the final day of a semester with the instructors’ permission, creating a misalignment of our academic expectations for acquisition of credit and the amount of time remaining in the semester. Alignment of the late add deadline with the late drop deadline, at the 80% mark in the semester, provides students with both the reasonable opportunity and time to complete course requirements, and the flexibility needed to make schedule adjustments late in the semester.
**Recommendations.** Based on the above, our committee recommends the changes to registration policies 34-20 and 34-87 shown below.

### 34-20 Undergraduate Registration

Students register at specified times and locations for credit courses. Although the registration procedures are generally uniform, there are variations at some locations. Information on registration for courses offered through Continuing Education is available from the Office of Continuing Education at each location or service area.

Students are strongly urged to consult with their academic adviser before registering for any credit course regardless of delivery system to discuss academic planning. No student shall be permitted to be enrolled for more than a typical credit load (see Section 34-52) in any one semester by all delivery systems without consultation with the student’s academic adviser. To enroll for more than a typical credit load (see Section 34-52) in any one semester by all delivery systems, a student must have a cumulative grade point average of at least 2.0.

No student shall be permitted to enroll in 30 or more credits per semester in any circumstance.

No student is permitted to register for another student or to permit anyone to register on the student’s behalf. Students are expected to register during the assigned time.

Students are considered officially enrolled when they have

1. Agreed to the Student Financial Responsibility Statement which outlines student financial obligations and
2. Registered for courses.

### 34-87 Course Add

A student may add a course to his or her schedule during the course’s Add Period. This period begins on the first day of classes for the semester and ends one (1) calendar day after the end of the Drop period (see Policy 34-89). The Late Add period for a course begins with the first calendar day after the course Add Period and ends on the day when 80 percent of the duration of the course is attained. A student may add a course after the Add Period ends only with written permission of the course instructor.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Bylaws; Article I – Officers, Sections 2 & 6

(Legislative)

Implementation: UPON APPROVAL BY THE SENATE

Rationale:
The University Faculty Senate is among the most complex faculty organizations in the United States, representing approximately 6,500 faculty members across the commonwealth. Despite enrollments doubling, the expansion of administration, significant change to the composition of the University’s faculty, and advances in information technology, there have been few changes to the structure of the Senate executive since the introduction of the office of Immediate Past Chair in 1974.

The Committee on Committees and Rules concluded that the office of the Chair could better perform its responsibilities if given the option of naming a data advisor to oversee special projects wherein data plays a significant role. For example, such an advisor could be assigned to a standing committee, special committee, or task force, and attend as a non-voting member. While the role of the advisor would remain flexible in order to avoid overprescribing duties to the role, such an advisor would help coordinate the initial formulation of research questions, the acquisition of data, analysis, and the presentation of data that standing committees request from the Office of Planning and Assessment in consultation with the Senate Office, thus facilitating the Senate’s capacity to produce evidence-based policy and decisions.

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

Please note that the following contains bold text for additions and strikeouts indicating deleted text.

___________

Article I – Officers

Section 2

(a) The Chair shall be the presiding officer of the Senate and shall, subject to approval by the Committee on Committees and Rules, appoint a faculty member of the Senate as Parliamentarian and may, subject to approval by the Committee on Committees and Rules, appoint a member of the Senate as Data Advisor who shall not vote unless otherwise entitled.

…

Section 6
The Data Advisor to the Chair shall coordinate the acquisition, analysis, and presentation of data that standing or special committees request from the Office of Planning and Assessment, in consultation with the Senate Office, and thereby serve as a liaison between the Chair, the Senate Office, and the Office of Planning and Assessment.

Section 6

Any officer of the Senate may be removed for neglect of duty or for misconduct in office in accordance with procedures for removal in the Standing Rules, Article I, Section 11 (b).

Clean copy
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Standing Rules; Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (k)

(Legislative)
Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

Introduction and Rationale
The Committee on Outreach recommends policy and advises the University on outreach activities. To best achieve this mission the committee has non-voting administrative members who serve to provide consultation and additional resources. When the Senate drafted the current legislation one person served as both the Vice President for Outreach and as the Vice Provost for Online Education. Since then, the position has been split into two separate positions. To preserve the purpose of the original legislation it is important for both positions to continue to be represented on the committee. CC&R therefore recommends the following changes.

Recommendation:

That Article II, Section 6(k) of the Standing Rules be and is hereby amended as follows: Please note that the following contains strikethroughs for deletions and bold text for additions.

Article II
(k) Committee on Outreach

1. Membership:

(i) At least nine elected faculty senators
(ii) One student senator
(Delete) (iii) Vice President for Outreach and Vice Provost for Online Education *(End Delete)
(Add) (iii) Vice President for Outreach *(End Add)
(Delete) (iv) Director of Cooperative Extension *(End Delete)
(Add) (iv) Vice Provost for Online Education *(End Add)
(Add) (v) Director of Cooperative Extension *(End Add)

2. Selection: By the Committee on Committees and Rules

3. Duties: The Committee on Outreach recommends policy and advises the University on outreach activities. Outreach is the exchange of information and the creation of meaningful collaborations between the University and its many external audiences. Responsibilities for the Outreach committee include: identifying University outreach
activities, establishing evaluation methods to ensure quality, and creating recognition measures to reward outstanding performance. Its responsibilities focus on the University’s outreach and public scholarship mission as realized through community engagement, research, credit and noncredit instruction, service through continuing and online education, cooperative extension, public broadcasting, and other programs beyond the sphere of resident education. These outreach activities are located in Penn State Outreach and Online Education, Penn State Extension, and in Penn State colleges and the commonwealth Campuses. The Committee on Outreach liaises with the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education, the bodies that are addressing engaged scholarship and other bodies as appropriate.

4. Mandated reports: none. The Committee on Outreach shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

*nonvoting unless Article IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws applies
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

Response to the Academic Integrity Task Force’s Final Report and Recommendations

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

Introduction and Rationale

The Faculty Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment (EECE) has several equity concerns in relation to the Academic Integrity (AI) Task Force’s Final Report and Recommendations (July 27, 2018). The EECE is troubled about the report’s lack of attention to how current AI practices affect underrepresented and international students and faculty. The Committee also believes that the Task Force unduly singled out international students in some of its recommended educational initiatives. And, in general, EECE members are concerned about how the current AI system and its proposed replacement seem to use the criminal justice system as a template. Below we outline our concerns in greater detail and provide recommendations to address them.

First, the Task Force’s report does not address the current impact of AI practices on underrepresented populations, faculty and students alike. The AI Task Force did not go deep into the data they provided in Appendix B (16), examining closely the demographic breakdown (e.g. gender, race, ethnicity, nationality, disability status, career status, etc.) of those involved in the reporting and those accused of academic dishonesty violations. Therefore, there is no way to assess if our current AI enforcement practices are biased and if systemic inequities exist that need to be addressed prior to implementing the new AI system.

Specifically, we cannot glean from the data offered by the AI Task Force if underrepresented and international students are being disproportionately reported vis-à-vis their white/male/domestic counterparts. We also cannot gauge if a greater number of white, domestic students contest the AI allegations from underrepresented and international graduate instructors and faculty in comparison to U.S.-born/white/male faculty. Similarly, we do not know if graduate instructors and non-tenured faculty have their accusations contested at a higher rate than tenured faculty nor what effects AI reporting has on their respective career trajectories. Finally, we are unable to determine if particular minority studies departments (e.g. Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies; African American Studies; Latino/a Studies; foreign languages, literatures, and cultures departments) are having to report AI violations more often than other departments in the University and, if so, whether that signals a problematic, negative valuation of diversity and international coursework on the part of students.

In essence, if we do not know how the AI enforcement system is operating now in relation to minoritized and international communities, as well as to non-tenured faculty and graduate
instructors, this report and the system-wide changes in practices, administration, adjudication, and education called for by the Task Force will be incomplete and could potentially reinforce or exacerbate extant inequalities.

Second, the Task Force’s report demonstrates a notable degree of bias toward international students. It singles them out as a class of potential “offenders” and treats them as a monolith, without any regard to differing cultural backgrounds in relation to AI practices. Specifically, in Appendix E, the Task Force champions a “[r]equired separate online module for international students on AI culture and expectations” and advocates for the provision of separate “materials for international students in prevalent native languages” (21) as part of its enumerated potential educational initiatives and approaches.

Once again, from the data provided in the report, it is unclear (even doubtful) if international students are really committing academic integrity violations in greater numbers than domestic students, if those who do violate AI standards do so because of language barriers that make understanding AI materials impossible; or if international students have far less knowledge of AI culture and expectations than their domestic counterparts and, thus, require separate educational initiatives, approaches, and treatment. Isolating international students from the rest of the student population has the potential to alienate them and reinforce domestic, nativist biases held against them, resulting in the further stigmatization of international status.

The third and final issue of concern is how the current and the prospective AI systems seem to use the criminal justice system as a template and, therefore, unwittingly replicate many of the same problems of the penal system in their pursuit of maintaining academic integrity standards throughout the University.

Existing sanctioning categories (Appendix H, 28-34) and the new classes of offenses advocated by the Task Force (Appendix I, 35-36) reflect an uneasy similarity to penal sentencing guidelines, which treat students more as offenders than learners. Moreover, the Task Force’s proposed sanctions are far more severe and have a far greater and longer stigmatizing effect than the previous system’s penalties. Specifically, the Task Force introduces new penalties, all but one of which result in transcript notations; various degrees and periods of exclusion from University courses, activities, and programs; and reporting to and exclusion from external organizations and activities (Appendix I, 35-36). Similarly, the new sanctions do not outline a clear process of restorative justice, allowing for the full rehabilitation of the student. There is only a brief mention of requiring as part of the sanction for academic integrity violations an online tutorial on academic integrity (21) and the requirement of “educational programs” in some of the new sanction descriptions (35).

The treatment of students as “offenders” within our AI system has caused some faculty to misconstrue their role in upholding AI standards, acting more as zealous criminal prosecutors than as educators, and has led, by the Task Force’s own discovery, to situations of improper adjudication and excessive punishment. In the Task Force’s engagement with stakeholders, some faculty indicated that they purposefully did not take part in the AI reporting process “to make sure offenders receive a strong set of consequences” (Appendix D, 20). The Task Force also
revealed that “[t]he current system results in situations in which students accept severe penalties for minor violations” (20).

In a laudable effort to address these abuses and ensure transparency, consistency and fairmindedness, the Task Force recommends the installation of a new centralized pseudo-judicial structure made up of a University-wide academic integrity office (4), a university adjudication committee (4), and a universal online case management system. Furthermore, the Task Force puts forth many excellent educational initiatives to help students learn about the importance of a culture of academic integrity and how to avoid academic dishonesty (Appendix E, 21-22). Still, the deployment of this new disciplinary and reporting bureaucracy fails to provide students with any official means of defense and guidance against unjust disciplinary action that is outside of the AI enforcement system. In the present AI system, as outlined in the Academic Integrity Form and Information for Students (Appendix F, 23-24), students are allowed to seek the advice of a University administrator, faculty member, or peer prior to deciding their acceptance of the allegations made and the sanctions imposed against them (23). In the new AI system, the Task Force recommends creating the position of Academic Integrity liaison, one whose job it would be to assist and support students and faculty alike during the AI process (4-5). Nonetheless, the co-mingled responsibilities of this individual would mean that students would not have at their disposal an advocate charged exclusively to counsel and represent them in what is increasingly, for all intents and purposes, an adversarial judicial proceeding.

Recommendation

Based on this background, we advance the following recommendations:

1. **Before making any systemic changes to the AI system in the University, we strongly advise the Provost and the Academic Integrity Task Force to carry out a deeper dive into available AI data and investigate how the current AI system affects underrepresented and international students and faculty.**

2. **We would recommend equal treatment of domestic and international students in all AI educational efforts, without isolating one segment of the student body from the other. Any instruction on AI matters should be universally designed and delivered to all students in the same manner, making no distinction between international and domestic status. We recommend removing the additional instructional module for international students.**

3. **We urge careful consideration of graduate students’ multiple roles (student, course instructor, researcher). We recommend changing “faculty” to “instructors” throughout the report. We also recommend replacing the module for graduate students with a general teaching module required for all instructors and teaching assistants (undergraduate, graduate, and faculty). The document should also clarify academic integrity issues related to research and dissertation work and fix the broken link on page 28: [http://bulletins.psu.edu/graduate/appendices/appendix4](http://bulletins.psu.edu/graduate/appendices/appendix4).**
4. We recommend that the document use more inclusive language that is non-binary. The report should use “they/them” instead of he/she.

5. Given the high-stakes nature of current and new proceedings and sanctions, we suggest that a module on student rights and on AI sanctions be included in the new educational initiatives advocated by the Task Force. We also advise that a position of AI Student Advocate be created, whose sole responsibility would be to assist students with navigating the AI system and counsel them during proceedings, leaving the Academic Integrity liaison to assist the faculty member alone.

6. Finally, and in keeping with the University’s educational mission, we also advise that a more robust system of restorative justice be formulated to balance the severity of the new penalties. We also recommend that the document be rewritten in line with an academic genre instead of that of criminal justice reform.
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Revision to AC-21 Definition of Academic Ranks (*Focusing on Internal Ranks*)

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

**Rationale**
The current version of AC-21 “Definition of Academic Ranks” (formerly HR-21) is ambiguous as to the definition of rank for tenure-line and non-tenure-line faculty in the University Libraries, College of Medicine, Dickinson Law, and Penn State Law. Clarifying the use of internal policies for the purpose of defining rank in those units resolves this ambiguity.

**Recommendation**
The committees recommend that AC-21 “Definition of Academic Ranks” be modified in the following way:

Please note that strikeouts indicating deleted text and additions appear in **bold**.

…

F. Ranks for faculty in the University Libraries [*Add* College of Medicine, Dickinson Law, and Penn State Law][End Add]

Ranks for [*Add* non-tenure-line faculty in the University Libraries, College of Medicine, Dickinson Law, and Penn State Law][End Add] are defined in policies internal to the units. Ranks for tenure-line faculty in the University Libraries are defined in policies internal to the unit. [*End Add*][Delete] Faculty in the University Libraries are defined in internal University Libraries policies UL-HRG07 Promotion and Tenure Criteria (for tenure-line ranks) and UL-HRG16 Promotion of Full Time, Non-Tenure Track Faculty (for fixed-term ranks).[End Delete]

…

FIXED-TERM RANKS and PROMOTION PROCEDURES:
Fixed-term ranks and titles should follow the guidelines set forth above for teaching, research, and clinical faculty, as well as [*Add* non-tenure-line faculty in University Libraries, College of Medicine, Dickinson Law, and Penn State Law][End Add] [Delete] librarians [End Delete]. Units should have clear rationales for the different ranks and titles they choose to use and their expectations for faculty to achieve these various ranks.

Rather than use the titles "lecturer" and "instructor" interchangeably for fixed-term appointments, each college should determine for itself which of the two titles it chooses to use, and then use that title consistently for such appointments.
Colleges should have their own guidelines for distinguishing between lecturer/instructor, assistant/associate/full professor positions for designating a third rank beyond that of lecturer or for promoting from one rank to the other, but all units should operate under the following University assumptions:

1. Although there can be exceptions, positions above the first rank are designed to be promotion opportunities, with a recommended period of at least five years in rank as an instructor or lecturer (or, for fixed-term and standing faculty without tenure who hold terminal degrees, assistant teaching/research/clinical professors) before consideration for promotion. Fixed-Term and Standing non-tenure-line faculty should become eligible for promotion to the second rank after five years in rank, and would be permitted to compile their promotion dossiers in their fifth year. There should be no fixed time period for promotion to the third rank. Reviews for promotions should be conducted solely with regard to the merit of the candidate.

2. Reviews for promotion of the full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty shall be conducted by Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committees. Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committees shall be constituted as follows: each of the colleges at University Park shall establish a committee for that college; each of the five stand-alone campuses (Abington, Altoona, Behrend, Berks, Harrisburg) shall establish a committee for that campus; each of the Special Mission Campuses (Great Valley, College of Medicine, and Dickinson Law) shall establish a committee for that campus; and the University College shall establish one committee composed of full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty from the campuses within the University College, with no more than one member from any campus. If a unit shall have fewer than seven full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty members, at least two members of that unit's Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committee shall be drawn from another unit's Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committee. Only full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty members in each unit are eligible to serve on and to vote for the members of the review committee in their unit. Only faculty of higher rank than the candidate should make recommendations about promotions. If there should be insufficient numbers of higher-ranked fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty, exceptions to this provision may be permitted by the Executive Vice President and Provost at the request of the academic unit.

3. The promotion procedure itself should include recommendations by both a campus/department faculty committee, (b) the DAA or department/division head, and (c) the approval of the campus chancellor and/or dean of the college.

4. All promotions should be accompanied by a promotion raise, in addition to a merit raise, to be determined and funded by the college.

5. Faculty members who are promoted shall be considered for a multi-year contract. If a multi-year contract is not granted, then factors that shaped this decision shall be communicated to the fixed-term faculty member at the time when a new contract is offered.
6. The exceptions to this policy are the College of Medicine, the Colleges of Law (Dickinson and University Park), and the University Libraries, since their faculty have for many years been hired off the tenure-track and do not create confusion about their relation to tenure-track faculty.

Clean Copy

Recommendation
The committees recommend that AC-21 “Definition of Academic Ranks” be modified in the following way:

F. Ranks for faculty in the University Libraries, College of Medicine, Dickinson Law, and Penn State Law

Ranks for non-tenure-line faculty in the University Libraries, College of Medicine, Dickinson Law, and Penn State Law are defined in policies internal to the units. Ranks for tenure-line faculty in the University Libraries are defined in policies internal to the unit.

FIXED-TERM RANKS and PROMOTION PROCEDURES:
Fixed-term ranks and titles should follow the guidelines set forth above for teaching, research, and clinical faculty, as well as non-tenure-line faculty in University Libraries, College of Medicine, Dickinson Law, and Penn State Law. Units should have clear rationales for the different ranks and titles they choose to use and their expectations for faculty to achieve these various ranks.

Rather than use the titles "lecturer" and "instructor" interchangeably for fixed-term appointments, each college should determine for itself which of the two titles it chooses to use, and then use that title consistently for such appointments.

Colleges should have their own guidelines for distinguishing between lecturer/instructor, assistant/associate/full professor positions for designating a third rank beyond that of lecturer or for promoting from one rank to the other, but all units should operate under the following University assumptions:

1. Although there can be exceptions, positions above the first rank are designed to be promotion opportunities, with a recommended period of at least five years in rank as an instructor or lecturer (or, for fixed-term and standing faculty without tenure who hold terminal degrees, assistant teaching/research/clinical professors) before consideration for promotion. Fixed-Term and Standing non-tenure-line faculty should become eligible for promotion to the second rank after five years in rank, and would be permitted to compile
their promotion dossiers in their fifth year. There should be no fixed time period for promotion to the third rank. Reviews for promotions should be conducted solely with regard to the merit of the candidate.

2. Reviews for promotion of the full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty shall be conducted by Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committees. Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committees shall be constituted as follows: each of the colleges at University Park shall establish a committee for that college; each of the five stand-alone campuses (Abington, Altoona, Behrend, Berks, Harrisburg) shall establish a committee for that campus; each of the Special Mission Campuses (Great Valley, College of Medicine, and Dickinson Law) shall establish a committee for that campus; and the University College shall establish one committee composed of full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty from the campuses within the University College, with no more than one member from any campus. If a unit shall have fewer than seven full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty members, at least two members of that unit's Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committee shall be drawn from another unit's Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committee. Only full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty members in each unit are eligible to serve on and to vote for the members of the review committee in their unit. Only faculty of higher rank than the candidate should make recommendations about promotions. If there should be insufficient numbers of higher-ranked fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty, exceptions to this provision may be permitted by the Executive Vice President and Provost at the request of the academic unit.

3. The promotion procedure itself should include recommendations by both a campus/department faculty committee, (b) the DAA or department/division head, and (c) the approval of the campus chancellor and/or dean of the college.

4. All promotions should be accompanied by a promotion raise, in addition to a merit raise, to be determined and funded by the college.

5. Faculty members who are promoted shall be considered for a multi-year contract. If a multi-year contract is not granted, then factors that shaped this decision shall be communicated to the fixed-term faculty member at the time when a new contract is offered.
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SENATE COMMITTEES ON FACULTY AFFAIRS AND
INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

Revision to AC-21 Definition of Academic Ranks *(Focusing on Contract Length)*

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

**Rationale**
The current version of AC-21 “Definition of Academic Ranks” (formerly HR-21) indicates that administrators shall consider promoted non-tenure-line faculty for multi-year contracts, but does not specify contract lengths. Special consideration should be given to non-tenure-line faculty promoted to the third rank; these faculty should be considered for the longest length of contract available to non-tenure-line faculty.

**Recommendation**
The committees recommend that AC-21 “Definition of Academic Ranks” be modified in the following way:

Please note that additions appear in **bold**.

…

FIXED-TERM RANKS and PROMOTION PROCEDURES:
Fixed-term ranks and titles should follow the guidelines set forth above for teaching, research, and clinical faculty, as well as librarians. Units should have clear rationales for the different ranks and titles they choose to use and their expectations for faculty to achieve these various ranks.

Rather than use the titles "lecturer" and "instructor" interchangeably for fixed-term appointments, each college should determine for itself which of the two titles it chooses to use, and then use that title consistently for such appointments.

Colleges should have their own guidelines for distinguishing between lecturer/instructor, assistant/associate/full professor positions for designating a third rank beyond that of lecturer or for promoting from one rank to the other, but all units should operate under the following University assumptions:

1. Although there can be exceptions, positions above the first rank are designed to be promotion opportunities, with a recommended period of at least five years in rank as an instructor or lecturer (or, for fixed-term and standing faculty without tenure who hold terminal degrees, assistant teaching/research/clinical professors) before consideration for promotion. Fixed-Term and Standing non-tenure-line faculty should become eligible for promotion to the second rank after five years in rank, and would be permitted to compile their promotion dossiers in their fifth year. There should be no fixed time period for
promotion to the third rank. Reviews for promotions should be conducted solely with regard to the merit of the candidate.

2. Reviews for promotion of the full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty shall be conducted by Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committees. Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committees shall be constituted as follows: each of the colleges at University Park shall establish a committee for that college; each of the five stand-alone campuses (Abington, Altoona, Behrend, Berks, Harrisburg) shall establish a committee for that campus; each of the Special Mission Campuses (Great Valley, College of Medicine, and Dickinson Law) shall establish a committee for that campus; and the University College shall establish one committee composed of full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty from the campuses within the University College, with no more than one member from any campus. If a unit shall have fewer than seven full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty members, at least two members of that unit's Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committee shall be drawn from another unit's Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committee. Only full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty members in each unit are eligible to serve on and to vote for the members of the review committee in their unit. Only faculty of higher rank than the candidate should make recommendations about promotions. If there should be insufficient numbers of higher-ranked fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty, exceptions to this provision may be permitted by the Executive Vice President and Provost at the request of the academic unit.

3. The promotion procedure itself should include recommendations by both a campus/department faculty committee, (b) the DAA or department/division head, and (c) the approval of the campus chancellor and/or dean of the college.

4. All promotions should be accompanied by a promotion raise, in addition to a merit raise, to be determined and funded by the college.

5. 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 fixed-term faculty member at the time when a new contract is offered.

6. The exceptions to this policy are the College of Medicine, the Colleges of Law (Dickinson and University Park), and the University Libraries, since their faculty have for many years been hired off the tenure-track and do not create confusion about their relation to tenure-track faculty.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS

Clarification of Applicability of Short-Term Disability policies to Faculty

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

Introduction
Penn State currently offers voluntary Short-Term Disability (STD) insurance among its Employee Benefits offerings. According to Penn State’s website https://hr.psu.edu/content/short-term-disability:

Short-Term Disability coverage, provided by Unum, is a new benefit for 2018. STD provides Faculty & Staff paid leave for illnesses and injuries lasting more than 14 or 30 days, up to 22 or 24 weeks, depending on which option you choose. You must exhaust all of your sick time prior to the Short-Term Disability benefit providing income replacement. See the Short Term Disability plan document for more information.

These plans, which guarantee continuation of a percentage of salary if employees miss more than a fixed number (14 or 30) days of work, have clear applicability for employees who are eligible to accrue sick leave. However, faculty employment contracts typically do not specify fixed amounts of sick leave per year, but instead designate a number of work weeks per year and the duties the faculty member is expected to perform on a semester or annual basis.

The University’s voluntary Long-Term Disability (LTD) insurance is a comparable benefits option, offering employees a policy providing income replacement if an employee is unable to work for medical reasons, for a period beyond six months. Faculty eligibility for LTD is clear since eligibility to collect LTD benefits is determined by a fixed amount of time (six months) rather than the requirement of having used up sick leave. For absences of less than six months, it is less clear when and how a partial pay replacement benefit might apply.

Additional Background Information
In the course of discussing the issue of the applicability of voluntary Short-Term Disability insurance to faculty, it was discovered through conversations with faculty and unit administrators that there may be inconsistency with payment of faculty who were unable to perform their assigned duties for some extended period due to medical issues. Anecdotally, there are instances where faculty who missed a significant portion of a semester received 100% of their pay during their absence while other faculty received less than full pay (or no pay at all) for missing significant portions of a semester.

Further, there was no consistency in how long a faculty member needed to miss before their pay was decreased. There are no university policies that address the issue of faculty medical leave during a semester. Up to this point, it has been generally up to the unit administrator (e.g.
Chancellor or Dean) to make the determination of whether the faculty member would receive less than full pay.

The University has explicit policies on how benefits and salary relate to various other forms of faculty leave:

**AC17 (Sabbatical Leave):** The section “Salary Payment While on Leave” has a formula to calculate salary based on sabbatical length. “Membership in Employee Benefits While on Sabbatical” specifies that Faculty employees who are “members of the University insurance program may maintain membership during the sabbatical leave.” It also clarifies how health insurance premium amounts are determined.

**HRG11 (Family and Medical Leave):** Specifies how the federally mandated twelve weeks of unpaid leave for purposes of Child Care, Family Illness (Partner or Parent), or Employee’s Own Serious Health Condition is administered. The section “Membership in University Insurances While on Leave” specifies employees’ rights to continue insurance during unpaid leave, and how insurance costs are calculated. It also states that: “an employee who is absent from work but receiving pay (using sick leave, vacation, etc.) shall continue to have the employee cost for all group insurance plans in which enrolled deducted from his or her paycheck.” This policy does not apply to situations where the faculty member has not requested unpaid leave under FMLA.

**HR16 (Leave of Absence Without Salary (Other Than for Extended Active Military Service)):** States that “costs for insurances in which [employees are] enrolled during a leave of absence without salary for sickness, maternity, family care as specified in HRG11, or formal study, shall be at the regular employee rates of contribution.” In addition, it states that “costs for insurances in which enrolled during a leave of absence without salary for other than the reasons enumerated in the paragraph above shall be the entire cost (employee and University costs) for those benefits.” The section “Contributions to Retirement Plans While on Leave” addresses that benefits issue with precision.

None of these or other University policies provide clarification about how faculty pay is determined during short-term absences for medical reasons. Thus, faculty currently have no way to understand how voluntary STD insurance offered by the University might apply to them, and thus no clear basis or guidelines for deciding whether to elect this benefit.

**Recommendation**

The Faculty Benefits Committee believes this situation should be rectified. Further, we believe there should be a University-wide policy that applies to all faculty. We offer two possible options:

1. In consultation with the University Faculty Senate, the University revises the guidelines presented at [https://hr.psu.edu/content/short-term-disability](https://hr.psu.edu/content/short-term-disability) that determine eligibility for STD insurance to include the circumstances under which faculty would benefit from STD insurance.
(2) In consultation with the University Faculty Senate, the University creates a new university wide policy that specifically addresses medical leave for faculty.

Whichever option is chosen, the revised guidelines or new policy should specify:

A. How much time a faculty member must be unable to perform their assigned duties before they would receive less than their full pay.
B. How much pay (% of salary) the faculty member would receive with and without STD insurance once the time threshold specified is met.
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Introduction and Rationale
The Global Programs committee was charged to investigate best practices for supporting international students and scholars at Penn State University. A previous informational report evaluated how the university can address the perception that, in light of the recent political climate, international students and scholars are unwelcome in the United States.

International students and scholars are a vital component of Penn State University. They enrich our mission and improve the experience for our entire community. There are a number of areas that present challenges for international students and scholars and to which the University should respond.

Data Gathering
There was a diversity of representation and opinion from constituencies at Penn State in compiling this report, including faculty and graduate students at University Park campus, administrative staff members, student representatives, and students from Great Valley campus where there is a large population of full-time international students. A draft of the report was sent to international student advisors at all of the Commonwealth Campuses to allow them the opportunity to provide feedback. Members of the subcommittee also spoke with Jennifer Campbell (Director, Global Operations & Learning), Matt Ishler (Associate Director, Career Counseling), and Masume Assaf (Director, Global Programs – DISSA). Finally, a survey was conducted by Global Programs Office in 2018 collecting information from five administrators, five faculty, and two connected community members, from every Penn State campus. This information was provided for the purposes of this report.

Visa Issues and Work Opportunities
Students express anxieties about visas required to pursue their degrees. J-1 visa students are unable to work outside the University and get paid. They can work 20 hours in the university but not outside of it. The US State Department points to a marked decrease in the number of F-1 visas issued to international students in 2017. The F-1 visa class applies for students involved in long-term studies in US higher education, as well as those on Optional Practical Training (OPT) placements following graduation. The State Department reports a total of 393,573 F-1 visas issued for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017. This represents a 17% decline from the 471,000 F-1s issued in 2016, and a nearly 39% drop in F-1 visa issuance from the recent-year high in 2015.
International students shared that they feel at a disadvantage compared to resident students in receiving internships and other work opportunities to help advance their careers. Recently, international students have been having difficulties securing OPT visas and internships. Employers are reluctant to sponsor international students for internships and practical training and as such opportunities for pre or post-completion training are limited. In light of these changing conditions, students are reluctant to apply to American universities.

Matt Ishler in Career Counseling mentioned that international students would particularly benefit from career assessments to identify career areas and plan job searches. This is confirmed by the National Career Development Association’s 2018 Report Resources for Partnering with International Students. The current schedule of career fairs in the fall semester and Jan/February seems to work well but they could be more targeted to support international students. Some disciplines/subjects are under scrutiny such as entrepreneur visas that are needed for certain STEAM fields.

Additionally, international students shared they were concerned about leaving the country for fear of not being allowed back in.

**Successful Transitions to Campus and Community**
Penn State faculty, staff and students need to appreciate the benefits of having international students and scholars as members of our communities. Engaging with international students provides a more diverse and rich academic experience for us all.

Transitioning to campus can be challenging for incoming students. Undergraduates explained that they need help in identifying banks, shopping areas, and other necessities for day-to-day living. Having a designated mentor would be useful. Students said the Directorate of International Student and Scholar Advising (DISSA) website is helpful, though a contact number would be valuable for an immediate response. Students particularly emphasized the benefit of having an identified mentor who could help with quick questions.

There are mental stress issues with being on campus as an international student and so resources need to be committed to provide support. Counseling resources that are culturally appropriate and relevant for international students must be available to the University Community and Global Programs.

**Local Climate**
The university environment should be made friendly, welcoming and relevant for our international students. The presence of a significant global university community is not reflected
in the fabric of our campus and necessitates steps to welcome the international students of our community in the physical campus.

Lastly, the home community needs to be welcoming. It has been shared to members of the subcommittee that at least at University Park, international students are subject to increased inspection at local bars. In the event that a driver’s license is not on hand, students are being asked to produce their passports and their visas are also inspected. Some bars do not recognize a passport as valid proof of age. In speaking with international students about this, it was emphasized that this limits their ability to interact with other students, as well as the number of establishments where they can have a meal.

Recommendations

- It is recommended that the University be more proactive in arranging career fairs with prospective employers who are willing to sponsor internships, practical training, and H-1B visas for international students. This could be done by networking with Career Services and alumni networks.
- It is recommended that Career Services work closely with Global Programs to identify prospective employers willing to support students with OPT and H-1B visas.
- Programs with international students who want to work should integrate Curricular Practical Training (CPT) into the academic schedule. Examples of this already exist and can serve as a model for other campuses.
- Global Programs and Career Services should highlight success stories of international students at Penn State and following graduation.
- It is recommended that Alumni mentoring should be arranged as Alumni mentors can be particularly helpful in ensuring that international students receive the counseling needed.
- Global Programs should have a hotline for international students. This could be used to report incidents of harassment or general campus climate issues. The hotline could also be used for students having difficulty reentering the country. This could be synchronized with the TSN program, which already has an existing infrastructure for faculty, staff, and students traveling internationally.
- Faculty are strongly encouraged to support students with visa issues by allowing Skype sessions for ongoing classes in the event that a student is delayed, or prevented, from returning to campus.
- Counseling resources that are culturally appropriate and relevant for the international students must be available to the University Community and Global Programs. If additional resources beyond what currently exists they should be allocated.
- We recommend having a Global Lion Ambassador on every campus to provide targeted mentoring to international students. These ambassadors would be international students from the campus who would also help support bridging these students to different groups of students.
- We recommend that the Administration, Student Affairs, and the Office of General Counsel contact the Global Programs committee for specific details on establishments at University Park that are providing barriers of entry to international students.
- The next Penn State climate survey should be developed in collaboration with Global Programs to ensure that the right questions are asked to help evaluate the experiences of international students on all of our campuses.
• As part of its current and successful work supporting town-gown relations, Student Affairs should emphasize the need to create a welcoming and inclusive environment for international students and scholars.
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ASENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Committee on Committees and Rules Nominating Report for 2019-2020

(Informational)

The Senate Committee on Committees and Rules identified the following nominees to stand for election to three extra-senatorial standing committees. Additional nominations may be made from the floor of the Senate on March 12, 2019.

Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

University Park *Elect two* (one member; one alternate)
- Daniel Larson, Professor of Physics, Eberly College of Science
- Richard Robinett, Professor of Physics, Eberly College of Science
- Amit Sharma, Professor of Hospitality, College of Health and Human Development

Locations other than University Park *Elect two* (one member; one alternate)
- Michael Doncheski, Professor of Physics and Chief Academic Officer, Penn State Mont Alto
- Frantisek Marko, Professor of Mathematics, Penn State Hazleton
- Delia Conti, Associate Professor of CAS, Penn State Fayette
- Gina Brelsford, Associate Professor, Penn State Harrisburg
- Binh Le, Reference and Instruction Librarian, Penn State Abington

Deans/Chancellors *Elect three* (one member; two alternates)
- R. Keith Hillkirk, Chancellor, Penn State Berks
- Francis Achampong, Chancellor, Penn State Mont Alto
- David Christiansen, Chancellor, Penn State York
- V. Dale Jones, Chancellor & Chief Academic Officer, Penn State Wilkes-Barre

University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee *Elect three* (Three members, two alternates)
- Linda Patterson-Miller, Professor of English, Penn State Abington
- Mary Beth Oliver, Distinguished Professor of Media Studies, Bellisario College of Communications
- Matthew McAllister, Professor of Media Studies, Bellisario College of Communications
- Garrett Sullivan, Professor of English, College of the Liberal Arts
- Eric Hayot, Distinguished Professor of Comparative Literature and Asian Studies, College of the Liberal Arts
- Peter Crabb, Professor of Psychology, Social Sciences and Education, Penn State Hazleton
- Hossein Movahedi-Lankarani, Professor of Mathematics, Penn State Altoona
- Barbara Canalupo, Professor of English, Penn State Lehigh Valley
Standing Joint Committee on Tenure *Elect two* (one member; one alternate)

- **Lisa Posey**, Associate Professor of Risk Management, Smeal College of Business
- **Ira Ropson**, Associate Professor and Assistant Dean for Medical Student Research, College of Medicine
- **William Doan**, Professor, Penn State School of Theatre, College of Arts and Architecture
- **Lonnie Graham**, Professor of Art, College of Arts and Architecture
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SENATE COUNCIL

Senate Council Nominating Committee Report for 2019-2020

(Informational)

The Nominating Committee consisting of the elected representatives of Senate Council was convened on January 15, 2019 and February 19, 2019. Additional nominations may be made from the floor of the Senate on March 12, 2019.

CHAIR-ELECT OF THE SENATE

- **William Butler**, John Edward Fowler Distinguished Professor of Law, Penn State Dickinson School of Law
- **Elizabeth Seymour**, Associate Teaching Professor, Anthropology, Communications, History, and Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, Penn State Altoona
- **Amit Sharma**, Professor of Hospitality Management/Finance, College of Health and Human Development

SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(One to be elected to one-year term)

- **Judy Ozment**, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Penn State Abington
- **Kathleen “Kat” Phillips**, Nursing and Allied Health Librarian, University Libraries

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PRESIDENT

(One to be elected, term expires 2022)

- **Martha Strickland**, Associate Professor of Education, School of Behavioral Sciences and Education, Penn State Harrisburg
- **Alok Sinha**, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, College of Engineering
- **Laurie Breakey**, Assistant Teaching Professor, Business Administration, Penn State DuBois
- **Geoffrey Scott**, Professor of Law, Penn State Law
- **Bonj Szczygiel**, Associate Professor of Landscape Architecture, College of Arts and Architecture
- **Kathryn Jablokow**, Professor of Engineering Design & Mechanical Engineering, Penn State Great Valley

SENATE COUNCIL NOMINATING COMMITTEE

- Mohamad Ansari
- Jonna Belanger
- Caroline Eckhardt
- Janet Hughes
• Brian King
• John Nousek
• Judith Ozment
• Rosemarie Petrilla
• Julia Plummer
• Lisa Posey
• Elizabeth Seymour
• Robert Shannon
• Alok Sinha
• Bonj Szyzgiel
• Paul Thompson
• James Warren
• William Wenner
• Matthew Woessner, Chair
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID

Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program

(Informational)

Introduction
"Reserved Spaces" are admission spaces reserved at University Park for eligible first-year students with special needs or talents that cannot be met at Commonwealth Campus locations 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.

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. Because of 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 following 2012 are reported for a full calendar year.

Table 2 provides limits for each type and group of students and the number of reserved spaces actually used. The graph that follows compares the number of reserved spaces to the total first-year admissions at University Park. On both the chart and graph, for the years 2011-2012, the data refer to fall admissions only. For 2013-2018, actual reserved space use for fall alone and for the full calendar year are shown. In 2018, a total of 204 spaces were used in the spring, summer and fall, constituting 2.47% of the calendar year admissions.

Table 3 shows the proposed reserved space limits for 2018. The spaces utilized by EOP/CAMP have been lower in recent years due to expiration of funding for the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP). However, we recommend keeping the current limit in place, as it is anticipated that we will apply for restored funding in the next cycle.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID

- Clark Brigger
- Wei-fan Chen
- Tracy Fausnight
- Deirdre Folkers
- Katherine Garren
- Edward Glantz
- Mark Horn
- James Jaap
- Robert Kubat
- Melissa Kunes
- Allen Larson
- Timothy Lawlor, Vice Chair
- Keith Nelson
- Maura Shea
- Jake Springer
- Mary Beth Williams, Chair
- Richard Young
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>CAT. 1 (4.00-3.50)</th>
<th>CAT. 2 (3.49-3.00)</th>
<th>CAT. 3 (2.99-2.75)</th>
<th>CAT. 4 (2.74-2.50)</th>
<th>CAT. 5 (2.49-2.25)</th>
<th>CAT. 6 (2.24-2.00)</th>
<th>CAT. 1-6 (4.00-2.00)</th>
<th>CAT. 7-10 (1.99-.01)</th>
<th>NO CAT.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SENATE APPROVED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Arch Talent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Educ Opp Prog/CAMP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER ACADEMIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC Scholars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Adm Review Comm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Sports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Band</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President &amp; Dean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENTAGE</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>30.39%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>21.57%</td>
<td>10.29%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>96.08%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **TOTAL FRESHMEN**      | 1266               | 5776               | 757                | 121                | 31                 | 2                  | 7953               | 0                    | 305     | 8258  |
| **PERCENTAGE**          | 15.33%             | 69.94%             | 9.17%              | 1.47%              | 0.38%              | 0.02%              | 96.31%             | 0.00%                | 3.69%   | 100.00% |

*EOP/CAMP = Educational Opportunity Program/College Assistance Migrant Program

**Adm Review Comm = Admissions Review Committee

Source: Office of Undergraduate Admissions, 1/2019

Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education
### TABLE 2
RESERVED SPACES - 9 YEAR COMPARISON
UNIVERSITY PARK

| TYPE (Evaluation Index) | 2011 | Fall 11 | Limit | Actual | 2012 | Fall 12 | Limit | Actual | 2013 | Fall 13 | Limit | Actual | 2014 | Fall 14 | Limit | Actual | 2015 | Fall 15 | Limit | Actual | 2016 | Fall 16 | Limit | Actual | 2017 | Fall 17 | Limit | Actual | 2018 | Fall 18 | Limit | Actual | 2019 | Fall 19 | Limit | Actual |
|------------------------|------|---------|-------|--------|------|---------|-------|--------|------|---------|-------|--------|------|---------|-------|--------|------|---------|-------|--------|------|---------|-------|--------|------|---------|-------|--------|
| **SENATE APPROVED**    |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |
| Arts & Arch Talent     | 10   | 7       | 10    | 3      | 10   | 1       | 2     | 10     | 0    | 0       | 10    | 1       | 1     | 10     | 4     | 4       | 10    | 4       | 5     | 10     | 7     | 7       | 10    | 7       | 10    | 7       | 10    | 7       |
| *EOP/CAMP              | 70   | 58      | 70    | 63     | 75   | 56      | 56    | 75     | 31   | 31      | 75    | 20      | 22    | 75     | 15    | 16      | 75    | 19      | 19    | 75     | 23    | 24      | 75    | 19      | 75    | 19      |
| Veterans               | 10   | 0       | 10    | 0      | 10   | 0       | 0     | 10     | 0    | 0       | 10    | 0       | 0     | 10     | 0     | 0       | 10    | 0       | 0     | 10     | 0     | 0       | 10    | 0       | 10    | 0       |
| **Subtotal**           | 90   | 65      | 90    | 66     | 95   | 57      | 58    | 95     | 31   | 31      | 95    | 21      | 23    | 95     | 19    | 20      | 95    | 23      | 24    | 95     | 30    | 31      | 95    | 23      | 95    | 30      |
| **OTHER ACADEMIC**     |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |
| ROTC Scholars          | 15   | 17      | 15    | 6      | 15   | 7       | 7     | 15     | 5    | 6       | 15    | 8       | 8     | 15     | 4     | 4       | 15    | 7       | 7     | 15     | 10    | 10      | 15    | 10      | 15    | 10      |
| **Adm Review Comm**    | 40   | 47      | 40    | 73     | 40   | 56      | 94    | 40     | 40   | 68      | 75    | 58      | 87    | 75     | 43    | 72      | 75    | 35      | 63    | 75     | 30    | 43      | 75    | 35      | 75    | 30      |
| **Subtotal**           | 55   | 64      | 55    | 79     | 55   | 63      | 101   | 55     | 45   | 74      | 90    | 66      | 95    | 90     | 47    | 76      | 90    | 42      | 70    | 90     | 40    | 53      | 90    | 42      | 90    | 40      |
| **ADMINISTRATIVE**     |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |      |         |       |        |
| Athletes               | 140  | 82      | 140   | 86     | 140  | 72      | 124   | 140    | 80   | 139     | 140  | 73      | 143   | 140    | 67   | 123     | 140  | 54      | 118   | 140    | 37    | 107     | 140  | 37      | 140  | 37      |
| Team Sports            | 5    | 7       | 5     | 4      | 5    | 4       | 5     | 5      | 4    | 5       | 5    | 2       | 1     | 5      | 1     | 1       | 5    | 3       | 4     | 5       | 2     | 3       | 5     | 3       |
| Blue Band              | 10   | 7       | 10    | 4      | 10   | 4       | 4     | 10     | 6    | 6       | 10   | 5       | 6     | 10     | 5     | 5       | 10   | 6       | 6     | 10     | 8     | 8       | 10   | 8       |
| VP & Dean              | 25   | 2       | 25    | 0      | 25   | 1       | 4     | 25     | 1    | 4       | 10   | 3       | 10    | 10     | 0     | 7       | 10   | 1       | 4     | 10     | 0     | 2       | 10   | 1       |
| **Subtotal**           | 180  | 98      | 180   | 95     | 180  | 81      | 136   | 180    | 91   | 154     | 165  | 83      | 161   | 165    | 73   | 136     | 165  | 64      | 132   | 165    | 47    | 120     | 165  | 47      | 165  | 47      |
| **NEW FIRST YEAR STUDENTS** | 5866 | 6020    | 6326  | 8382   | 6289 | 8663    | 5756  | 8013   | 6547 | 8861    | 5934 | 8211    | 6130  | 8258   |
| %                      | 3.87%| 3.99%   | 3.18% | 3.52%  | 2.66%| 2.99%   | 2.95% | 3.48%  | 2.12%| 2.62%   | 2.17%| 2.75%   | 1.91% | 2.47%  |
Reserved Spaces Used Compared to Total First-year Admission to UP by Year


Bar chart showing the number of reserved spaces used compared to total first-year admission to University Park by year from 2011 to 2018.

The years 2011 to 2012 reflect fall only, with 240 of the 6020 first-year-admissions in 2012 admitted via reserved spaces.

# TABLE 3
Proposed Reserved Spaces Limits for 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senate Approved</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; A Talent (Architecture/Landscape Architecture)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Opportunity Program/College Assistance Migrant Program</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Academic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC Scholars</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Review Committee</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsity Sports</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Sports</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Band</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP&amp;D</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 art work 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 Provost 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 Provost 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.
On behalf of the Faculty Senate, the Office of Student Aid facilitates the awarding of University Scholarships designated as ‘Faculty Senate Scholarships.’ Twenty-one endowments and one annually funded source generate the support for these undergraduate awards. As a whole, the Faculty Senate endowments require recipients to be academically talented and demonstrating financial need. Individually, most of the endowments have a unique eligibility preference that we are required to honor. Donors agree to scholarship guidelines that can include both general eligibility criteria and specific preferences that donors have chosen. For instance, several guideline preferences specify students from a particular high school, city, or county; more specify students who have demonstrated leadership skills, service to community and school, and/or participation in extra-curricular activities.

Faculty and staff at each campus nominate students who have reached at least their third semester of enrollment at Penn State. In most cases, financial aid officers solicit nominations from faculty, rank order the nominees, and submit names and brief comments about the academic merit and extra-curricular activities of each nominee. The Office of Student Aid then matches a pre-determined number of nominees to appropriate guidelines and funds. Typically, in late July or early August, students receive formal scholarship award letters sent from the Faculty Senate Office. Each letter identifies the name of the Faculty Senate Scholarship, the award value, and the one-year term of the award, as well as provides the donor name and a request for a thank you note. If original scholarship recipients do not enroll or choose not to return mid-year, funds are awarded to the next nominees from those particular campuses.

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

In the 2017-18 academic year, Penn State undergraduates received a total of $256,300 in Faculty Senate Scholarship awards. The majority of recipients are from Pennsylvania (81%), and they are enrolled in 19 different academic colleges. Available spending tends to fluctuate year to year based on the value of the University’s investment pool and the available endowment earnings. A three-year comparison follows and confirms this fluctuation in available dollars and resulting awards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Senate Scholarship Awarding: A Three-Year Comparison</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Recipients</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollars Awarded</td>
<td>$256,300</td>
<td>$258,566</td>
<td>$254,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Award Value</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The attached report shows the distribution of scholarships across campuses, colleges and class.

### 2017-18 Faculty Senate Fund Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Awards</th>
<th>% of Total Awards</th>
<th>Fall ‘16 Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3591</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3491</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubois</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4,566</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Allegheny</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5,046</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont Alto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>47,789</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes Barre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Scranton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>242</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>78,759</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Faculty Senate Scholarships are awarded to undergraduates across all campuses.

The number of awards made per campus is in proportion to campus vs. total undergraduate enrollment figures from the University Budget Office’s fall head count, prior to the year of awarding.
B. The majority of Faculty Senate Scholarship recipients are from Pennsylvania.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residency Distribution</th>
<th># of Awards</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-PA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. At least one Faculty Senate Scholarship recipient is enrolled in each college. The table below shows the distribution of recipients for the last three years across all academic colleges. This table is not intended to compare to Table A since the student’s academic college is not a factor in the selection of Faculty Senate Scholarship recipients. This distribution is an outcome of the selection process and varies from year to year. This table is provided for informational purposes only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Distribution</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington College</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend College</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smeal Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital College</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth &amp; Mineral Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sciences &amp; Technology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Faculty Senate Scholarship recipients are predominantly juniors and seniors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Standing</th>
<th># of Awards</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID
- Clark Brigger
- Wei-fan Chen
- Tracy Fausnight
- Deirdre Folkers
- Katherine Garren
- Edward Glantz
- Mark Horn
- James Jaap
- Robert Kubat
- Melissa Kunes
- Allen Larson
- Timothy Lawlor, Vice Chair
- Keith Nelson
- Maura Shea
- Jake Springer
- Mary Beth Williams, Chair
- R. Scott Young
SENATE COMMITTEES ON INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS AND FACULTY AFFAIRS

Promotion to the Rank of Professor

(Informational)

Introduction

There is an institutionally significant difference in the proportion of faculty promoted to the rank of Professor from the Commonwealth Campuses (CWC) as compared to faculty at University Park (UP). In any discussion of the promotion system at the campuses it is important to understand the structure. The University College includes 14 campuses and has a single College committee, with an Executive Chancellor acting as Dean. In addition, there are five Campus Colleges that have their own criteria for promotion, two levels of committees and Chancellors (Deans). These are Abington, Altoona, Behrend, Berks, and Harrisburg.

During the March 2018 Senate Plenary Meeting, an Informational Report was presented jointly by the Committees on Intra-University Relations (IRC) and Faculty Affairs (FA) that identified reasons contributing to the lower proportion of faculty promoted to the rank of Professor at the CWC as compared to UP. The informational report stated that:

This charge was initiated due to an examination of 2016 data that indicate 46% of University Park (UP) faculty from all Colleges and Schools (excluding Law) have earned the rank of Professor while 21% of faculty from CWC (excluding Medicine, Law, Great Valley) have earned that rank (Penn State, University Budget Office, 2016).

The informational report identified higher teaching loads on the CWC, limited resources for research and scholarly communication, and greater expectations for service, among other reasons, for observed difference. Also noted was variability in guidelines and criteria for promotion across units. Canvassed faculty and administrators revealed additional potential explanations for the gap that needed further investigation, such as: the availability of external peer reviewers; the absence or paucity of faculty at the rank of Professors at the CWC, which limits opportunity for mentoring; insufficient research support; and a lack of a clear process and transparency in the nomination procedure. On some CWC the Directors of Academic Affairs or Chief Academic Officers are Associate Professors. While these administrators may work diligently to promote faculty, not having been successfully through the process puts them at a distinct disadvantage when providing advice to faculty regarding when to seek promotion and what materials to include in their dossier.

The 2018-2019 Chair of the University Faculty Senate charged IRC and FA to “draft an informational report on the disparity between UP and the campuses with regard to promotion to Professor.” In the concluding remarks from the March 2018 information report, and following challenges to the data presented therein, it was clear that the Senate, Administration, and the Office of Planning and Assessment needed to collaborate to review the data for accuracy and to better define the disparity.
Additional steps were taken to survey faculty from across the CWC about the barriers to promotion to Professor. Senators representing these units had an opportunity at the Commonwealth Caucus Meeting, January 2019, to have an open discussion about barriers with administrators from University Park and the CWC. The outcome of the discussion mirrored many of the barriers stated in the March 2018 report with additional challenges, further supporting the belief that the reasons for the gap are multifactorial. These discussion points will be of the utmost importance in shaping the next steps in what needs to be a shared governance approach to mitigating the gap. Equity in our promotion policies and procedures is an accreditation criterion for the University. Future assessment must be linked to changes leading to identified outcomes.

**Background**

Initial discussions of the promotions gap centered on the significance of the 25-point difference in rates of promotion to the rank of Professor, especially whether this gap is temporary in nature. During the initial review of the promotion gap, administrators provided data that purportedly showed the promotion gap narrowing over time (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Data table from administration showing the promotion gap over time.

![](image)

In their presentation to the Senate, the chairs of IRC and FA noted that the apparent narrowing of the gap, observable in Figure 1, was not a function of improvements in the rates of promotion on the CWC, but, rather, the result of the natural attrition of faculty in the middle ranks as a natural function of time. Given enough time, the percentage of faculty at the rank of Associate Professors will drop to zero regardless of location as faculty move to other institutions or retire or die. Also, sharp drop in the percentage of associate professors at UP (at the 7-10-year mark) is indicative of a system that tends to move associate professors to promotion in a timely fashion.
Absence of a drop in the percentage of CWC associate professors after the sixth year in rank provides evidence that there are far fewer promotions on the CWC after six years in rank.

To help illustrate the impact of the differing rates of promotion, the Senate presentation included data from the “Associate Professor Time in Rank: 2016-17 Annual Report” which showed that “Promotion to professor within six years was more common at University Park than at the CWC (22.4% compared to 2.6%)…” The presentation further noted that six years after their promotion to associate professors among the 2010 cohort, 11 of 43 faculty at University Park had been elevated to the rank of full professor compared to 1 of 36 on the campuses. The administration later reported that the data drawn from this administrative report was incomplete as the data omitted two other promotions on the CWC. Regardless, six years after the promotion of UP and CWC faculty to the rank of associate professor, there remained a considerable gap in rates of promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

Updated Analysis

Material provided in the March 2018 informational report and floor presentation was limited in scope, making it difficult to draw definitive conclusions about the extent of the promotion gap or its probable causes. In the October 2018 meeting of the IRC Committee, the OVPCC provided additional information on the rates of promotion among tenure-line faculty on the CWC. The results highlight the ongoing challenges faced by the CWC in providing tenure-line faculty with opportunity for promotion and professional development (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: Data table from administration showing the promotion gap over time.

Figure 2 shows the percentage of full professors at seven locations, with a line highlighting the overall percentage at each location. Note that unlike the March 2018 report, the data in Figure 2 omits faculty at the rank of Assistant Professors. Figure 2 indicates that in 12 years there has been some improvement in the rates of faculty earning Professor on the campuses, moving from 26% to 30%. To put this in perspective, using this unit of measurement, approximately 60% of
UP tenure-line faculty hold the rank of Professor. The data provided by the OVPCC confirms that, as a proportion of the overall tenure line faculty, UP has twice as many faculty with the rank of Professor as do the CWC.

In discussions about the nature of the promotion gap, administrators acknowledged ongoing differences in the pace with which faculty attain the rank of Professor. One statistic, provided by administrators during the April 2018 meeting with the Commonwealth Caucus and included in the October 2018 presentation to the IRC committee, illustrates the difficulty in even measuring and interpreting the promotion gap. Concerned that the March 2018 report might have overstated the nature of the problem, administration asserted that the average time to promotion to the rank of Professor for UP faculty was 6.7 years, compared to 8.7 years for CWC faculty—a gap of two years.

But because this statistic compares the time to promotion among those who successfully moved to the rank of Professor, it understates the nature of the problem in at least two significant ways. First, the average faculty member with the rank of Professor at the CWC took approximately nine years to advance from the rank of Associate Professor to Professor, a pace notably slower than most of those at UP. Second, in comparing only those who successfully attained promotion to the rank of Professor, the statistic fails to capture the majority of CWC faculty who never reach the third rank.

The inability of faculty members to secure promotion to the third rank, the rank of Professor, has important implications for morale, retention, and long-term unit productivity.

Discussion and Conclusion

The University’s Strategic Plan and President Barron’s vision of “One Penn State 2025” call for the faculty to respond to the changing pedagogical needs of today’s students and to develop creative approaches to research and scholarship as well. In comments to the Senate during the December 2018 plenary meeting, President Barron gave compelling data and arguments as to the integral role the CWC play in providing students across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania access to an affordable world-class degree. Additionally, the President’s comments noted that the CWC allow for specialization at campuses, put a primary focus on community, and serve a richly diverse student population, which is a mission of the University.

In this light, the disparity between the CWC and UP faculty earning promotion to Professor is striking. One of the reasons offered is that faculty members are not pursuing promotion to Professor. But that may be a surface explanation, masking the deeper possibility that faculty are not pursuing promotion to professor because (a) they believe it is futile or (b) they suspect they will not be permitted to submit a dossier for promotion by their chancellor, associate dean, or director of academic affairs. If faculty members are denied the opportunity to go forward, this has a negative impact on morale and promotes stagnation. Strong mentorship is needed, and pre-reviews must take place by someone in the discipline. As President Barron has affirmed, the CWC have an important and unique mission that is different from that of University Park; therefore, the guidelines and criteria need to reflect the expectations of a CWC associate professor’s scholarly work to meet the mission.
To move forward and improve promotion to the rank of Professor for faculty at CWC, the Senate will need to adopt a shared governance approach. Working together with administration on getting accurate long-term data is necessary to determine trends and aid the Senate to make evidence-based, informed decisions and recommendations.

Importantly, promotion criteria should be appropriate to the actual working conditions of CWC faculty. Faculty members teaching a 3/3 load, with limited opportunities for research, access to graduate students, and scholarly travel cannot reasonably be expected to compile a record of research equal to that of a typical faculty member with a lesser teaching and higher research load. However, setting an appropriate expectation for publishing is challenging. Similarly, given the 3/3 teaching loads, it seems reasonable to place a greater emphasis on CWC faculty’s teaching performance than might be the case for a faculty member at UP. Disparity in rates of promotion suggests that, to date, expectations have not been calibrated to the CWC’s teaching oriented mission. The Senate and administrators will presumably explore ways to set clear and reasonable expectations.

In the coming year, the FA and IRC committees will presumably consider whether Deans and Chancellors should retain the right to nominate associate professors they deem ready for consideration, rather than permitting faculty to apply for promotion when they feel they are ready. Giving administrators the responsibility for screening applicants for promotion to Professor creates unfortunate incentives for chancellors and deans to put only a handful of associate professors up for promotion. While consultation with administrators is vital to preparing candidates for promotion, giving administrators the authority (even with an appeals process) to choose who goes up for the rank of Professor may have unintended consequences in the promotion of CWC faculty.

Lastly, the Senate and administrators may wish to explore methods of improving or expanding opportunities for senior faculty to support faculty aspiring to the rank of Professor. Given their unique role as the gatekeepers to the rank of Professor, the most senior faculty have a crucial role in helping to populate the third rank of faculty with worthy candidates.

With an additional year to explore the promotions gap, the FA and IRC committees have a much clearer understanding of the nature of the problem. The solution is complex and multi-faceted. Moving forward, the FA and IRC committee will work with administrators to propose concrete solutions to provide CWC faculty with the opportunity to secure promotions based on reasonable expectations of performance.
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Background
Penn State has a process to authorize the use of software that has been fully vetted by the Office of General Counsel (OGC), Office of Information Security (OIS), and Risk Management. Prior to October 2015, this process included the University’s Hosted Sensitive Data Addendum (HSDA). This process for having a university-signed agreement is required by university policy for any software that faculty are using, including Courseware. A broad definition of Courseware includes any digital, educational applications or software used by students or educators for a class. Courseware provides online learning tools such as lessons, homework sessions, and quizzes or tests. For Courseware to be used in a class it must be reviewed and authorized by the University to ensure it meets the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), security and accessibility policies.

The HSDA was designed to protect university data and hold the software vendors accountable for any data breaches. As the name suggests, this was designed for a broader range of sensitive data and the requirements for the vendors were pretty stringent. The HSDA was often a non-starter for new vendors to agree with because their software being used within Penn State courses was either free or low-cost. Hence, the vendors were unwilling to meet the stringent requirements of the HSDA. As a result, Purchasing, OGC, OIS, Risk Management and TLT (collectively) agreed we needed a “reasonable and simplified” solution to address FERPA regarding Third-Party Courseware use.

Results
In response to this challenge, a Courseware FERPA Agreement (CFA) was developed to create a set of standards that are not as rigorous as the HSDA and allow for a quicker approval process. This CFA was developed with input from a large set of stakeholders including:

- Penn State Online Coordinating Council (includes faculty)
- Canvas Advisory Group (includes faculty)
- Office of Information Security
- Accessibility Services
- Purchasing
- General Counsel
- Risk
- Teaching and Learning with Technology

Authorized for University-wide Use
All courseware that has gone through the courseware review process and meets University security, privacy, and accessibility policies is authorized for use. If there will be payments by the
University for the Courseware, faculty are responsible for following standard University purchasing policy (https://policy.psu.edu/policies/bs09).

**Resources**
A website was developed to provide faculty easy access to the list of Courseware that is already approved, to learn more about how Courseware gets approved, and a form to request new software titles to be added to their courses. [https://sites.psu.edu/coursewarepsu/](https://sites.psu.edu/coursewarepsu/). The site also includes a list of software titles that have not agreed to the terms of the CFA, allowing faculty to make educated choices about the Courseware that they use within their courses. The list is searchable and gives information on each of the titles.

Questions about this can be directed to: courseware@psu.edu
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MINUTES OF SENATE COUNCIL
Tuesday, February 19, 2019 – 1:30 p.m.
102 Kern Graduate Building


Members absent: J. Plummer, B. Szczygiel


Others absent: R. Jolly

Chair Bérubé called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 19, 2019, in 102 Kern Graduate Building.

The minutes of the January 15, 2019, meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

Chair Bérubé reported that The Faculty Advisory Committee to the President met with President Barron and Provost Jones on Tuesday, February 19, 2019 at 9:00 am. in the Tom Poole Conference Room in 201 Old Main. Topics for Discussion included: graduate student stipends, policy to shorten lengths of contracts for new FT faculty at Behrend, University guidelines and procedures for faculty awards, process for annual review of Senate operations. There were also updates on the following: admissions, searches, Simba, Strategic Plan, Work Lion, Academic Integrity Task Force, and curricular coherence in one Penn State 2025.

Chair Berebe also reported that Academic Trustee, David Han, Professor of Surgery and Radiology, Milton S. Hershey Medical Center and College of Medicine has agreed to provide an update from the Board of Trustees at the March meeting.

Provost Jones reported that the search for the Dean of the College of the Liberal Arts is coming to a close. Searches are currently underway for Deans for the College of Arts & Architecture and College of Education. Other searches underway include the Vice Provost for Global Programs, Vice President for Research and the Vice President of Human Resources. Stage 4 strategic plan grant applications were due yesterday. A fifth stage will be announced which may have larger awards focused on areas ripe for attention.
Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs discussed that she has been working with the office of research on the increasing effort required from faculty in complying with the necessary requirements of Federal grant application, especially in the case of foreign visitors.

Rob Pangborn, Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education discussed the current enrollment numbers. As of February 19, 100,173 undergraduate applications have been received, including 91,586 baccalaureate applications for the incoming summer/fall 2018 class, up by 26,893 or 42% compared to the same date last year. University Park applications are up 36%, and direct applications to the Commonwealth Campuses are up 64%. PA applications are higher by 15%, while out-of-state applications are up by 72% and international applications are up by 19%. Owing to the earlier application date and offers made, as well as the larger volume, paid accepts are up 10% compared to last year, including 2,457 for the Commonwealth Campuses, 3,201 for University Park; and 132 for the World Campus, for a total of 5,790 paid accepts to date.

Madlyn Hanes, Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses and Executive Chancellor, discussed ongoing searches. The search for Chancellor of Brandywine is ongoing. The search for the Chancellor at Schuylkill was successful with the appointment of Patrick Jones. The search for an Associate Vice President and Senior Associate Dean for Academic Programs is ongoing. Dr. Hanes mentioned that she is conducting visits to the campuses.

Marcus Whitehurst, Vice Provost Educational Equity announced that the Board of Trustees Committee on Academic Affairs and Student Life was planning a discussion of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion at the public meeting on Thursday February 21, 2019.

Renata Engel, Vice Provost for Online Education, shared the ways that there is integration of World Campus into the academic infrastructure and how they will be continuing to have the Penn State Reads, book club for the new world campus students to introduce them to each other and faculty and staff before the semester.

ACTION ITEMS
A revision to the Constitution of the Faculty of the University Libraries was presented to Senate Council by subcommittee chair Taylor for review. After receiving feedback from a Council member prior to the meeting, Chair Taylor withdrew the constitution from the agenda.

REPORT OF GRADUATE COUNCIL. John Nousek reported that their was a continued discussion of the issue of new requirements for dissertation committees to meet with every doctoral student at least once a year. Graduate Council will have their next meeting of the academic year on Wednesday, March 13, 2019.

SENATE AGENDA ITEMS FOR MARCH 12, 2019
FORENSIC SESSIONS

The Senate Committees on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid, and Education, “The Future of Academic Advising at Penn State.” The report was placed on the agenda by a Nousek/Ozment motion. Fifteen minutes were allocated for presentation and discussion.

The Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology, “Senate Policy on Open Access.” The report was placed on the agenda by an Eckhardt/Ozment motion. Fifteen minutes were allocated for presentation and discussion.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid. “Revisions to Registration Policies: 34-20 Undergraduate Registration and 34-87 Course Add.” The report was placed on the agenda by a Nousek/Seymour motion.

Senate Committees on Committees and Rules. “Revisions to Bylaws; Article I – Officers, Section 2 & 6” Council had concerns about the proconsul title and broad scope of the new position. The report was placed on the agenda with revisions on an Eckhardt/Ozment motion.

Committee on Committees and Rules. “Revisions to Standing Rules; Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (k)” It was pointed out that the Vice Provost for Online Education could no longer serve on the committee because they were serving on the Education Committee. With that change the report was placed on the agenda by a Nousek/Ozment motion.

ADVISORY CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment, “Response to the Academic Integrity Task Force’s Final Report and Recommendations.” The report was placed on the agenda by a Sinha/Petrilla motion.

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations. “Revision to AC-21. Internal Ranks.” The report was placed on the agenda by a Posey/Ozment motion.

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations. “Revision to AC-21, Contract Length” The report was placed on the agenda by an Eckhardt/Petrilla motion.

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations. “Revision to AC-21, Three Tiers of Promotion” This report was returned to committee for additional work.

Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits. “Clarification of Applicability of Short-Term Disability policies to Faculty.” This report was placed on the agenda by an Ozment/Nousek motion.

Senate Committee on Global Programs. “Supporting International Students and Scholars at Penn State University.” This report was placed on the agenda by a Seymour/Eckhardt motion.
Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity and Graduate Council Committee on Graduate Research. “Barriers to Sustainability and Growth of Intercollege Graduate Degree Programs.” This report was withdrawn from the agenda by committee.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules, entitled “Committee on Committees and Rules Nominating Report for 2019-2020.” This report was placed on the agenda by a Nousek/Ozment motion. Ten minutes were allocated for presentation and discussion.

Senate Council, “Nominating Committee Report for 2019-2020.” was embargoed and not presented at the meeting. It will be available with the Senate agenda. Ten minutes were allocated for presentation and discussion.

Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid. “Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program.” The report was placed on the agenda by a Posey/Ozment motion. The report will be presented on the Senate website only.

Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid. “Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded to Undergraduates.” The report was placed on the agenda by an Eckhardt/Nousek motion. The report will be presented on the Senate website only.

Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment. “Report on Results Will Vary* and Campus Climate Issues.” The report was returned to committee.

Senate Committee on Intra-University Relations. “Promotion to the Rank of Professor?” The report was approved for the agenda by an Ozment/Eckhardt motion. Revisions and clarification were requested. Fifteen minutes were allotted for this report.

Senate committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology. “Courseware FERPA agreement.” Five minutes were allocated for presentation and discussion.

The Agenda for the March 12, 2019 Senate meeting was approved unanimously.

Chair Bérubé thanked Senate Council members and guests for their attendance and participation. The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Dawn G. Blasko, Executive Director
Date: March 5, 2019

To: All Senators and Committee Members

From: Dawn Blasko, Executive Director

Following is the time and location of all Senate meetings March 11 and 12, 2019. Please notify the University Faculty Senate Office and committee chair if you are unable to attend.

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 2019

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

TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 2019

8:00 a.m.
   Intercollegiate Athletics – 102 Burrowes Building

8:30 a.m.
   Committees and Rules – 201 Kern Graduate Building
   Curricular Affairs – 102 Kern Graduate Building
   Educational Equity and Campus Environment – 315 Grange Building
   Faculty Affairs – 202 Hammond Building
   Faculty Benefits – 214 Business Building
   Intra-University Relations – 504 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building
   Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology – 510A Paterno
   Outreach – 114 Kern Building
   Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity – 502 Keller Building
   University Planning – 424 Ag Admin Building
9:00 a.m.
  Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid – 203 Shields Building
  Education – 110C Chandlee Lab
  Global Programs – 412 Boucke Building
  Student Life – 409H Keller Building

11:00 a.m.
  Student Senator Caucus – 114 Kern Building

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

1:30 p.m.
  University Faculty Senate – 112 Kern Graduate Building
Date: March 5, 2019
To: Commonwealth Caucus Senators (includes all elected campus senators)
From: Rosemarie Petrilla and Elizabeth Seymour, Caucus Co-chairs

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 2019 – 8:15 PM
102 KERN BUILDING

Guest Speakers and Agenda:
Gregory Stoner
Senior Director of Compensation and Benefits
Topic: Satisfaction with Caremark CVS and AETNA as our Third Party Providers

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

***********************************************************
TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 2019 – 11:15 AM
ASSEMBLY ROOM, NITTANY LION INN
A buffet luncheon will be provided at 12:15 p.m.

Agenda

I. Call to Order
II. Announcements
III. Candidate Presentations:
   • Chair Elect (five minutes allotted each): William Butler, Elizabeth Seymour, Amit Sharma
   • Secretary (three minutes allotted each): Judy Ozment, Kathleen Phillips
   • FAC (one minute allotted each): Martha Strickland, Alok Sinha, Laurie Breakey, Geoffrey Scott, Bonj Szczygiel, Kathryn Jablokow
IV. Other Items of Concern/New Business
V. Adjournment and Lunch