Meeting rescheduled for Tuesday, March 21, 2017 – 1:30 p.m due to inclement weather conditions.

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 Live at http://live.psu.edu/.

A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Minutes of the January 24, 2017, Meeting in The Senate Record 50:4

B. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report of February 21, 2017 Appendix A

C. REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – Meeting of February 21, 2017

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

Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment

Educational Equity and Faculty Appendix B

[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]
Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits

WorkLion: Development and Implementation Plan  
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Appendix C

Senate Committee on Outreach

Penn State Adult Learners  
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]  
(Additional privileged information available in Box to Senators)

Appendix D

H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules

Revisions to Senate Bylaws Article II Section 1  
(introduced at January 24 meeting)

Appendix E

I. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules

Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article II Section 6(k)  
Committee on Outreach

Appendix F

Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education

Change to Senate Policy 43-00 (Syllabus)

Appendix G

Change to Senate Policy 47-70 Online Student Progress Report  
(Policy number changed to from 43-70 to 47-70 - typographical error)

Appendix H

J. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment

Revision of AD 84 Preferred Name and Gender Identity Policy

Appendix I

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

Proposed Revision to HR21 Recommendation for Standardizing  
Titles for Nontenured Faculty across Units

Appendix J
Senate Committees on Outreach, and Educational Equity and Campus Environment

Office of Educational Equity Middle and High School Pre–College Programs TRIO Upward Bound, Upward Bound Migrant, Upward Bound Math and Science, and Talent Search

K. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Senate Council

Nominating Committee Report for 2017-2018

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules

Nominating Report for 2017-2018

Senate Council

Policy Harmonization
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules

New Member Information*

Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment

CLGBTQE Commission Reads
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Elections Commission

Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2017-2018*

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (SRTE) Evaluations: Effective Use of SRTE Data
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]
Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

Annual Report for 2015-2016* Appendix S

Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology

PSU Libraries Collection Budget Report, 2016* Appendix T

Senate Committee on Outreach

Online Education at Penn State Appendix U
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Senate Council

Report on Fall 2016 Campus Visits Appendix V
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]
(Additional privileged information available in Box to Senators)

University Planning

All Gender Restrooms at The Pennsylvania State University Status Report Appendix W
[5 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

OPP Report: Connecting Operations with Students, Faculty, and Researchers Appendix X
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

* No presentation of reports marked with an asterisk.

L. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, April 25, 2017, 1:30 p.m., Room 112 Kern Graduate Building.

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

DATE: February 22, 2017

TO: James A. Strauss, Chair, University Faculty Senate

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

The Senate Curriculum Report dated February 21, 2017 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 24, 2017.

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 EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

Educational Equity and Faculty

(Forensic)

To expand Senate consideration of the Educational Equity topics raised in the 2017 report to the Senate from the President’s Commission on Racial and Ethnic Diversity, Rob Loeb (Chair of Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment) will ask the following questions:

“Considering that faculty from underrepresented groups have expressed concerns about the presence of bias in SRTE responses against faculty from diverse backgrounds, should the Senate recommend that the SRTE responses for faculty from diverse backgrounds be analyzed for bias?”

“Should the Senate support the University Park Undergraduate Association’s (UPUA) request to change Faculty Senate Policy 43-00 Syllabus in order to include the report bias web site (http://equity.psu.edu/reportbias/statement) as a requirement for all syllabi at the Pennsylvania State University?”

“Should the Senate recommend that colleges sponsor workshops for all faculty to raise awareness of, and how to properly handle, implicit discrimination, stereotype threat, and microaggressions in the classroom?”

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

• Kimberly Blockett
• Julia Bryan, Vice Chair
• Dwight Davis
• Erinn Finke
• Timothy Lawlor
• Robert Loeb, Chair
• John Malchow
• Adam Malek
• Karyn McKinney
• Dara Purvis
• Eileen Trauth
• Marcus Whitehurst
Susan Basso, Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer, and representatives from the WorkLION Task Force will present a report on WorkLION, demonstrating some of its features and asking the following questions:

1) Can you provide insights on how best to manage training in order to transition faculty to the new Workday system?

2) Are there any specific thoughts on communication or tools for faculty that we should adopt for effective change management?

3) What concerns or issues might you have?
Faculty Senate
WorkLion Workday update
March 14, 2017

HR Business Process Transformation: Technology

- **Workday – Human Capital Management/Payroll**
  - Cloud-based technology
  - User-friendly reporting to enable data-driven decisions
  - Management data visibility
  - Supervisory structure and roles-based security
- **Neocase – HR Portal, Inquiry Management, Knowledge base**
  - Self-service HR portal for employees
  - Documentation of inquiries and answers to streamline and improve process for employees
  - Consistent database of information for HR customer service employees
Key Impacts to Faculty & Academic Leadership

- Faculty will use Workday to
  - View, enroll and change benefit elections
  - Change payment elections, such as direct deposit
- Faculty “managers” will have additional responsibilities, such as approving time worked submissions or time off requests
  - Faculty can request exception from this responsibility through delegation, but Performance Management cannot be delegated.
- “One-stop shop” on-boarding for faculty hires
- “Employee Profile” will have details about the faculty’s Academic Appointment
  - Academic leadership will be able to view this data for their area
- Academic units can roll up to create an academic hierarchy view for leadership

Additional Positive Changes

- Workday will allow employees to elect two direct deposits in addition to the Penn State Federal Credit Union deduction as a 3rd option.
- Employees will be able to designate beneficiary information directly into Workday.
- New and existing employees will have the ability to upload dependent verification forms into Workday.
- Workday access is secure & role-based, creating consistency across Penn State.
Key Timeframes

- **January- May**: Testing is key for successful implementation
  - End to End System Testing
  - Payroll Reconciliation Testing
  - User Testing
- **January**: Launched WorkLion Ambassadors for key message distribution
- **April-June**: End user training. Tailored for faculty and student employees prior to summer break
- **June 2017**: Workday and HR Portal implementation
- **Mid-to-late June 2017**: Phase 1 Move in to Shared Services Center
- **Mid-to-late October 2017**: Phase 2 Move in to Shared Services Center

After further testing results in March, the sponsors will evaluate the readiness for a June 2017 WorkLion go-live.

Appendix
Faculty Communication and Training Strategy

- Academics will require special attention and timing, as a large portion of the faculty population will not be present during deployment
- WorkLion’s Communications Plan addresses this through customized pre- and post-deployment activities that engage faculty when they are available
- WorkLion has also created an Academic Toolkit, which will be accessible to WorkLion Ambassadors and Unit Communicators to share with Academics in their area

Academic Toolkit

Academic toolkit, accessible to WorkLion Ambassadors & Unit Communicators, will be updated monthly. They will in turn share the materials with Academic leaders & faculty in their units.

Content customized for academics will include:
- Videos and demos
- Template emails
- Newsletter articles
- Pre-made presentations and talking points
Academic Touchpoints

- WorkLion Faculty Advisory Committee (Monthly)
- Provost’s Faculty Advisory Committee (Monthly)
- Academic Leadership Council (As Needed)
- Planned Broadcast Emails:
  - 90 Days until Go-Live (March)
  - 60 Days until Go-Live (April)
  - 30 Days until Go-Live (May – timed with semester’s end)
  - Go-Live Announcement (June)
  - Back to School Checklist (August)
- Planned Faculty Senate presentations
  - Benefits Committee (March 14)
  - Faculty Senate (March 14)
  - Commonwealth Caucus (April 24)
  - Faculty Senate (September)
- Roadshows (April and May)
  - Attend existing meetings, host new virtual and in-person meetings to demo Workday

Governance

- Representative, decision-making structure
- Advisory groups including Faculty & Campus
- Regular inputs from Blannie Bowen
SENATE COMMITTEE ON OUTREACH

Penn State Adult Learners

(Forensic)

Prepared by Martha Jordan, Senior Director of Adult Learner Advocacy, Outreach and Online Education for the Committee on Outreach

During the Spring of 2005, Penn State’s reorganization created an opportunity for the University to place increased emphasis on the adult learner and their access to degree programs at each of our campuses. The changing demographics supported this as the market share of traditional students was declining in most areas across the Commonwealth. According to the Pennsylvania Department of Education, only 12 percent of the undergraduate student body at Penn State was comprised of adult learners.

Today we are experiencing growth in the numbers of adult learner enrollments, which is now at 21 percent. The increase in the number of military students utilizing their GI benefits; the integration of World Campus courses and programs towards degree completion at our campuses; and the emphasis placed on reviewing policies and procedures to address the needs of this population have all contributed to this increase in enrollments.

The University’s Commission for Adult Learners has supported initiatives that continually improve the experience of this population and increase their recruitment and retention. Creating an office and director of Prior Learning Assessment, a University-wide Financial Literacy Program and, the Course Substitution Request System (CSRS) are just a few of the many accomplishments which had their beginnings during discussions at Commission meetings and are now meeting the needs of the greater population of Penn State’s students.

Penn State’s official definition of an adult learner is a student who meets one or more of the following characteristics:

1. 24 years of age or older; or
2. Is a veteran of the armed services; or an active duty service member; or
3. Is returning to school after four or more years of employment, homemaking, or other activity; or
4. Assumes multiple adult roles such as parent, spouse/partner, and employee.

Questions for the consideration and discussion of the Senate:

1. What are some of the difficulties and barriers that adult learners face in planning to attend and complete a degree at Penn State?
2. How can faculty address the need of flexibility that many of our adult learners experience as they juggle course requirements, employment, and parenting responsibilities?
3. World Campus has created an online course OL3100 “Teaching Adult Learners” to help faculty better understand how adult learners approach learning. What additional resources could be created?

SENATE COMMITTEE ON OUTREACH

Richard Brown
Dennis Calvin
Anne Douds
Jill Eckert
Renata Engel
Terry Harrison
Alex Hristov
Beth King, Vice Chair
Lisa Mangel
John Potochny
Rama Radhakrishna
Elizabeth Seymour, Chair
Jonathan Stephens
Cristina Truica
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Senate Bylaws Article II Section 1

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate

Rationale
Senate Councilors represent their unit(s) in the performance of their duties in Senate Council. Effective representation includes two-way communication between the unit(s) and the Senate Council. The proposed revision would codify the expectation of Senate Councilors to communicate effectively with their unit(s). Effective communication should increase units’ awareness of the actions and activities of Senate Council and improve understanding across this very complex university.

Proposed new wording is in bold.

Section 1

Duties:
(a) It shall ensure that the Senate addresses issues of major concern to the faculty voting units and the faculty as a whole.
(b) It may initiate Senate legislation in the same manner as a standing committee. In addition, it may charge a standing committee of the Senate to investigate matters deemed appropriate by the Council.
(c) It shall provide a mechanism for Council members’ review of all legislative, forensic, advisory/consultative, and informational reports submitted for the Senate Agenda. If Council determines the report is adequately prepared, it will be submitted to the Senate Agenda with the following options:
   1. Place an informational report, mandated or otherwise, on the Senate Agenda for presentation and discussion.
   2. Place an informational report, mandated or otherwise, on the Senate Agenda only for the purposes of dissemination to the Senate and University community.
   Decision on whether an item is to be placed on the Agenda for full Senate discussion is to be based on whether a report is adequately prepared and documented.
(d) It shall advise, upon consultation with appropriate Senate committees, the President and Executive Vice President and Provost of the University on the establishment, reorganization, or discontinuation of organizational units and areas of the University that involve two or more teaching, research, and continuing education functions (whether or not delegation of authority exists). Such advice should be given before official action is taken.
(e) It shall maintain a standing Constitution Subcommittee with authority and responsibility to carry out specific legislative, advisory and consultative functions relative to properly organized faculty organizations. These functions include review of Unit Constitutions, Bylaws and Standing Rules. The subcommittee will consist of two Council members.
appointed by the Senate Chair and the Senate Parliamentarian, and will be chaired by the Senate Secretary.

(f) In coordination with the University administration, it shall represent the Senate in seeking information from officials and agencies external to the University especially those who establish policies and control resources affecting University academic programs. It shall advise the University administration on external government legislation and other external issues that may have impact on the University. It shall advise the Senate on the preparation of statements on such matters. It shall be the Senate advisory body to the University on public and alumni relations, public information, general publications and private fundraising. The Chair shall be the spokesperson for the Council in these matters. The External Matters Subcommittee is a standing subcommittee of Senate Council that will be charged to deal with issues external to the University. The subcommittee will consist of at least five Council members together with appropriate additional elected faculty senators and resource personnel and will be chaired by the Immediate Past Chair of the Senate. A majority of the subcommittee will be councilors with at least two members from locations other than University Park. The members of the External Matters Subcommittee will serve terms of two years, and may complete the second year of the term even in cases where they are no longer a member of Senate Council.

(g) It shall serve as an advisory body to the Senate officers and the Senate as a whole.

(h) In the event that the Chair of the Senate declares existence of a situation of special Senate concern, the Senate Council shall be empowered to act for the Senate in all matters until this authority is terminated by actions of the Senate.

(i) Individual Senate Council members play a critical role in communicating Faculty Senate issues and legislative decisions back to their units of origin. To facilitate these important communications, best practices for Senate Councilors include organizing caucuses with their unit membership, creating regular electronic communications of Senate activities and sending these communications to their Academic Unit Faculty Leaders, Senators and Administrators, and speaking about Faculty Senate activities at unit governance meetings. It is expected that Senate Councilors will embrace their leadership role and actively serve as a communication conduit back to the academic unit they represent.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

- Jonathan Abel
- Mohamad Ansari
- Larry Backer
- Dawn Blasko, Chair
- Mark Casteel
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- William Kelly, Vice Chair
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- Keith Shapiro
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• Matthew Woessner
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article II Section 6(k) Committee on Outreach

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate

Rationale:

The Committee reviewed the membership and duties and proposes changes to each section. In the membership section, the Committee recommends increasing the number of elected faculty senators from seven to nine in order to facilitate work. In the duties section, the Committee concluded that the current description uses outdated terminology and does not adequately describe the current duties of the Committee. Since the current description was written, the purview of the Office of Outreach and Online Education has changed, the structure of Penn State Extension has changed, online education has expanded considerably across the University, and outreach activities have been refocused and reorganized across all Colleges and Campuses.

Proposed Changes to Senate Standing Rules (proposed changes marked)

1. Membership:
   (i) At least nine elected faculty senators
   (ii) One student senator
   (iii) Vice President for Outreach and Vice Provost for Online Education*
   (iv) Director of Cooperative Extension*

2. Selection: By the Committee on Committees and Rules

3. Duties: The Committee on Outreach will recommend policy and advise the University on outreach activities. Outreach is understood as the exchange of information and the creation of meaningful collaborations between the University and its many external audiences.

   Responsibilities for the Outreach committee include: The Committee shall be responsible for identifying University outreach activities, establishing evaluation methodologies 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 distance 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 liaisons will be maintained with the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education, the bodies that are addressing engaged scholarship University Council on Engagement and other bodies as appropriate.

*nonvoting unless Article IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws applies

Clean Version

1. Membership:

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

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 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 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.


*nonvoting unless Article IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws applies

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

- Jonathan Abel
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Change to Senate Policy 43-00 (Syllabus)

(Legislative)

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

Introduction and Rationale
When faculty collaborate and develop a shared understanding of course learning goals and Objectives and communicate these with students, it aligns expectations for student achievement. Common goals and objectives can help to address concerns about course coherence and curricular drift over our large University, and also serve to focus on student learning within a course and across a curriculum. The Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education is therefore recommending that every course syllabus list shared learning goals and objectives.

Listing goals and objectives will help to insure that a course syllabus, wherever the course is taught in the University, communicates to students the faculty member’s expectations for learning. This provides a foundation for learning by clearly articulating the relevance of the material and encourages students to take ownership of their learning. It is important to note that achieving shared learning goals and objectives can be accomplished through different course materials. Faculty members should use their professional judgment to choose materials that will best help students meet the learning goals and objectives in a given course. Finally, formally stating learning goals and objectives is a step that enables course assessment across the University.

RECOMMENDATION:

Please note that the following contains bold text for additions.

ORIGINAL:

43-00 Syllabus
A written (paper or electronic form) syllabus must be distributed to students in each course on or before the first class meeting. In addition to course content and expectations, the syllabus must include contact information for all course instructors, the course examination policy, grade breakdown by assessment type and percentage, required course materials, and the academic integrity policy for the course, information on procedures related to academic adjustments identified by the Student Disability Resources, and information on available Counseling and Psychological Services. Changes to the syllabus shall also be given to the student in written (paper or electronic) form.

Related resources:
- Academic Integrity
- Student Disability Resources
- Counseling and Psychological Services
CHANGE: (note the Undergraduate Education Committee decided to separate and list the requirements; only the learning goals and objectives have been added)
43-00 Syllabus
A written (paper or electronic form) syllabus must be distributed to students in each course on or before the first class meeting. Changes to the syllabus shall also be given to the student in written (paper or electronic) form. In addition to course content and expectations and location of the program, the syllabus must include the following information:

Inherent to course:

- Course examination policy;
- Grade breakdown by assessment type and percentage;
- Required course materials;
- **Course Goals and Objectives.**

**Course Goals** are broad educational benchmarks describing general understanding and knowledge domains in each course.

**Course Objectives** are more specific, should map to broader course goals, and represent unique, focused skill sets with learning outcomes that are assessable.

**Both Goals and Objectives should reflect the most current course description on record.** Each Penn State course should offer similar educational and knowledge domain experiences regardless of campus location and adhere to Senate Policy 42-10, referred to as the 80%/20% course content rule.

- Academic integrity policy for the course;
- Information on procedures related to academic adjustments identified by the Office of Disability Services and information on available Counseling & Psychological Services.

Inherent to instructor:

- Contact information for all course instructors

Related resources:

- Academic Integrity
- Office of Disability Services
- Counseling and Psychological Services

**CLEAN COPY:**
43-00 Syllabus
A written (paper or electronic form) syllabus must be distributed to students in each course on or before the first class meeting. Changes to the syllabus shall also be given to the student in written (paper or electronic) form. In addition to course content and expectations and location of the program, the syllabus must include the following information:
Inherent to course:

- Course examination policy;
- Grade breakdown by assessment type and percentage;
- Required course materials;
- Course Goals and Objectives.

- Course Goals and Objectives.

  Course Goals are broad educational benchmarks describing general understanding and knowledge domains in each course.

  Course Objectives are more specific, should map to broader course goals, and represent unique, focused skill sets with learning outcomes that are assessable.

  Both Goals and Objectives should reflect the most current course description on record. Each Penn State course should offer similar educational and knowledge domain experiences regardless of campus location and adhere to Senate Policy 42-10, referred to as the 80%/20% course content rule.

- Academic integrity policy for the course;
- Information on procedures related to academic adjustments identified by the Office of Disability Services and information on available Counseling & Psychological Services.

Inherent to instructor:

- Contact information for all course instructors

Related resources:

- Academic Integrity
- Office of Disability Services
- Counseling and Psychological Services
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Change to Senate Policy 47-70 Online Student Progress Report
(Policy number changed from 43-70 to 47-70 - typographical error)

(Legislative)

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

Introduction and Rationale

This recommended legislation has come about as a result of the greater functionality of Starfish, which allows instructors to submit early progress reports for all of their students. The Committee believes that we should no longer restrict these reports to the three categories of students defined in the current legislation, but, as a matter of best practices, we believe that instructors should evaluate the performance of all the students in classes numbered 499 and below. This is a mechanism for giving positive feedback, but also a mechanism to give a heads-up to any student in any undergraduate course whose work is in danger of falling below a C.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

ORIGINAL:

47-70 Online Student Progress Report

Between the start of the third week and the end of the sixth week of classes during both fall and spring semesters, each instructor shall evaluate the performance of each 1. non-transfer degree candidates who are enrolled in their first or second semester (summers not included) 2. Degree-seeking provisional students and 3. nondegree regular students who have earned 27 or fewer credits. If any such student has a grade of less than C, the instructor will record that information. The student and his/her adviser will be notified that the performance is unsatisfactory.

CHANGE:

Between the start of the third week and the end of the sixth week of classes during both fall and spring semesters, each instructor shall evaluate the performance of each 1. non-transfer degree candidates who are enrolled in their first or second semester (summers not included) 2. Degree-seeking provisional students and 3. nondegree regular students who have earned 27 or fewer credits. If any such student has a grade of less than C, the instructor will record that information. The student and his/her adviser will be notified that the performance is unsatisfactory.
To help students evaluate and improve their academic performance, instructors should submit early progress reports for all undergraduates in courses numbered 499 and below. Prior to the late-drop deadline in a given semester, instructors should complete online early progress reports, especially noting whether a student is in danger of earning a grade of less than C. Because academic success is a shared effort, it is the expectation that students take appropriate actions as outlined in any early progress report received. Early progress reports are sent via email to students and their assigned academic adviser.

CLEAN COPY:

47-70 Online Student Progress Report

To help students evaluate and improve their academic performance, instructors should submit early progress reports for all undergraduates in courses numbered 499 and below. Prior to the late-drop deadline in a given semester, instructors should complete online early progress reports, especially noting whether a student is in danger of earning a grade of less than C. Because academic success is a shared effort, it is the expectation that students take appropriate actions as outlined in any early progress report received. Early progress reports are sent via email to students and their assigned academic adviser.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

Revision of AD 84 Preferred Name and Gender Identity Policy

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the President

Introduction

The University Policy AD 84 (https://guru.psu.edu/policies/AD84.html) currently considers the preferred name of members of the Penn State Community. Based upon extensive and thorough work by the President’s Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Equity a revision to University Policy AD 84 is proposed to include Gender Identity. The proposed revision has been reviewed by the General Council of the University and following review by the University Faculty Senate the revision will be considered by the President’s Council. The Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment reviewed the changes and supports the proposed revision to University Policy AD 84.

Recommendation

The Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment proposes the following revisions be made to University Policy AD 84.

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

Administrative Policy AD84 PREFERRED NAME AND GENDER IDENTITY POLICY

Policy Steward: Vice President for Administration

Contents:

• Purpose
• Preface
• Policy
• Process
• Further Information

PURPOSE:
This policy provides guidance for the establishment of a preferred name and/or gender identity within the University's information systems.

PREFACE:
Preferred Name: This mechanism is intended for those who have a significant reason for utilizing a preferred name instead of, or in addition to, their legal name, particularly
individuals in the process of gender transition or those who have a safety concern. At this time, Penn State does not have information systems in place which can accommodate all forms of a person’s legal and preferred name; changes must be made manually, on a case by case basis, for each system that can accommodate a preferred name. Name changes based on preference alone cannot be accommodated at this time but may become available as future information systems are designed.

**Preferred Gender:** This mechanism is intended for those who have a reason for utilizing a Gender Identity instead of, or in addition to, their legal Gender, individuals in the process of gender transition or those who have a safety concern.

**POLICY:**

**Preferred Name:** The Pennsylvania State University recognizes the need or preference for members of the University community to refer to themselves by a first name other than their legal first name. As long as the use of this name is not intended for the purposes of avoiding legal obligations or for misrepresentation, the University acknowledges that a “preferred name” can be used where possible in the course of University business and education.

Only the first name may be designated to appear as a preferred name, in systems which can accommodate it. The person’s preferred name may be used in University communications and informational materials except where the use of the legal name is required by University business or legal need. Not all University information systems, databases, and processes may be able to display a preferred name, and many uses require display of the legal name; therefore, individuals who utilize a preferred name within University systems should always be prepared to reference their legal name as well and to provide corresponding identification when necessary.

This policy is not intended to encompass arbitrary or repeated name changes. The University reserves the right to refuse a preferred name. Instances that may result in this prohibition include arbitrary or repeated name changes; the use of profane words; names that may be used for fraudulent purposes; cartoon or other commonly known fictional characters; or other situations deemed inappropriate.

Except as set forth below, the individual is free to determine the preferred name he or she wants to be known by in University information systems. Only the first name may be designated for the preferred name; the last name must remain the same as the full legal last name in the system.

The following list provides examples of appropriate preferred name options at this time:

- A shortened version of the full legal name may be used (for example, Christine to “Chris”).
- Initials may be used (David Craig to “D. C.”; Mary Ann to “M.A.”; Teresa Jeanette to “T.J.”).
- A different first name than the legal first name may be used (David Craig to “Christy”; Christine to “Cory”; Crystal Lynn to “Lynn”).

In the instances where a member of the University community utilizes a preferred name in various University information systems, it should be understood that for University business, it will still be necessary that the legal name be used wherever the legal name is required by University business or legal need. This may be but is not limited to financial, medical, and law enforcement documents, transcripts, diplomas, W-4 forms, I-9 forms, payroll documents, Visa/immigration documents, personnel files, employment applications and related documents, background check documents, and insurance documents, etc.
Gender Identity: The Pennsylvania State University recognizes the need or preference for members of the University community to self-assert a Gender other than their Legal Gender or their Gender at the time of birth (sometimes called “Birth Gender). As long as the use of this Gender assertion is not intended for the purposes of avoiding legal obligations or for misrepresentation, the University acknowledges that a “Gender Identity” can be used where possible in the course of University business and education. The person’s Gender Identity may be used in University communications and informational materials except where the use of the legal Gender is required by University business or legal need. Not all University information systems, databases, and processes may be able to store or display a separate Gender Identity, and there may be uses that require display of the legal Gender; therefore, individuals who utilize a Gender Identity within University systems should always be prepared to reference their legal Gender as well and to provide corresponding identification when necessary.

Except as set forth below, the individual is free to determine the Gender Identity they want to be known by in University information systems. The following list Gender Identity options at this time:

- Man
- Woman
- Other

In the instances where a member of the University community uses a Gender Identity in various University information systems, it should be understood that for University business, it will still be necessary that the legal Gender be used wherever the legal Gender is required by University business or legal need. This may include but is not limited to financial, medical, and law enforcement documents, transcripts, diplomas, W-4 forms, I-9 forms, payroll documents, Visa/immigration documents, personnel files, employment applications and related documents, background check documents, and insurance documents.

PROCESS:
In order to simplify compliance with policies and procedures related to the management of person identity information under Penn State Administrative Policy AD80, Penn State Identity Services (IdS) and the Enterprise Project Management Office (EPMO) coordinated an initiative to establish the Penn State Person Biographical (Bio) Record. The Person Bio Record is a shared set of data elements related to person identity whose definitions are collectively understood and adhered to, created and maintained under shared policies and procedures.

Employees: Information about procedures related to an employee’s Legal Name, Preferred Name, Gender Designation, or related to withholding directory information, is available through the Penn State Person Biographical (Bio) Record website. A preferred name designation is not a legal name change. If an employee’s name has been legally changed, Policy HR66, Change of Legal Name of an Employee, applies.

Members of the Penn State Employee community requesting use of a preferred name for reasons related to gender transition, or those who have a safety concern should contact the Affirmative Action Office, which will provide liaison to relevant information systems offices when needed.
For the purposes of maintaining accurate University records, members of the Penn State community requesting use of a preferred name for reasons related to gender transition or safety concern must work with the appropriate Penn State office which will provide a recommendation to the relevant information system office. Requests will be considered on a limited basis. Contact offices are:

- For students in the process of gender transition, or those who have a safety concern: LGBTA Student Resource Center; Center for Women Students
- For employees in the process of gender transition, or those who have a safety concern: The Affirmative Action Office

The office being asked to provide the recommendation may ask for additional information or documentation. Once the recommendation is completed, the recommending office will contact the relevant information systems offices to implement the change. The preferred name will be added to the University’s Central Person Registry so that the preferred name may be used in additional information systems as they are able to accommodate it.

**Students:** Information about procedures related to a student’s Legal Name, Preferred Name, Gender Designation, or related to withholding directory information, is available through the Penn State Person Biographical (Bio) Record website.

**Members of the Penn State Student community** requesting use of a preferred name for reasons related to gender transition, or those who have a safety concern should contact the LGBTA Student Resource Center or the Center for Women Students, who will provide liaison to the relevant information system offices when needed.

**Alumni:** Alumni Association members may update their personal information through the “Update Your Info” link on the Alumni Association website, by email, or by phone. Detailed information may be found at the Alumni Association website.

Students may use e-Lion to set confidentiality preferences, and use https://www.work.psu.edu to change e-mail alias and name related account settings to reflect the selected preferred name.

The Alumni Association maintains its own database of alumni and Blue & White Society student members. Updates can be made in three ways:

- “Update Your Info” link on the website http://alumni.psu.edu/home-page
- Email alumni-address@psu.edu
- Phone: 800-548-5466

In some cases, students may wish to establish a confidentiality hold on their directory information until the preferred name request is processed. Information about withholding directory information is available at http://www.registrar.psu.edu/confidentiality/directory_information.cfm. Once the preferred name request has been processed, the student should release the confidentiality hold on the directory information, which will allow the preferred name to appear. It is important to note that even when a confidentiality hold is in place, the student’s name will appear in ANGEL rosters in courses in which the student is enrolled; the legal name will appear until the preferred name request is processed, after which time the preferred name will appear.

A preferred name designation is not a legal name change. If a student’s name has been legally changed, see Office of the University Registrar’s policy regarding legal name changes and corrections http://www.registrar.psu.edu/academic_actions/name_change.cfm. Gender designation can also be changed, which requires a government-issued ID card, such as a
driver’s license showing the gender. If an employee’s name has been legally changed, Policy HR66, Change of Legal Name of an Employee, applies.

FURTHER INFORMATION:
For questions, additional detail, or to request changes to this policy, please contact Information Technology Services Office of Identity Services. In addition, students may contact the LGBTA Student Resource Center or the Center for Women Students; faculty or staff may contact the Affirmative Action Center.

Effective Date: January 27, 2014
Date Approved: August 26, 2013
Date Published: January 27, 2014
Revision History (and effective dates):
• January 27, 2014 - New policy.
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Introduction

In January 2017, the University Faculty Senate held a forensic session on a recommendation, drafted by the Committee on Faculty Affairs, to standardize titles for fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty at Penn State. Based on that forensic session, and wide consultation across units, campuses, and caucuses, as well as with Senate Council and the Academic Leadership Council, the Committee on Faculty Affairs revised its original recommendation (Senate Agenda, January 24, 2017, Appendix B) and offers the following Advisory and Consultative report for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

Discussion

The following recommendation attempts to clarify and strengthen the titles of fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty positions without conflating significant differences among primary responsibilities of various types of appointments. In other words, changes in job titles should not entail changes in job description. Fixed-term faculty whose positions involve high teaching loads, for example, should not be expected to develop research agendas simply because their title becomes “teaching professor.”

Every unit must ensure that its criteria for appointments and promotions are clear and appropriately differentiated in order to guard against fixed-term and/or standing non-tenure-line faculty being expected to take on substantive responsibilities typically characteristic of tenure-track faculty. At the same time, titles are not meant to restrict effort. Many fixed-term faculty members pursue a range of teaching, research and/or scholarship, and service activities. Such efforts are encouraged as long as job descriptions are clear and resources are provided.

The committee does not recommend using a single system of titles in colleges (i.e., assistant/associate/ professor, with no “teaching/clinical/research” designations) that employ both tenure-track and non-tenure-line faculty, on the grounds that this will obscure the ratio of tenured to non-tenure-line faculty and allow units to hire more aggressively off the tenure track, thereby eroding the tenure system itself.

The College of Medicine is the sole and salient exception 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.

Since the many units of Penn State University have, over the years, adopted widely varying approaches to titling their fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty, we propose implementing the new shared titling system over two to three years. Gradual implementation will allow the development of fair...
procedures for assessing who among the existing fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty might be eligible for a change in rank and title, how job descriptions and advertising language need to be adjusted throughout the unit, and how to minimize negative impacts on valued colleagues. Gradual implementation will also enable the Faculty Senate to receive and react to feedback about the new program in timely ways. Allowing three years for full implementation risks some erosion of institutional memory over the long period of transition. But such a time frame permits existing fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty to achieve new credentials, if they wish, and enables administrators to introduce the changes smoothly as existing contracts expire.

Recommendation

1. The following system of ranks and titles is recommended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Faculty with Terminal Degree</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty without Terminal Degree</th>
<th>Researchers with Terminal Degree</th>
<th>Researchers without Terminal Degree</th>
<th>Clinical Faculty with Terminal Degree*</th>
<th>Clinical Faculty without Terminal Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Teaching Professor</td>
<td>Lecturer <em>(Add) or Instructor (End Add)</em></td>
<td>Assistant Research Professor</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Assistant Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Clinical Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Teaching Professor</td>
<td>Assistant Teaching Professor</td>
<td>Associate Research Professor</td>
<td>Assistant Research Professor</td>
<td>Associate Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Assistant Clinical Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Professor</td>
<td>Associate Teaching Professor</td>
<td>Research Professor</td>
<td>Associate Research Professor</td>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Associate Clinical Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding terminal-degree faculty (M.D., D.O. and Sc.D. and Ph.D.) appointed within the College of Medicine, whose titles are governed by longstanding College of Medicine policy.

2. Individual colleges will determine qualifying terminal degrees.

3. All current and new hires holding qualifying terminal degrees will, at minimum, hold the assistant teaching/clinical/research titles.
4. All faculty designated as lecturers or instructors can be promoted to the “assistant” professor positions, given appropriate time and demonstrated expertise as set forth in HR21.

5. “Professor of Practice” titles will be maintained.

6. The committee therefore recommends the attached revision to HR21 (see Appendix A for the markup, Appendix B for the clean version). Rank and title share the same designation.
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Purpose:

This policy provides guidance on the qualifications necessary for appointment or promotion to the various academic ranks.

Earned Degrees:

...
In assessing candidates for appointment, tenure, promotion, sabbatical leave, etc., the University will accept only those degrees earned at institutions in the United States that have been accredited by regional higher education accrediting associations (such as Middle States) and professional accrediting associations (such as AASCB in Business) in disciplines in which such accrediting takes place, or foreign degrees that have been earned at institutions recognized by their respective governments. Degrees from qualified institutions (per above) are the only ones that the University will acknowledge for appointment, determination of rank, or subsequent personnel decisions. Misrepresentation of such information by an individual can be cause for denial or termination of employment.

ACADEMIC RANK:

- **Lecturer or Instructor.** A lecturer or instructor should possess at least a master's degree or equivalent, or be an active candidate for an advanced degree, in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization.

- **Senior Lecturer or Senior Instructor.** The senior lecturer or senior instructor should possess at least a master's degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization; must have demonstrated ability as a teacher and adviser; and must have shown evidence of professional growth, scholarship, and mastery of subject matter.

- **Research Assistant.** The research assistant should possess a master's degree or equivalent, or be an active candidate for an advanced degree, in an academic field related to his/her research.

- **Senior Research Assistant.** A senior research assistant should possess a master's degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her research; must have demonstrated ability as a researcher; and must have shown evidence of professional growth and scholarship in his/her discipline.

- **Assistant Librarian.** The assistant librarian should possess a graduate degree in Library or information studies or other appropriate degree; must have demonstrated potential, ability as a librarian; and must have shown promise of growth in research and service.

- **Assistant Professor (or Research Associate).** The assistant professor (or research associate) should possess a doctor's degree or its equivalent in organized research or professional practice; must have demonstrated ability as a teacher or research worker; and must have shown definite evidence of growth in scholarly, artistic, or professional achievement. The research associate rank is limited to a faculty member in an academic unit who devotes a major fraction of time to the personal conduct of research in which individual initiative, creativity and responsibility are required.

- **Associate Librarian.** The associate librarian should possess the same qualifications as the assistant librarian, demonstrate excellence in librarianship, show evidence of an established reputation in research, and have a strong record of service to the University and the profession.

- **Associate Professor (or Senior Research Associate).** The associate professor (or senior research associate) should possess the same qualifications as the assistant professor (or research
associate), but must also give evidence of an established reputation in scholarly, artistic, or professional achievement.

**Librarian.** In addition to the qualifications for associate librarian, the librarian should demonstrate sustained excellence in librarianship, give evidence of creativity in his/her field of specialization (including a continuing capacity for significant contributions in research and creative accomplishments), and show evidence of leadership in the profession. The rank of librarian should be reserved for persons of proven stature in librarianship, research, and service.

**Professor (or Professor of Practice or Senior Scientist).** In addition to the characteristics of the members of the lower ranks, the professor (or senior scientist) should give evidence of a marked capacity for creative work and of leadership in his or her field of specialization. This rank should be reserved for persons of proven stature in teaching and/or research.

A. Ranks for tenure-line faculty.

1. **Assistant Professor.** The assistant professor should possess a terminal degree or its equivalent in organized research or professional practice; must have demonstrated ability as a teacher or research worker; and must have shown definite evidence of growth in scholarly, artistic, or professional achievement.

2. **Associate Professor.** The associate professor should possess the same qualifications as the assistant professor, but must also provide evidence of an established reputation in scholarly, artistic, or professional achievement.

3. **Professor.** The professor should possess the same qualifications as the associate professor, but must also provide evidence of a substantial record of advanced research and/or creative work, and of leadership in his/her field of specialization. This rank should be reserved for persons of proven stature in teaching and/or research.

B. Ranks for non-tenure-line (fixed-term or standing) teaching faculty.

1. **Lecturer or Instructor.** A lecturer or instructor should possess at least a master’s degree or its equivalent, or an active candidate for a terminal degree, in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization.

2. **Assistant Teaching Professor.** The assistant teaching professor should possess a terminal degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization; alternatively, the assistant teaching professor without a terminal degree should possess at least a master’s degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization; must have demonstrated ability as a teacher and adviser; and must have shown evidence of professional growth, scholarship, and/or mastery of subject matter.
3. **Associate Teaching Professor.** The associate teaching professor should possess a terminal degree in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization; must have demonstrated ability as a teacher and adviser; and must have shown evidence of professional growth, scholarship, and/or mastery of subject matter. Alternatively, the associate teaching professor without a terminal degree should possess at least a master’s degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization; must have demonstrated exceptional ability as a teacher and adviser while in the rank of assistant teaching professor and must have shown evidence of professional growth, scholarship, and/or mastery of subject matter at a level of distinction beyond that of the assistant teaching professor.

4. **Teaching Professor.** The teaching professor should possess a terminal degree in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization; must have demonstrated exceptional ability as a teacher and adviser while in the rank of associate teaching professor; and must have shown evidence of professional growth, scholarship, and/or mastery of subject matter at a level of distinction beyond that of the associate teaching professor.

C. **Ranks for non-tenure-line (fixed-term or standing) research faculty.**

1. **Researcher.** The researcher should possess a master’s degree or its equivalent, or an active candidate for a terminal degree, in an academic field related to his/her research.

2. **Assistant Research Professor.** The assistant research professor should possess a terminal degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her research. Alternatively, the assistant research professor without a terminal degree should possess at least a master’s degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization; must have demonstrated ability as a researcher; and must have shown evidence of professional growth and scholarship in his/her discipline.

3. **Associate Research Professor.** An associate research professor should possess a terminal degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her research; must have demonstrated ability as a researcher; and must have shown evidence of professional growth and scholarship in his/her discipline. Alternatively, the associate research professor should possess at least a master’s degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her research; must have demonstrated exceptional ability as a researcher; and must have shown evidence of professional growth and scholarship in his/her discipline at a level of distinction beyond that of the assistant research professor.

4. **Research Professor.** A research professor should possess a terminal degree or
its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her research; must have demonstrated exceptional ability as a researcher; and must have shown evidence of professional growth and scholarship in his/her discipline at a level of distinction beyond that of associate research professor.

D. Ranks for clinical faculty with terminal degrees.
Units that designate faculty as “clinical” should establish, for faculty with terminal degrees, qualifications for each rank that track closely to the qualifications for research and teaching faculty with terminal degrees.

1. Assistant Clinical Professor.
2. Associate Clinical Professor.
3. Clinical Professor.

DI. Ranks for clinical faculty without terminal degrees.
Units that designate faculty as “clinical” should establish, for faculty without terminal degrees, qualifications for each rank that track closely to the qualifications for research and teaching faculty without terminal degrees.

1. Clinical Lecturer.
2. Assistant Clinical Professor.
3. Associate Clinical Professor.

DII. Ranks for Faculty in the University Libraries. Ranks for 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).

1. Assistant Librarian. The assistant librarian should possess a graduate degree in library or information studies or other appropriate degree; must have demonstrated potential and ability as a librarian; and must have shown promise of growth in research and service.
2. Associate Librarian. The associate librarian should possess the same qualifications as the assistant librarian; and should demonstrate excellence in librarianship, show evidence of an established reputation in research, and have a strong record of service to the University and the profession.
3. Librarian. In addition to the qualifications for associate librarian, the librarian should demonstrate sustained excellence in librarianship, give evidence of creativity in his/her field of specialization (including a continuing capacity for significant contributions in research and creative accomplishments), and show evidence of leadership in the profession. The rank of librarian should be reserved for persons of proven stature in librarianship, research, and service.
PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE:

The professor of practice title is limited to those individuals who are non-tenure track faculty who may not have had the traditional academic background that is typical of faculty as they move through the professorial ranks. The title of professor of practice should be reserved for persons who have accumulated a decade or more of high level and leadership experience in the private or public sectors outside the academy that would provide a unique background and wealth of knowledge that is of particular value as it is shared with the University's students and other faculty. Prior to an offer being extended to an individual being considered for the professor of practice title, the appropriate dean or academic administrator shall consult with, and receive approval from, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

The senior scientist title for this rank should include the field of research specialization of the individual as appropriate for the college or intercollege unit.

NOTE: For example, in a college; Senior Scientist--Biology Research; Senior Scientist--Sociology Research; Senior Scientist--Soil Research; etc. In interdisciplinary programs: Senior Scientist--Toxicology Research; Senior Scientist--Materials Research; Senior Scientist--Policy Research; etc.

PROFESSORIAL TITLES FOR RESEARCH FACULTY:

Research faculty who profess are entitled to professorial titles in accordance with HR24 (Professorial Dual Titles for Research Faculty).

The equivalency of rank, indicated above, is followed in granting such titles.

FIXED-TERM RANKS AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES:

Ranks and titles vary among units for faculty in fixed-term positions; most units use the titles of instructor, lecturer, or senior lecturer; some may use the professorial ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor, or assistant librarian, associate librarian, and librarian. Units should have clear rationale of the different ranks and titles they choose to use and their expectations for faculty to achieve these various ranks.

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 and senior lecturer or instructor and senior instructor positions, **lecturer/instructor, assistant/associate/full professor positions** 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, the senior lecturer and senior instructor positions are designed to be promotion opportunities, with a recommended period of at least five years in rank as an instructor or lecturer before consideration for promotion.

2. The promotion from instructor to senior instructor or from lecturer to senior lecturer should be accompanied by a promotion raise, in addition to a merit raise, to be determined and funded by the college.

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

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

4. Reviews for promotion of the full-time fixed-term faculty shall be conducted by Fixed-Term Promotion Review Committees. Fixed-Term 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 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 fixed-term faculty members, at least two members of that unit’s Fixed-Term Review Committee shall be drawn from another unit’s Fixed-Term Review Committee. Only full-time fixed-term 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 faculty, exceptions to this provision may be permitted by the Executive Vice President and Provost at the request of the academic unit.
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PURPOSE:
This policy provides guidance on the qualifications necessary for appointment or promotion to the various academic ranks.

EARNED DEGREES:
In assessing candidates for appointment, tenure, promotion, sabbatical leave, etc., the University will accept only those degrees earned at institutions in the United States that have been accredited by regional higher education accrediting associations (such as Middle States) and professional accrediting associations (such as AASCB in Business) in disciplines in which such accrediting takes place, or foreign degrees that have been earned at institutions recognized by their respective governments. Degrees from qualified institutions (per above) are the only ones that the University will acknowledge for appointment, determination of rank, or subsequent personnel decisions. Misrepresentation of such information by an individual can be cause for denial or termination of employment.
ACADEMIC RANK:

A. Ranks for tenure-line faculty.

1. **Assistant Professor.** The assistant professor should possess a terminal degree or its equivalent in organized research or professional practice; must have demonstrated ability as a teacher or research worker; and must have shown definite evidence of growth in scholarly, artistic, or professional achievement.

2. **Associate Professor.** The associate professor should possess the same qualifications as the assistant professor, but must also provide evidence of an established reputation in scholarly, artistic, or professional achievement.

3. **Professor.** The professor should possess the same qualifications as the associate professor, but must also provide evidence of a substantial record of advanced research and/or creative work, and of leadership in his/her field of specialization. This rank should be reserved for persons of proven stature in teaching and/or research.

B. Ranks for non-tenure-line (fixed-term or standing) teaching faculty.

1. **Lecturer or Instructor.** A lecturer or instructor should possess at least a master’s degree or its equivalent, or an active candidate for a terminal degree, in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization.

2. **Assistant Teaching Professor.** The assistant teaching professor should possess a terminal degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization; alternatively, the assistant teaching professor without a terminal degree should possess at least a master’s degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization; must have demonstrated ability as a teacher and adviser; and must have shown evidence of professional growth, scholarship, and/or mastery of subject matter.

3. **Associate Teaching Professor.** The associate teaching professor should possess a terminal degree in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization; must have demonstrated ability as a teacher and adviser; and must have shown evidence of professional growth, scholarship, and/or mastery of subject matter. Alternatively, the associate teaching professor without a terminal degree should possess at least a master’s degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization; must have demonstrated exceptional ability as a teacher and adviser while in the rank of assistant teaching professor; and must have shown evidence of professional growth, scholarship, and/or mastery of subject matter at a level of distinction beyond that of the assistant teaching professor.
4. **Teaching Professor.** The teaching professor should possess a terminal degree in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization; must have demonstrated exceptional ability as a teacher and adviser while in the rank of associate teaching professor; and must have shown evidence of professional growth, scholarship, and/or mastery of subject matter at a level of distinction beyond that of the associate teaching professor.

C. **Ranks for non-tenure-line (fixed-term or standing) research faculty.**

1. **Researcher.** The researcher should possess a master’s degree or its equivalent, or an active candidate for a terminal degree, in an academic field related to his/her research.

2. **Assistant Research Professor.** The assistant research professor should possess a terminal degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her research. Alternatively, the assistant research professor without a terminal degree should possess at least a master’s degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her teaching specialization; must have demonstrated ability as a researcher; and must have shown evidence of professional growth and scholarship in his/her discipline.

3. **Associate Research Professor.** An associate research professor should possess a terminal degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her research; must have demonstrated ability as a researcher; and must have shown evidence of professional growth and scholarship in his/her discipline. Alternatively, the associate research professor should possess at least a master’s degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her research; must have demonstrated exceptional ability as a researcher; and must have shown evidence of professional growth and scholarship in his/her discipline at a level of distinction beyond that of the assistant research professor.

4. **Research Professor.** A research professor should possess a terminal degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to his/her research; must have demonstrated exceptional ability as a researcher; and must have shown evidence of professional growth and scholarship in his/her discipline at a level of distinction beyond that of associate research professor.

Cl. **Ranks for clinical faculty with terminal degrees.**

Units that designate faculty as “clinical” should establish, for faculty with terminal degrees, qualifications for each rank that track closely to the qualifications for research and teaching faculty with terminal degrees.

1. **Assistant Clinical Professor.**
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2. **Associate Clinical Professor.**

3. **Clinical Professor.**

E. Ranks for non-tenure-line (fixed-term or standing) clinical faculty

Units that designate faculty as “clinical” should establish, for faculty without terminal degrees, qualifications for each rank that track closely to the qualifications for research and teaching faculty without terminal degrees.

1. **Clinical Lecturer.**
2. **Assistant Clinical Professor.**
3. **Associate Clinical Professor.**

F. **Ranks for Faculty in the University Libraries**

(Ranks for 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).)

1. **Assistant Librarian.** The assistant librarian should possess a graduate degree in library or information studies or other appropriate degree; must have demonstrated potential and ability as a librarian; and must have shown promise of growth in research and service.
2. **Associate Librarian.** The associate librarian should possess the same qualifications as the assistant librarian; and should demonstrate excellence in librarianship, show evidence of an established reputation in research, and have a strong record of service to the University and the profession.
3. **Librarian.** In addition to the qualifications for associate librarian, the librarian should demonstrate sustained excellence in librarianship, give evidence of creativity in his/her field of specialization (including a continuing capacity for significant contributions in research and creative accomplishments), and show evidence of leadership in the profession. The rank of librarian should be reserved for persons of proven stature in librarianship, research, and service.

PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE:

The professor of practice title is limited to those individuals who are non-tenure-track faculty who may not have had the traditional academic background that is typical of faculty as they move through the professorial ranks. The title of professor of practice should be reserved for persons who have accumulated a decade or more of high level and leadership experience in the private or public sectors outside the academy that would provide a unique background and wealth of knowledge that is of particular value as it is shared with the University's students and
other faculty. Prior to an offer being extended to an individual being considered for the professor of practice title, the appropriate dean or academic administrator shall consult with, and receive approval from, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

PROFESSORIAL TITLES FOR RESEARCH FACULTY:

Research faculty who profess are entitled to professorial titles in accordance with HR24 (Professorial Dual Titles for Research Faculty).

The equivalency of rank, indicated above, is followed in granting such titles.

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, and for promoting from one rank to the next, 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. All promotions should be accompanied by a promotion raise, in addition to a merit raise, to be determined and funded by the college.

3. The promotion procedure itself should include recommendations by both a campus department faculty committee and the DAA or department/division head, and the approval of the campus chancellor and/or dean of the college.
4. Reviews for promotion of the full-time fixed-term faculty shall be conducted by Fixed-Term Promotion Review Committees. Fixed-Term 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 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 fixed-term faculty members, at least two members of that unit’s Fixed-Term Review Committee shall be drawn from another unit’s Fixed-Term Review Committee. Only full-time fixed-term 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 faculty, exceptions to this provision may be permitted by the Executive Vice President and Provost at the request of the academic unit.
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Executive Summary

Penn State has assisted thousands of low–income and potential first–generation college bound middle and high school students through its TRIO Upward Bound, Upward Bound Math and Science (UBMS), and Talent Search programs. These programs work with socioeconomically distressed school districts throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Penn State began this work in 1968 with one Upward Bound program. Today the University has two Upward Bound programs, one UBMS, and three Talent Search programs in operation, with plans to include two more Upward Bound and two more UBMS programs.

The programs are very successful at helping an economically distressed population of talented students increase academic preparedness, graduate from high school, enroll in postsecondary education, and ultimately complete postsecondary education. “Our Commitment to Impact: Penn State’s Strategic Plan for 2016 through 2020” explicitly connects the work of these TRIO programs to the very essence of our University.

The hallmark of the Upward Bound and UBMS programs is a six–week summer residential component where high school students come to Penn State’s University Park campus for an intensive academic program that immerses them in the college environment and culture. Unfortunately, University housing and food service costs are rising so rapidly that we are having to significantly cut the number of students we are able to serve. Specifically, housing and food service costs for these programs have risen 69 percent since 2014, and funding for these programs has increased by a total of only 8.15 percent since 2005.

We surveyed other Upward Bound and UBMS programs around the country and found several examples of institutions that provide housing and food services at reduced rates for these programs because they serve low–income and first–generation students. It is the confluence of this fact, Penn State’s programs’ success, and the programs’ alignment with Penn State’s strategic goals that lead to this report. This report is provided in the spirit of the Supporting Elements of the University strategic plan statement “organizational processes should be driven by strategy, not vice versa.”
Following review and consideration of this report, the Faculty Senate Committee on Outreach and Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment recommend that Penn State should review its business practices related to housing and food services for its TRIO Upward Bound and UBMS programs to design a cost structure that:

- Is specific to these programs that serve low-income and first-generation students;
- Exemplifies Penn State’s commitment to this population of students and their communities, as reflected in “Our Commitment to Impact: The Penn State Strategic Plan for 2016 to 2020,” by offering housing and food services at a reduced rate for these programs;
- Ensures that future changes to housing and food services organizational processes maintain a commitment to affordability for these programs.

**History, Background, and Report Objectives**

The federal TRIO programs were created as part of Lyndon B. Johnson’s War on Poverty (Council for Opportunity in Education (COE), 2017). The first program, Upward Bound, was authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (COE, 2017). The Higher Education Act of 1965 created Talent Search (COE, 2017). A third program, Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, was added in 1968 (COE, 2017). Very soon thereafter the term TRIO was coined to refer to these programs, credit for originating the term TRIO is difficult to place, but the term has stuck as the accepted label or brand for these programs even though there are currently nine TRIO programs authorized within the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended by the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008. The UBMS Program was authorized in 1990 (COE, 2017).

The programs are designed to address the social, cultural, and structural barriers to educational achievement created by poverty (low-income status) and a student’s status as a potential first-generation college student (Code of Federal Regulations 34 CFR 643.1–643.32, 645.1–645.43). Low-income individual is defined statutorily as “an individual from a family whose taxable income for the preceding year did not exceed 150 percent of an amount equal to the poverty level determined by using criteria of poverty established by the Bureau of the Census” (20 USC Chapter 28, Subchapter IV, Part A Section 107a–11(h) (4)). First-generation college student is likewise defined as “an individual both of whose parents did not complete a baccalaureate degree; or in the case of any individual who regularly resided with and received support from only one parent, an individual whose only such parent did not complete a baccalaureate degree” (20 USC Chapter 28, Subchapter IV, Part A Section 107a–11(h) (3)).

Funding for the programs is awarded through a competitive grant process. Successful applicants receive a five-year award. At the end of each five-year period, all existing programs that wish to continue, along with any prospective new programs compete together for the next round of awards. The process and requirements for awarding these grants is detailed in 34 CFR 643.20–643.24 and 34CFR 645.30–645.35.
For this report, we will focus on the Upward Bound, UBMS, and Talent Search programs. Following the more general discussion of background and purpose of the programs we will provide a detailed discussion of Penn State’s experience and success administering these programs. We have five principle objectives that have informed this report:

1. To increase awareness of Penn State’s long and successful history of partnerships with school districts across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to provide services to low–income and potential first–generation college students in middle and high school.

2. To show the evolution of these efforts through the increasing commitment of Penn State to continue to compete for their existing programs, and new program grants.

3. To provide data summarizing program outcomes.

4. To make clear the direct linkages that exist with “Our Commitment to Impact: Penn State’s Strategic Plan for 2016 through 2020” and the efforts undertaken through these TRIO programs.

5. To raise awareness of the impact that rapidly increasing housing and food service costs are having on Penn State’s TRIO programs’ ability to keep their commitments to the vulnerable populations they serve.

Program Descriptions and Purpose

**Upward Bound** – “The Upward Bound Program provides Federal grants to projects designed to generate in program participants the skills and motivation necessary to complete a program of secondary education and to enter and succeed in a program of postsecondary education” (34 CFR 645.1(a)). Grantees must certify that “at least two–thirds of project participants are both low–income and potential first–generation college students” (34 CFR 645.21(a)(1)). “The remaining third must be low–income, potential first–generation college students, or individuals who have a high risk for academic failure” (34 CFR 645.21(a)(2)).

**Upward Bound Math and Science** – The purpose is identical to Upward Bound with the caveat that the programs are specifically designed to “prepare high school students for postsecondary education programs that lead to careers in the fields of math and science” (34 CFR 645.10(b)). Grantees must certify that at least two–thirds of project participants are both low–income and potential first–generation college students (34 CFR 645.21(b)(1)). “The remaining participants will be either low–income individuals or potential first–generation college students” (34 CFR 645.21(b)(2)).

The signature programming component for both Upward Bound and UBMS programs involves conducting a six–week summer residential program. We bring participating students to Penn State’s University Park campus for intensive academic programming while immersing them into the college environment and culture (see 34 CFR 645.13 and 34 CFR 645.14).

**Talent Search** – “The Talent Search Program provides grants for projects designed to: (a) Identify qualified youth with potential for education at the postsecondary level and encourage
them to complete secondary school and undertake a program of postsecondary education; (b) Publicize the availability of, and facilitate the application for, student financial assistance for persons who seek to pursue postsecondary education; and (c) Encourage persons who have not completed education programs at the secondary or postsecondary level to enter or reenter and complete these programs” (34 CFR 643.1). Grantees must certify that at least two–thirds of participants served are both low–income and potential first–generation college students (34 CFR 643.11(a)).

We apply a service model for Penn State’s Talent Search programs that involves embedding program counselors within the partner school districts. This model allows for much more intensive service delivery over traditional Talent Search programs that typically assign a counselor to multiple schools and employ a drive–in–and–out approach to service delivery.

**Penn State’s Current Programs and Prospective Programs**

Currently, Penn State has three funded Talent Search, two funded Upward Bound, and one funded UBMS programs in operation. Table 1 shows these six programs, the year they began at Penn State, grade levels served, and partner school districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>School District Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upward Bound (UB)</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Mifflin County, Moshannon Valley, Mount Union, Newport, Steelton–Highspire, West Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Bound Math and Science (UBMS)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Harrisburg, Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Search York (TS–YK)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Bound Migrant (UBM)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Hazleton, Lebanon, Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Search McKeesport (TS–MK)</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>McKeesport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Penn State is also currently competing for two additional Upward Bound and two additional UBMS programs. Tables 2 and 3 provide details about these prospective programs. Table 4 shows the number of students funded to serve, annual funding amounts, and maximum per student cost for each of the six currently funded programs.
Table 2. Potential New Penn State Programs Awaiting Grant Competition Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Month/Year Grant Submitted</th>
<th>Grades Served</th>
<th>School District Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upward Bound Altoona</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Altoona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Bound Chambersburg</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>Chambersburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Potential New Penn State Programs Awaiting Grant RFP Submission Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Anticipated Submission Date</th>
<th>Grades Served</th>
<th>School District Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upward Bound Math and Science Hazleton</td>
<td>February or March 2017</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Hazleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Bound Math and Science Western PA</td>
<td>February or March 2017</td>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>Clairton, McKeesport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Current Penn State Programs Annual Funding, Minimum Numbers of Students Funded to Serve, and Cost per Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Min. # of Students Funded Annually</th>
<th>Annual Funding ($)</th>
<th>Maximum Cost per Participant ($), per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upward Bound</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$499,843</td>
<td>$4,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Search Western PA</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>$454,560</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Bound Math and Science</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$310,856</td>
<td>4,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Search York</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Bound Migrant</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$257,500</td>
<td>4,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Search McKeesport</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,196</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,002,759</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data and Performance Outcomes for Penn State’s Currently Funded Programs

Annually, we are required to report to the U.S. Department of Education Penn State’s performance on specific program objectives. The measures include high school GPA, state assessment performance, high school retention and graduation, postsecondary college enrollment and completion. The following data summarizes how the Upward Bound, Upward Bound Migrant, Upward Bound Math and Science, and Talent Search programs performed.

Table 5 provides the percentage of participants served during the reporting period who had a cumulative GPA of 2.5 or better on a four-point scale at the end of the school year over the past three years. This is not applicable for the Talent Search programs.
Table 5. Academic Performance – GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBM</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBMS</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS All 3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 identifies the percentage of seniors served during the project year who achieved at the proficient level on state assessments in reading/language arts and math, but it is not applicable for the Talent Search programs for the past three reporting years.

Table 6. Academic Performance on Standardized Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Approved objective</th>
<th>2013–14 rate</th>
<th>2014–15 rate</th>
<th>2015–16 rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBM</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBMS</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS All 3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 provides the percentage of participants served during the reporting period who continued in school for the next academic year at the next grade level, or who graduated from secondary school. Talent Search McKeeseport is in its first year of operation, and so we do not have reportable outcomes yet. Table 7 details program performance for the past three years.

Table 7. Secondary School Retention and Graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Approved objective</th>
<th>2013–14 rate</th>
<th>2014–15 rate</th>
<th>2015–16 rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBM</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBMS</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS–WP</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS–YK</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS–MK</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 provides the percentage of participants graduating from high school during the program year with a regular secondary school diploma. This objective applies only to Talent Search programs. Talent Search McKeeseport is in its first year of operation so we do not yet have reportable outcomes. Table 8 details program performance for the past three reporting years.
Table 8. Secondary School Graduation: Regular Secondary School Program of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Approved objective</th>
<th>2013–14 rate</th>
<th>2014–15 rate</th>
<th>2015–16 rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TS–WP</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS–YK</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS–MK</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB both &amp; UBMS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 9, we supply the percentage of participants, having graduated from high school during the school year, who completed a rigorous secondary school program of study (colloquially, college–prep curriculum). Talent Search McKeepsport is in its first year of operation so we do not yet have reportable outcomes. Table 9 details program performance for the past three years.

Table 9. Secondary School Graduation: Rigorous Secondary School Program of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Approved objective</th>
<th>2013–14 rate</th>
<th>2014–15 rate</th>
<th>2015–16 rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBM</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBMS</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS–WP</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS–YK</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS–MK</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 identifies the percentage of current and prior participants, having graduated high school during the school year, who enrolled in a program of postsecondary education by the fall term immediately following high school graduation, or who were accepted for deferred enrollment in the next academic semester. Talent Search McKeepsport is in its first year of operation so we do not yet have reportable outcomes. Table 10 details program performance for the past three reporting years.

Table 10. Enrollment in Postsecondary Education by Fall Immediately Following Graduation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Approved objective</th>
<th>2013–14 rate</th>
<th>2014–15 rate</th>
<th>2015–16 rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBM</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBMS</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS–WP</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS–YK</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS–MK</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the final table in this section we present the percentage of participants having enrolled in postsecondary education in the fall immediately following high school graduation who attained either an associate or bachelor’s degree within six years. Upward Bound Migrant was funded in 2012 so we do not yet have a six-year graduation cohort to report. Likewise, this objective for Talent Search was added in the 2011 competition so none of the three Talent Search programs have a six-year graduation cohort to report for this objective. Table 11 details program performance for the past three reporting years.

Table 11. Postsecondary Education Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Approved objective</th>
<th>2013–14 rate</th>
<th>2014–15 rate</th>
<th>2015–16 rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBM</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBMS</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS–WP</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS–YK</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS–MK</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive Data and Case Studies for Upward Bound and UBMS

The performance data just presented, though important, only tells a part of the story. What gives these numbers life, and makes them truly impressive is the context within which they were achieved. In this section we will highlight two of the communities within which our program students live. The struggles our students face growing up in these communities exist in all of the areas served by Penn State’s TRIO programs. We will also spotlight a few students in an effort to tell small portions of their stories, and provide you context and texture to complement the above-presented data.

Penn State’s Upward Bound Programs work in a dozen communities across the state, including Reading, which hosts both Penn State’s Upward Bound Program serving only migrant students and our Upward Bound Math and Science Program. Reading has been a high need community since manufacturing moved out in the 1970s. The recent recession, limited jobs, and failing infrastructure has added to its struggles. In 2011, it was named the poorest city (over 65,000) in the U.S.; and in 2009 and 2014, it had the distinction of being the fifth most dangerous midsized city in the country: [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/27/us/reading–pa–tops–list–poverty–list–census–shows.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/27/us/reading–pa–tops–list–poverty–list–census–shows.html). [http://www.infoplease.com/us/cities/safest–dangerous–cities.html](http://www.infoplease.com/us/cities/safest–dangerous–cities.html). One hundred percent of students in the Reading School District receive free lunch. Just over 55 percent of individuals residing in the city live below 150 percent of the poverty level. More than 36 percent of the population do not have a high school diploma and only 8.4 percent have a bachelor’s degree. In 2014–15, 779 of 17,303 students in the Reading School District were homeless. The average composite SAT score of Reading School District high school students is 810 (for comparison, Penn State’s University Park campus enrollees’ average is 1240–1410); the district spends $3,300 less than the state average per pupil, underfunding each classroom by more than $64,000 annually.
Mount Union, located in neighboring Huntingdon County, is another district included in the Upward Bound family of schools. A high percentage of persons in rural Mount Union (34.3 percent) live in poverty, with income levels below 150 percent of the poverty level. Nearly 65 percent of students qualify for free lunch. Educational attainment in the town of Mount Union is also staggeringly low. While over 85 percent of residents 25 years old in the district have earned a high school diploma, college going and college completion are devastatingly low; 92 percent are without a bachelor’s degree. In the high school, only 44 percent take the SAT, with a composite score of 910 (Penn State students score 1240–1410 at entry). Sadly, only 36 percent of Mount Union high school graduates enroll in college. This district too, spends almost $3,000 less than the state average per pupil. Gangs, opioid abuse, and long–standing hate group activity is also prevalent.

But the news is not totally bad. Across all three Upward Bound Programs, alumni participants are attending and persisting in postsecondary education at a rate much higher than those in their communities. Eighty–four percent entered college immediately following high school graduation, compared to 40 percent of their peers. While most enroll at Penn State (UB – 26.14 percent; UBM – 31.37 percent; UBMS – 10.4 percent), Penn State’s Upward Bound Program students are also attending community colleges in their home towns (RACC, HACC, LCCC, CCP); private schools including Bucknell, Duquesne, American, Georgetown, and Carnegie Mellon; HBCUs (Alabama State, Howard, Clark Atlanta, Neumann, and Lincoln); the Ivies (Cornell and Penn); and schools in California (USC), New Mexico (UNM), Coastal Carolina, the New England Conservatory of Music, and the University of Maine. The average post–secondary graduation rate of UB students (57 percent) is much higher than district, state and national averages. Data from 2011 shows that only 27.9 percent of the 2011 US cohort graduated within 150 percent of normal time from a two–year institution and 39.8 percent of the 2008 cohort graduated within four years at a four–year institution (http://collegecompletion.chronicle.com/). A snapshot of UB students may help better paint the picture of student success.

In numerous foster care placements since birth, Marc R. was adopted at age 12 and moved from Philadelphia to Mount Union (Huntingdon County). He joined UB as a ninth grader in 2005 and attended three summer programs before graduating from Mount Union HS in 2008. He graduated from Penn State in 2012 with a degree in finance and currently works as an education savings specialist supervisor at Vanguard. He serves as a Big Brother and returns regularly to Mount Union to mentor students and assist in UB recruiting.

April S. is a wildlife biologist aide with the Pennsylvania Game Commission, coordinating field work for white–tailed deer research. A 2010 graduate of West Branch (Clearfield County) High School, April earned her associate degree in Wildlife Technology from Penn State DuBois in 2013 then transitioned to University Park, completed a field study abroad in Tanzania, Africa, and graduated with a B.S. in Wildlife and Fisheries Science in 2015. She attended the UB six–week residential program, which convinced her to attend college. She is featured on the Penn State College of Agricultural Sciences website where she credits her Upward Bound experience as an important component in her success. The article can be accessed at the following link: http://ecosystems.psu.edu/majors/wfs/careers/wildlife–biologist–pa–game–commission
Sixty-nine UB Migrant students have graduated from high school since the program’s funding began in 2012. Of that group, 77 percent remain in colleges and institutions across the state and as far away as Puerto Rico. Among them are two UBM women — both daughters of migrant mushroom laborers from Reading, Pennsylvania, — who will graduate from Lehigh University in May in pursuit of medical degrees. Thirty-one percent of UBM students attend Penn State — at University Park, Berks, Hazleton, and Mont Alto campuses. These are but a few of the students who attended postsecondary education against overwhelming odds. A large number go on to attend Penn State. Any investment in summer housing and food service costs for these programs is arguably an investment in Penn State itself.

Additionally, Penn State’s TRIO programs continue to support the engaged scholarship of both graduate and undergraduate students at the University. In any given year, Educational Equity’s pre-college TRIO programs provide up to three graduate assistantships, eight work study positions, ten to fifteen residential staff positions for the summer program, one policy intern from the College of Education, and up to four counseling interns.

**Linkages With Penn State’s Strategic Plan 2016 Through 2020**

As indicated previously in this report, the schools served by Penn State’s TRIO programs are located in communities that have experienced tremendous economic decline. As a result, very large numbers of children in these school districts are living in poverty. The schools themselves struggle with student retention, graduation, and postsecondary placement that is far below more affluent districts within the Commonwealth.

It is this tremendous need that led the University to work toward improving the educational prospects for children through the TRIO programs. Woven into every section of “Our Commitment to Impact: Penn State’s Strategic Plan for 2016 through 2020” is the explicit principle that the work undertaken by these programs is a fundamental part of the very essence of the University.

The University mission statement invokes Penn State’s status as Pennsylvania’s land–grant university and states that “we provide unparalleled access to education and public service to support the citizens of the Commonwealth and beyond.” Penn State’s institutional values include the value of “community,” and explains how “we work together for the betterment of our University, the communities we serve, and the world.” It is easy to place the work of Upward Bound, Upward Bound Math and Science, and Talent Search within the mission and values of Penn State.

Furthermore, as discussed in the strategic plan, the University considers “enabling access to education” as foundational. The University identified *foundations* to underscore what is “integral to everything Penn State does and will be essential to implementing this strategic plan.” You can almost hear the voices of our TRIO students in this excerpt that outlines the “enabling access to education” foundation. “Many factors contribute to the ability to earn a Penn State degree, and we must address them all if we are to increase access, especially for populations that have historically had barriers to entry.”
Another area of the strategic plan that is suggestive of the importance of these programs is the thematic priority of “Transforming Education.” Within this priority the University again invokes its land–grant mission and places it in “a 21st century context.” One of the key components of this thematic priority is to “partner more effectively with pre–college educators.” Penn State’s TRIO programs have been advancing this priority for forty-eight years and as the above data attest, we have achieved considerable success. Unfortunately, the rapid rate with which housing and food service costs are rising is creating difficulty for our Upward Bound and Upward Bound Math and Science programs, threatening this success and sustainability. Additional, detailed information is provided in the next section.

Impact of Rapidly Rising Housing and Food Service Costs on Upward Bound, Upward Bound Migrant, and Upward Bound Math and Science Programs

The room and board costs associated with Penn State’s Upward Bound and Upward Bound Migrant programs’ six-week summer program have increased over 69 percent since 2014. This is of particular concern given that funding for both of these grants has only increased by 8.15 percent in total from 2005 to 2017. As a consequence of this disparity, we have had to reduce significantly the number of students who participate in the summer experience at Penn State. In the last three years, the total number of students participating in the summer experience decreased over 21 percent. Table 12 details these figures for 2014 through 2017.

Table 12. Housing and Food Service Costs on Upward Bound, Upward Bound Migrant, and Upward Bound Math and Science Programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room &amp; Board Cost/Student</td>
<td>$1,413.11</td>
<td>$1,840.03</td>
<td>$2,019.70</td>
<td>$2,377.19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Students Served</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>–21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Paid to Penn State Conference Services</td>
<td>$113,048.80</td>
<td>$132,482.16</td>
<td>$127,241.10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$372,772.06</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Penn State’s UBMS program is experiencing similar challenges with these rising costs. The base grant has seen only a 4.65 percent increase in total funding from 2005 to 2017. We have had to cut the number of students who are able to participate in the summer experience from forty-seven in 2014 to thirty-six in 2016.
As we took time to explore options for addressing the issue of these rising costs, we surveyed some of our peers at other institutions to see how this situation is being addressed in other programs. Here are some of the ways other institutions are addressing this issue:

- Indiana University – Housing offered at a 33 percent discounted rate to TRIO programs. Full cost of meals charged for meals actually eaten. The University provides the funds for the discount.
- West Virginia University – TRIO programs receive a 29 percent discounted rate for housing and food services.
- North Carolina A&T State University – Housing offered at a flat rate for the duration of the five–year grant cycle for TRIO programs. Currently represents a 54 percent discount from the regular rates. Full cost of meals charged.
- Kennesaw State University – TRIO programs receive a 28 percent discount on housing and a 33 percent discount on food.
- University of Akron – TRIO programs receive a 64 percent discount on room charges and a $1.50 discount per day per student for food.
- Wichita State University – TRIO programs receive a 54 percent discount on room charges and pay the full cost for meals.

This list, though not comprehensive, provides some idea of the manner in which other universities are supporting the work of their TRIO programs. We will continue to reach out to other institutions for information.

**Recommendation**

The Faculty Senate Committee on Outreach and Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment recommend that Penn State should review its business practices related to housing and food services for its TRIO Upward Bound and UBMS programs to design a cost structure that:

- Is specific to these programs that serve low–income and first-generation students;
- Exemplifies Penn States commitment to this population of students and their communities, as reflected in “Our Commitment to Impact: The Penn State Strategic Plan for 2016 to 2020,” by offering housing and food services at a reduced rate for these programs; and
- Ensures that future changes to housing and food services organizational processes maintain a commitment to affordability for these programs.
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SENATE COUNCIL

Nominating Committee Report for 2017-2018

(Informational)

The Nominating Committee consisting of the elected representatives of Senate Council was convened on January 10, 2017. Additional nominations may be made from the floor of the Senate on March 14, 2017.

CHAIR-ELECT OF THE SENATE

• Asad Azemi, Associate professor of Engineering, Penn State Brandywine,
• Michael Bérubé, Edwin Erle Sparks Professor of Literature and Director of the Institute for the Arts and Humanities, College of the Liberal Arts
• John Nousek, Professor of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Eberly College of Science
• Elizabeth Seymour, Instructor of Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, Penn State Altoona

SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(One to be elected to one-year term)

• Roger A. Egolf, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Penn State Lehigh Valley
• Nicholas Rowland, Associate Professor of Sociology and Environmental Studies
• Keith D. Shapiro, Associate Professor of Art, College of Arts and Architecture
• Ann H. Taylor, Director of the John A. Dutton e-Education Institute, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PRESIDENT

(One to be elected, term expires 2020)

• Galen Grimes, Associate professor of Information Science, Penn State Greater Allegheny
• Rosemary J. Jolly, Weiss Chair in the Humanities, Professor of Comparative Literature, English, Bioethics, African Studies, and Women’s Studies, College of the Liberal Arts
• Robert Loeb, Professor of Biology and Forestry, Penn State Dubois
• Mark Patzkowsky, Professor of Geosciences, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences
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• Robert Shannon
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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 14, 2017.

**Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities**

**University Park** *Elect four* (one member; three alternates)
- Jennifer Boittin, Associate Professor of French, Francophone Studies, and History, College of the Liberal Arts
- Chris Marone, Associate Director, Institute for Natural Gas Research, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences
- Keith Shapiro, Associate Professor of Art, College of Arts and Architecture

**Locations other than University Park** *Elect one* (one member)
- Gina Brelsford, Associate Professor of Psychology, Penn State Harrisburg
- Rebecca C. Craven, Professor of Microbiology and Immunology, College of Medicine
- Michael Doncheski, Director of Academic Affairs, Penn State Mont Alto
- Barbara Miller, Professor of Pediatrics, College of Medicine

**Deans/Chancellors** *Elect two* (one member; one alternate)
- David W. Chown, Chancellor, Penn State York
- Marie Hardin, Dean, College of Communications
- R. Keith Hillkirk, Chancellor, Penn State Berks

**Standing Joint Committee on Tenure** *Elect two* (one member; one alternate)
- Eric Hayot, Distinguished Professor of Comparative Literature and Asian Studies, College of the Liberal Arts
- Robert Loeb, Professor of Biology and Forestry, Penn State Dubois
- Linda Patterson-Miller, Professor of English, Penn State Abington
- Pamela Silver, Professor of Biology, Penn State Erie

**University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee** *Elect four.*
- Daniel Purdy, Professor of German, College of the Liberal Arts
- Mark J. Roberts, Professor of Economics, College of the Liberal Arts
- Steinn Sigurdsson, Professor of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Eberly College of Science
- Mark Widome, Distinguished Professor of Pediatrics, College of Medicine

---
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Susan Basso, Vice President for Human Resources, will give a slide presentation describing the objective and process for reorganizing and consolidating certain types of university policies.
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Faculty Senate
Policy Harmonization
March 14, 2017

HR Business Process Transformation: Policy and Process

Currently 104 policies / 18 guidelines

• Update policies to provide greater clarity, ensure legal compliance, and improve accessibility
  o Recommend new policies
  o Recommend enhancements to policies
  o Reclassify some Human Resources policies to academic policies

• Redesign end-to-end processes to prepare for Workday

• Design processes for consistent implementation
From HR Policy to Academic Policy

• Policy Steward is Office of Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
  o Bringing policy in alignment with practice.
  o Not proposing changes to academic policy
  o HR will continue to assist in the administration of academic policies

• Examples of Academic Policies
  o HR10 – Distinguished Professorships
  o HR21 – Definition of Academic Ranks
  o HR23 – Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations
  o HR64 – Academic Freedom
  o HR76 – Faculty Rights and Responsibilities
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

New Member Information

(Informational)

This document provides an overview of the purpose, duties, and membership of the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules.

Purpose

The Senate Committee on Committees and Rules (CC&R) facilitates the Senate’s work by monitoring the Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Standing Rules, proposes revisions to these documents when needed to maintain consistency with the University’s structure (e.g., academic units, personnel titles) or to facilitate the Senate’s work, appoints senators to Senate committees, and makes some nominations, as described below.

Duties [modified from http://senate.psu.edu/senators/standing-committees/committees-and-rules/]

CC&R:
- reviews and makes recommendations on the Senate’s committee structure (e.g., creating new committees or subcommittees, merging existing committees, or abolishing existing committees);
- proposes changes in the Constitution, Bylaws, and Standing Rules of the University Faculty Senate for action by the Senate;
- serves as a Nominating Committee to the administrative officers of the University in the selection of University faculty to serve on University-wide committees; e.g.,
- investigates the constitutionality of acts of the Senate, failures to implement Senate legislation, problems resulting from conflicting legislation, and errors in the implementation of legislation;
- interprets the Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Standing Rules subject to review by the Senate;
- selects a pool of faculty members who will be available to serve as members of all Division I Intercollegiate Head Coach athletics searches (each spring);
- asks new and returning senators to rank their preferences for committee assignments and appoints the members of all Senate Standing Committees, taking mandated unit representation, senators’ preferences, and the balance of committee membership into account, and consults with administrative officers to select ex officio members of Senate committees;
- elects its own Chair and Vice Chair, and in consultation with the Senate Chair, designates the leadership of all other Standing Committees of the Senate;
- consults with the Senate officers about faculty governance issues raised in the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC);
nominates candidates for Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee, and the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities;
renders decisions in tie votes for retired senators.

Membership

- Ten (10) elected faculty senators
- Chair-Elect of the Senate (non-voting)
- Immediate Past Chair of the Senate (non-voting)
- Secretary of the Senate (non-voting)

Membership Responsibilities

Members of the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules are expected to:

- Serve for a two-year term (and a maximum of four years);
- Be familiar with the Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Standing Rules;
- Contribute to written committee reports

Annual Subcommittee

- Elections Commission (to certify elections and interpret the Bylaws when needed)

Committee Meetings

- CC&R typically meets at 8:30 am on Senate Tuesdays in Kern Building. There is a meeting of the new and continuing members one week after the last Senate meeting of the academic year, and a meeting in May to appoint senators to Senate committees for the following academic year. Additional business is conducted electronically between meetings.

Mandated Report

- Nomination Report (annually)

Resources Routinely Referenced by CC&R

- Senate Constitution http://senate.psu.edu/senators/senate-constitution/
- Senate Bylaws http://senate.psu.edu/senators/bylaws/
- Senate Standing Rules http://senate.psu.edu/senators/standing-rules/
- GURU for Penn State policies https://guru.psu.edu/
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Introduction

In the 2016–17 academic year, the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Equity (CLGBTQE) created “Commission Reads,” patterned on the Penn State Reads program. Just as Penn State Reads offers new students a shared text with which to engage, Commission Reads provides an opportunity to engage commission members and the larger LGBTQ community at Penn State with queer historical, intellectual, academic, and literary narratives.

Program Description

The Commission’s Curriculum Integration Committee (CIC) selected a book pairing two plays by Larry Kramer, *The Normal Heart* and *The Destiny of Me*. As summarized by the CIC:

*The Normal Heart* is a semi-autobiographical story of a writer who cares for his partner as he dies of an unnamed and misunderstood disease in the early 1980s. Themes of injustice, civil rights, love, family, homophobia, resistance, and resiliency permeate the play and resound with current-day audiences, who must still reckon with the ethical, political, and social implications of the virus.

Copies of the book were provided to all Commission members during the Commission’s orientation at the beginning of the academic year, and the Commission publicized a series of Commission Reads events in order to encourage other faculty, staff, students, and community members to read the plays, attend events, and participate in community-wide discussion of the plays and their themes. Although multiple groups on campus organize around LGBTQ identities, the goal of the Commission Reads program is to supplement existing communities in two ways. First, by providing a single themed piece of literature around which events and discussion center, members of the Penn State community from different departments and campuses share in discussion of a single shared experience. Second, the series of discussions and events around an LGBTQ theme provides multiple entry points for members of the broader Penn State community to engage with issues that they may not face in their daily lives.

A series of events were planned throughout the academic year to offer multiple perspectives on the plays as well as grapple with broader questions relating to the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Those events include:
From GRID (Gay-Related Immune Deficiency) to AIDS: The Emergence of HIV in the 1980s
October 3–December 16, 2016
University Libraries presented a display in conjunction with CLGBTQE’s 2016 Commission
Read, The Normal Heart/The Destiny of Me. The exhibit displayed books and other objects
related to the emergence of HIV and AIDS in the United States in the early 1980s.

Book Discussion: The Normal Heart/The Destiny of Me
October 4, 2016
Book discussion with Christopher Castiglia, Liberal Arts research professor of English and
women’s, gender, and sexuality studies; Kirsten Burkhart, executive director, AIDS Resource;
and Christopher Reed, professor of English and visual culture.

An Evening with Larry Kramer
October 13, 2016
Larry Kramer is a Pulitzer Prize-winning American playwright and author who became a
political and gay rights activist when HIV/AIDS began to spread in the early 1980s. Thirty-five
years ago he co-founded Gay Men’s Health Crisis (GMHC) in New York City to raise funds and
awareness for people at risk for acquiring the disease. Kramer wrote the semi-autobiographical
script The Normal Heart, which debuted off-Broadway in 1985. HBO released a film version in
2014.

Day With(out) Art/World AIDS Day
December 1, 2016
In 1989, Visual AIDS organized the first Day Without Art to coincide with World AIDS Day. A
Visual AIDS committee of art workers (curators, writers, and art professionals) sent out a call for
“mourning and action in response to the AIDS crisis” that would celebrate the lives and
achievements of lost colleagues and friends; encourage caring for all people with AIDS; educate
diverse publics about HIV infection; and find a cure. The Palmer Museum of Art shrouded its
iconic Paws on December 1, 2016, to remember those who died of AIDS and recognize the
profound impact of their loss.

Film Screening: The Normal Heart
January 26, 2017
An introductory lecture on the HIV/AIDS epidemic and legal regulation of HIV/AIDS was
delivered by Dara Purvis, assistant professor of law, with Shushan Sadjadi and Brett Atanasio,
members of OutLaw.

Paper Views Gallery Talk: “From Realism to Magic: Looking Queerly”
April 28, 2017
Selection curated by Anthony D’Augelli, professor of human development and family studies.

Program Outcomes
The Commission Reads flagship event, An Evening with Larry Kramer, drew over 150 attendees
to hear Kramer discuss his work and life. The event was co-sponsored by the LGBTQA Student
Resource Center, the Department of English, and the Department of Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. The October book discussion had approximately fifteen participants in addition to the discussion leaders. The University Libraries display and *Day Without Art* were longer-term public displays so do not have clear attendance estimates.

Audience engagement and participation at events has been enthusiastic and well-informed by the plays, indicating that substantial numbers of attendees read the Commission Reads selection before attendance. The Commission is planning to make the Commission Reads program an annual event.
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ELECTIONS COMMISSION

Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2017-2018

(Informational)

PENN STATE ABINGTON
SENATORS (5)

Term Expires 2018
Levinthal, Bonnie
McMillan, G. Steven

Term Expires 2019
Ozment, Judith
Golden, Lonnie

Term Expires 2021
Love, Yvonne

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
SENATORS (9)

Term Expires 2018
Hristov, Alex
Shannon, Robert D.
Webster, Nicole S.

Term Expires 2019
Abdalla, Charles W.
Brennan, Mark A.
McDill, Marc E.

Term Expires 2020
Elias, Ryan J.

Term Expires 2021
Glenna, Leland
Perkins, Daniel

PENN STATE ALTOONA
SENATORS (6)

Term Expires 2018
Mahan, Carolyn G.
Term Expires 2019
Hayford, Harold S.
Seymour, Elizabeth M.
Singer, Richard

Term Expires 2020
Brunsden, Victor W.

Term Expires 2021
Rowland, Nicholas

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE
SENATORS (7)

Term Expires 2018
Kelly, William J.
Schulz, Andrew
Szczygiel, Bonj

Term Expires 2019
Kenyon, William C.
Shapiro, Keith D.

Term Expires 2021
Clements, Ann
Kalisperis, Loukas

PENN STATE BERKS
SENATORS (5)

Term Expires 2019
Snyder, Stephen J.

Term Expires 2020
Ansari, Mohamad A.
Aynardi, Martha W.

Term Expires 2021
Bartolacci, Michael
Zambanini, Robert
SMEAL COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
SENATORS (5)

Term Expires 2018
Harrison, Terry P.
Posey, Lisa L.

Term Expires 2020
Guay, Terrence
Preciado, Felisa

Term Expires 2021
Knight, Shaun

COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATIONS
SENATORS (3)

Term Expires 2019
Connolly-Ahern, Colleen

Term Expires 2020
DiStaso, Marcia W.

Term Expires 2021
Shea, Maura

COLLEGE OF EARTH AND MINERAL SCIENCES
SENATORS (7)

Term Expires 2018
Patzkowsky, Mark E.
Radovic, Ljubisa R.
Smithwick, Erica

Term Expires 2019
Forest, Christopher
King, Elizabeth F.
Taylor, Ann H.

Term Expires 2021
King, Brian
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
SENATORS (6)

Term Expires 2018
Myers, Jamie M.
Passmore, David L.

Term Expires 2019
Duschl, Richard A.
Plummer, Julia D.

Term Expires 2020
Bryan, Julia

Term Expires 2021
Reid-Walsh, Jacqueline

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
SENATORS (14)

Term Expires 2018
Messner, John
Regan, John
Rothrock, Ling
Sinha, Alok
Wolfe, Douglas E.

Term Expires 2019
Giebink, Noel Christopher
Hodgdon, Kathleen K.
Horn, Mark
Lang, Teresa

Term Expires 2020
Cusumano, Joseph
Melton, Robert G.
Suliman, Samia

Term Expires 2021
Pauley, Laura
Eden, Timothy
PENN STATE ERIE, THE BEHREND COLLEGE
SENATORS (8)

Term Expires 2018
Mangel, Lisa A.
Nelatury, Sudarshan R.

Term Expires 2019
Barney, Paul E., Jr.
Lobaugh, Michael J.

Term Expires 2020
Blakney, Terry
Troester, Rodney L.

Term Expires 2021
Kahl, David
Noce, Kathy

PENN STATE GREAT VALLEY
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2020
Jablokow, Kathryn W.

Term Expires 2021
DeFranco, Joanna

PENN STATE HARRISBURG
SENATORS (7)

Term Expires 2018
Brown, Richard
Subramanian, Rajarajan

Term Expires 2019
Sliko, Jennifer L.
Wilson, Matthew T.

Term Expires 2020
Douds, Anne

Term Expires 2021
Strickland, Martha
Thompson, Paul
COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
SENATORS (8)

Term Expires 2018
Shurgalla, Richard N.

Term Expires 2019
Eggebeen, David
Finke, Erinn H.
Koch, Patricia B.
Sharma, Amit

Term Expires 2020
Duffey, Michele L.

Term Expires 2021
Stifter, Cynthia
Stine, Michele

COLLEGE OF INFORMATION SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGY
SENATORS (3)

Term Expires 2018
Friedenberg, Marc A.
Trauth, Eileen

Term Expires 2020
Glantz, Edward J.

SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
SENATORS (1)

Term Expires 2018
Jett, Dennis C.

DICKINSON LAW
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2019
Welsh, Nancy A.

Term Expires 2020
Butler, William E.
PENN STATE LAW
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2019
Scott, Geoffrey

Term Expires 2021
Farmer, Susan Beth

COLLEGE OF THE LIBERAL ARTS
SENATORS (20)

Term Expires 2018
Eckhardt, Caroline D.
Jolly, Rosemary J
Pearson, Nicholas
Safran, Janina M.
Thomas, Darryl

Term Expires 2019
Baumer, Eric
Beaver, Daniel C.
Linn, Suzanna
Makoni, Sinfree B
Wagner, Johanna

Term Expires 2020
Abel, Jonathan
Bérubé, Michael
Casper, Gretchen
Furfaro, Joyce A.
Miles, Mary C.

Term Expires 2021
Brady, Christian
Decker, Alicia
Dietz, Amy
Young, Cynthia
Zorn, Christopher
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
SENATORS (3)

Term Expires 2018
Harwell, Kevin

Term Expires 2020
Hughes, Janet A.

Term Expires 2021
Novotny, Eric

MILITARY SCIENCES
SENATORS (1)

Term Expires 2018
Young, Richard S.

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE
SENATORS (30)

Term Expires 2018
Davis, Dwight
Eckert, Jill
Han, David C.
High, Kane M.
Meyers, Craig M.
Neves, Rogerio I.
Potochny, John D.
Vrana, Kent E.
Walker, Eric A.
Yun, Jong

Term Expires 2019
Berg, Arthur
Bruno, Michael A.
Cockroft, Kevin M.
Enama, Joseph L.
Levine, Martha P.
Palmer, Timothy W.
Song, Jim
Wennner, William J., Jr.
Cios, Theodore

Term Expires 2020
Kaag, Matthew
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Lopez, Hector
Robertson, Gavin
Ruggiero, Francesca
Silveyra, Patricia
Truica, Cristina

Term Expires 2021
Saunders, Brian
Ropson, Ira
Specht, Charles
Wang, Ming
Stephens, Mark

COLLEGE OF NURSING
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2018
Kitko, Lisa

Term Expires 2021
Snyder, Melissa

EBERLY COLLEGE OF SCIENCE
SENATORS (13)

Term Expires 2018
Funk, Raymond
Krasilnikov, Andrey
Sigurdsson, Steinn
Strauss, James A.

Term Expires 2019
LaJeunesse, Todd C
Mazzucato, Anna
Nelson, Kimberlyn
Nousek, John A.
Williams, Mary Beth

Term Expires 2020
Banyaga, Augustin

Term Expires 2021
Keiler, Kenneth
Larson, Daniel
Robinett, Richard
RETIRED FACULTY SENATORS
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2018
Jurs, Peter C.

Term Expires 2020
Clark, Mary Beth

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE SENATORS
SENATORS (30)

BEAVER (2)
Term Expires 2018
Mookerjee, Rajen

Term Expires 2020
Pierce, Mari Beth

BRANDYWINE (3)
Term Expires 2018
Azemi, Asad

Term Expires 2019
Lawlor, Timothy M.

Term Expires 2021
Gallagher, Julie

DUBOIS (2)
Term Expires 2019
Hufnagel, Pamela P.

Term Expires 2021
Breakey, Laurie

FAYETTE (2)
Term Expires 2019
Eberle, Peter M.

Term Expires 2020
Conti, Delia B.
GREATER ALLEGHENY (2)
Term Expires 2020
Grimes, Galen A.

Term Expires 2021
Signorella, Margaret

HAZLETON (2)
Term Expires 2018
Marko, Frantisek

Term Expires 2019
Petrilla, Rosemarie

LEHIGH VALLEY (2)
Term Expires 2018
Krajsa, Michael J.

Term Expires 2020
Egolf, Roger A.

MONT ALTO (3)
Term Expires 2018
Dendle, Peter J.

Term Expires 2019
Borromeo, Renee L.

Term Expires 2020
Linehan, Peter

NEW KENSINGTON (2)
Term Expires 2018
Kalavar, Jyotsna M.

Term Expires 2019
Bridges, K. Robert

SCHUYLKILL (2)
Term Expires 2019
Andelin, Steven L.

Term Expires 2020
Aurand, Harold W.
SHENANGO (2)
*Term Expires 2020*
Brown, Claudia M.

*Term Expires 2021*
Saltz, Ira

WILKES-BARRE (2)
*Term Expires 2018*
Ofosu, Willie K.

*Term Expires 2020*
Chen, Wei-Fan

WORTHINGTON SCRANTON (2)
*Term Expires 2019*
Bishop-Pierce, Renee

*Term Expires 2020*
Aebli, Fred J.

YORK (2)
*Term Expires 2018*
Casteel, Mark A.

*Term Expires 2019*
Sutton, Jane S.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (SRTE) Evaluations:
Effective Use of SRTE Data

(Informational)

Introduction

Senate Chair James Strauss asked the Faculty Affairs Committee to sponsor a report from Senator Angela Linse on the Student Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness (SRTE). This report focuses on using student ratings data in the faculty evaluation process and is based on Senator Linse’s original work (Linse, in press), with additions specific to Penn State and the SRTEs.

The purpose of this report is to provide guidance about some of the most common misuses of student ratings data in the faculty evaluation process, and to set forth guidelines for best practices in the use and evaluation of SRTEs. The report includes a brief overview of student ratings, including a description of what student ratings are and are not (or, in other words, what they do and do not do). The most important sections are the two sets of guidelines developed for two distinct target audiences responsible for faculty evaluation—faculty serving on review committees and academic administrators. The two sets of numbered guidelines are written so that they may be distributed separately.

Faculty have a host of reasonable concerns about student ratings. Most of these concerns have been the subject of more than 80 years of research, which has been published in a vast body of peer-reviewed literature. This research generally refutes common misperceptions, but the literature is not widely known or readily accessed by faculty or administrators.

Faculty in evaluative roles are rarely, if ever, provided guidance on interpreting other faculty members’ student ratings even though faculty regularly rotate onto review committees and move into new administrative roles. Without research-based guidance, these faculty end up relying on their own experiences, biases, and possibly erroneous information to the evaluation process. New administrators will eventually see a wide range of student ratings and typically develop a broader understanding of the variability across courses and individuals. However, faculty on review committees may only see the ratings for a few faculty per year, which could encourage over-interpretation of the results.

Overview

Student ratings instruments have been around since the 1920s (Marsh, 1987; Remmers, 1933; Remmers & Brandenburg, 1927). The term “student ratings” refers to surveys directly administered by colleges and universities to enrolled students under controlled circumstances, typically near the end of an academic term. Other common names for these surveys include student evaluations of teaching (SETs), student ratings of instruction (SRIs), teaching evaluations, and course evaluations.
Student ratings are nearly ubiquitous in U.S. higher education and the practice has become more common in other countries in the past few decades (Berk, 2005; Seldin, 1999; Miller & Seldin, 2014). Student ratings serve as a source of feedback for instructional improvement, but they are also widely used in personnel decisions such as annual reviews, merit raises, promotion and tenure, post-tenure review, and for hiring and re-appointment of “tenure exempt” faculty.

Penn State’s Faculty Senate created the Student Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness (SRTE) instrument to improve the consistency of student ratings across the university for the purposes of promotion, tenure, and annual review (see University Faculty Senate Record, Vol. 19, No. 6, April 30, 1985). Penn State is unlike other institutions where student ratings instruments originally created for developmental purposes were co-opted for evaluative purposes. Approval of the April 30, 1985 Advisory and Consultative report established the Statement of Practices for the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness for Promotion and Tenure, as a set of guidelines maintained separately from the Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations (HR21) and the associated Administrative Guidelines for HR23. While separately maintained, the Statement of Practices appears as Appendix A in the Administrative Guidelines (http://vpaa.psu.edu/files/2016/09/p_and_t_guidelines-2i76gdt.pdf). The 1985 senate legislation explicitly repealed all previous senate legislation related to the evaluation of teaching. By fall semester 1987, faculty across the university had provided the items now included in the common pool of 177 questions (see http://srte.psu.edu/SRTE_Items/).


What Student Ratings Are and Are Not

Before advancing to the principal sections of this article (Guidelines for Faculty and Questions Asked by Administrators), it is important to clarify what student ratings are and are

---

1. I prefer to use a positive term, “tenure exempt,” to describe a class of faculty that has long been the majority in most U.S. colleges and universities, rather than the more typical terms “non-tenure-line” and “adjunct” faculty. The latter terms marginalize these faculty because they describe what they are not, emphasize difference, and highlight a lack of status.
The purpose of the items below is to clarify that “students' classroom experiences,” “student learning,” and “teaching quality” are not synonymous.

- **Student ratings are student perception data**
  Student ratings instruments are used to gather the collective views of a group of students about their experience in a course taught by a particular faculty member (Arreola, 2007; Abrami, 2001; Hativa, 2013a). Data are typically collected systematically from enrolled students who have experienced the learning environment created by the faculty member. Students can provide a unique perspective on how the instruction and the course requirements affected them and they have had many opportunities to observe the teacher in class and interacting with students—these are perspectives that other faculty cannot provide. Because students provide these unique perspectives on the teaching and learning environment, their collective perceptions can serve as one source of data for teaching improvement and for personnel decisions, as well as for research (McKeachie, 1990, p. 194).

- **Student ratings are not measures of student learning**
  Student ratings data were never intended to serve as a proxy for learning, but instead as a method of gathering student perception data. Even though assessment of student learning is rightly in the domain of the faculty member, that student ratings do not measure learning is a common criticism. Conflation of gathering student perceptions and assessing student learning may stem from research that has demonstrated a low to moderate positive correlation between students’ ratings and their grades or expected grades (Abrami et al., 1980; Abrami, 2001; Benton & Li, 2015; Eiszler, 2002; Feldman, 1976; Greenwald & Gilmore, 1997; Stumpf & Freedman, 1979). Correlation is to be expected.

  When students learn and subsequently receive high grades for demonstrating their learning, some might understandably assign credit for their learning to the faculty member. That said, a simple correlation between grades and student ratings does not demonstrate causality. We cannot assume that if a faculty member gives high grades, the faculty member will receive high ratings. At Penn State, faculty members whose students learn also tend to receive higher ratings from their students—and deservedly so.

- **Student ratings are not faculty evaluations**
  Students are just one source of data used in the evaluation of faculty. Students are *producers of data* and faculty and administrators are the *interpreters of that data*, whether the data are used for improvement or evaluative purposes. Faculty and administrators are responsible for deciding how to use and interpret the ratings data provided by students. Unfortunately, the names that colleges and universities assign to their ratings instruments (Student Evaluations of Teaching, Course Evaluations) probably contribute to the view that student ratings constitute an instance of evaluation, rather than an instance of data collection.
• **Student Ratings are here to stay**
  Given the utility of student ratings in academic personnel decisions, student ratings are unlikely to be eliminated any time soon (Benton & Cashin, 2011; Kulik, 2001; Franklin, 2001). Furthermore, most faculty agree that students’ views should not be entirely ignored (Berk, 2006). As such, how these data are interpreted and (mis)used is important (McKeachie, 1997).

**Guidelines for Faculty Who Use Student Ratings Data to Evaluate Other Faculty**

1. **Student ratings should be only one of multiple measures of teaching.**

   Student ratings proponents and researchers unanimously recommend personnel decisions be based on more than just the faculty member’s student ratings (Arreola, 2007; Benton & Cashin, 2011; Benton & Li, 2015; Berk, 2013; Cashin, 1996, 1999, 2003; Hativa, 2013a; Marsh, 1987; McKeachie, 1990, 1997; Miller & Seldin, 2014; Nulty, 2008). The most common additional sources of data about the faculty member’s teaching include written student feedback, peer and administrator observations (Miller & Seldin, 2014), internal or external reviews of course materials (Chism, 2007; Miller & Seldin, 2014), and more recently, teaching portfolios (Seldin, 1999; Zubizarreta, 1999) and teaching scholarship (Berk, 2013; Miller & Seldin, 2014). While none of these additional data collection methods have been extensively examined for reliability, validity, or bias (as have student ratings), they provide important points of comparison to students’ perspectives. Data collection for each of these additional data sources should be systematic rather than informal.

   Penn State guidelines recommend against using SRTEs as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. This is stated in a number of places and ways in the *Statement of Practices for the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness for Promotion and Tenure*. The final line in the Statement of Practices document is "Furthermore, student evaluations alone are not sufficient for either personnel decisions or for improvement of teaching" (Section I.D.4.c).

2. **In personnel decisions, a faculty member’s complete history of student ratings should be considered, rather than a single composite score.**

   Some academic units (departments, colleges, schools) combine a faculty member’s cumulative record into a single score. Cashin (1999) recommends looking across time and courses in order to generalize about students’ views of an instructor’s teaching and discourages creating a single score, in part because teaching is multidimensional (Abrami, 2001; Franklin, 2001; Marsh, 1984; Marsh & Dunkin, 1992) and is difficult to represent in a single score. The temptation to create a composite score may derive from the common practice of tenure and promotion committees to label each faculty member’s research, teaching, and service with a single evaluation along a scale from excellent to poor. While statistical models can be used to create a composite score that weights different teaching factors (Marsh, 1987), the adjustments should be applied to all faculty. If only some faculty have their ratings reduced to a single number, they are being evaluated under different circumstances than their peers and may be at a significant disadvantage. Furthermore, evaluators can be assured that the results are reliable.
when they see similar ratings across multiple courses because “multiple classes provide more reliable results than a single class” (Benton & Cashin, 2011). Creating weighted averages or adjusted means based on perceptions about the ease or difficulty of teaching a particular type of course or teaching context should be avoided (e.g., adding a 0.2 points for teaching a course larger than 50).

Another reason to avoid reducing a faculty member’s student ratings history to a single composite score is that anomalous ratings are given the same weight as average ratings that are more common and consistent. A faculty member with a single cumulative rating may be unfairly disadvantaged relative to faculty whose entire history is visible and for whom anomalous scores can be explained and/or disregarded (see Table 1). The hypothetical faculty member represented in Table 1 would have a lower composite average for the Overall Course rating if the anomalous results were not differentiated. These anomalous results in Table 1 are explainable as the result of a low number of responses in a very small course (three respondents out of seven students), a low response rate (37%) in course D, year 4, and a possible curricular problem with another course (F).

3. Small differences in mean (average) ratings are common and not necessarily meaningful.

Student ratings are "broad brush" instruments used to gather information from a group of students, not all of whom will agree. They are not precision tools that produce a measurement that can then be compared to a known standard. Unfortunately, some faculty evaluators over-interpret small differences as indicative of a problem, a decrease in quality, or as an indication that one faculty member is materially better than another. In reality, a faculty member could teach the same course under similar conditions and in a similar way and still receive results that differ. Sources of variation include differences in the students enrolled, in student ratings respondents, and chance.

Variations of up to 0.4 points within a course are not unusual, but that variability can change depending on the number of categories in the ratings scale (Cashin, 1999; Husbands, 1997; Marsh, 1980, 1982a, 1982b). Rather than focusing on small differences in average scores that may not be meaningful (Abrami, 2001; Ory & Ryan, 2001), evaluators’ time is better spent looking for patterns and consistency within courses and across time (Pallett, 2006). Table 2 shows the same set of ratings as Table 1, but reorganized by course and in chronological order.

This alternative perspective shows that course F consistently receives low overall course ratings while the faculty member receives high overall instructor ratings, which may indicate a curricular problem rather than an instructional issue. Given that review committees typically do not have access to the ratings of all faculty that teach a single course, reviewers must rely on contextual commentary provided by a department head or program chair, who may be able to confirm that the course is consistently rated low by students regardless of the faculty member. This commentary can help evaluators not attribute low ratings directly to the faculty member’s teaching.

The argument for not over-interpreting relatively small differences in average ratings is supported by research that indicates a wide variety of factors have relatively small impacts on
student ratings, but that none of these alone, or even in combination can explain extremely low ratings for a faculty member. These include class size, course level, major vs. non-major courses, elective vs. required, and discipline (Feldman, 2007; Arreola, 2007; Hativa, 2013b). Bias due to gender, race, ethnicity, or culture is addressed in the next section under the question about student bias (5).

Table 1. A hypothetical faculty member’s comprehensive history of student ratings (1-7 Likert scale, with 1 the lowest and 7 the highest rating); possible anomalies are indicated in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Overall Course</th>
<th>Overall Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. A hypothetical faculty member’s student ratings history ordered chronologically by course (1–7 Likert scale, with 1 the lowest and 7 the highest score); possible anomalies are indicated in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Overall Course</th>
<th>Overall Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td><strong>5.64</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td><strong>4.42</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td><strong>4.49</strong></td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td><strong>4.44</strong></td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td><strong>4.25</strong></td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td><strong>4.58</strong></td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The argument for not over-interpreting relatively small differences in average ratings is supported by research that indicates a wide variety of factors have relatively small impacts on student ratings, but that none of these alone, or even in combination can explain extremely low ratings for a faculty member. These include class size, course level, major vs. non-major courses, elective vs. required, and discipline (Feldman, 2007; Arreola, 2007; Hativa, 2013b). Bias due to
gender, race, ethnicity, or culture is addressed in the next section under the question about student bias (5).

Penn State’s Statement of Practices for the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness for Promotion and Tenure explicitly recommend against assigning the student ratings “a precision they do not possess” (Section I.D.4.a). A report from the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs notes that “the spirit of the SRTE is best served by regarding SRTE results as the students’ view of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness in absolute terms – that Professor X (whose evaluation mean is 6.25) is a “very good teacher,” without necessarily saying that Professor X is a better “very good teacher” than Professor Y (whose evaluation mean is 6.10)” (Senate Record, Vol. 22, No. 6, February 21, 1989)

4. Treat anomalous ratings for what they are, not as representative of a faculty member’s teaching.

Look for patterns in the faculty member’s scores over time or across different course types. Do they show a general improvement or a persistent and unexamined issue? Every faculty member, even the very best, receives an occasional low average rating (Franklin, 2001). And every faculty member will have a course that does not go well or a course with unhappy students. When reviewing other faculty members’ scores, patterns of low scores are more important than occasional low scores. For example, some faculty are more comfortable teaching particular types of courses. Also look for patterns of improvement that post-date a low rating, which may provide evidence that the faculty member is making improvements.

Table 2 highlights that some of the ratings of our hypothetical faculty member do appear to be anomalous. For example, the 5.08 average rating for course A in the fall of her fourth year is inconsistent with previous ratings. This anomalous rating can be explained by a substantial increase in enrollment, which could have resulted in students viewing the course as impersonal. The rating does not necessarily indicate that the faculty member cannot teach well in large courses, but it may indicate a need to adjust in-class activities. Table 2 shows many positive trends, including that the faculty member’s scores are generally consistent within and across courses and that her scores have improved over time. These patterns are more important than a few low ratings over the course of five years.

5. Examine the distribution of scores across the entire scale, as well as the mean.

Most student ratings scores are ordinal-, not ratio-level, so the difference between a mean of 5.9 and a 6.2 (on a 7-point scale) is not meaningful when considered from the students’ perspectives. Relying solely on the mean, without examining the overall shape of the distribution and the spread of scores can provide an inaccurate picture of the students’ views.

Very few faculty have a normal distribution of scores (Theall & Franklin, 1990). Student ratings distributions are typically negatively skewed (Arreola, 2007; Hativa, 2013a, 2013b), i.e., they have a long tail at the low end of the scale and the mode at the high end of the scale. This tells us that most students have positive views of their courses and instructors and the mean (average) is not the best measure of central tendency for skewed distributions. Means are more
appropriately used with normal (bell-curve) distributions. In skewed distributions, means are sensitive to (influenced by) outlier ratings; in student ratings, these outliers are almost always low scores.

In small-enrollment courses, even one or two low scores can shift the mean lower, even though those students’ views are not representative of the majority of students. The median or the mode is a better measure of central tendency in skewed distributions, but only a few instruments use the median or also report the median (e.g., Student Ratings of Instruction, IDEA Center; Instructional Assessment System, University of Washington).

Any report of a mean or median should also include the distribution of scores across the scale or a bar chart of the scores. If it is not possible to include the distribution with the mean or median, there may be other ways to ensure that reviewers have this additional information. For example, some institutions provide department heads with an opportunity to provide a narrative about the faculty member’s teaching, which would be a good place to mention the distribution of both scores and student comments.

6. Evaluate each faculty member individually. Evaluations and decisions should stand alone without reference to other faculty members; avoid comparing faculty to each other or to a unit average in personnel decisions.

Student ratings instruments are not designed to gather comparative data about faculty (Franklin, 2001). The purpose of these instruments is to get an overall sense of the students’ perceptions of a single faculty member teaching a particular course (or part of a course) to a specific group of students. Ultimately, no one faculty member teaching a group of students can be assumed to have the same experience as a different faculty member, even if he/she is teaching the same group of students (McKeachie, 1979).

The faculty who are most likely to be negatively impacted by faculty-faculty comparisons are those who do not fit common stereotypes about the professoriate—typically women and faculty of color. Biases, even unconscious biases, against non-majority faculty are well known in the academy (Gutgold & Linse, 2016), especially in white-male-dominated fields such as business and the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering & Math) disciplines (National Academies, 2006; Street et al., 1996). However, such bias can also negatively impact any faculty member who is seen as different by students and faculty evaluators.

If personnel decisions are made by comparing faculty to each other, but only in some units, the faculty of those units are at a disadvantage relative to other faculty in units that do not compare faculty to each other. Faculty evaluators and administrators are the only people with the power to stop this practice.

Unit means are not an appropriate cutoff or standard of comparison because there will always be some faculty members who are, by definition, “below the mean.” This is particularly problematic in units with many excellent teachers. Consider the case of a department with a mean of 6.0 on a 7-point scale. If the departmental mean is the “standard” of comparison, then
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faculty who have a mean of 5.5 or even a 5.9 will be labeled as “below the mean” despite being rated by students as very good teachers (Arreola, 2007).

7. **Focus on the most common ratings and comments rather than emphasizing one or a few outlier ratings or comments.**

Student ratings instruments are designed to reflect the collective views of a sample of students. They are best at capturing the modal perceptions of respondents, but they are not the best instruments for capturing rare views, i.e., the views of students represented by the tail of the distribution. While students with outlier views are not unimportant, they should not be given more weight than the views of most students. This is particularly crucial when evaluating the ratings of non-majority faculty because we often see students with biased views represented in the tails of the distribution.

Many student ratings instruments are accompanied by additional questions that request written feedback from students. A variety of research indicates that written comments are highly correlated with student ratings (Berk, 2005; Braskamp et al., 1981; Marincovich, 1999; Ory et al., 1980). Too often, faculty and administrators seem to focus their attention on rare ratings or comments, possibly because the written comments are typically the most vehement or the most negative (Franklin, 2001; Franklin & Berman, 1998). It is neither appropriate nor fair to the faculty member to treat rare comments as if they are equal to ratings and comments that are representative of the rest of the students in a course. Evaluators need to be particularly vigilant and self-aware when they are reading or summarizing students’ comments. When rare negative ratings or comments are emphasized, it presents an inaccurate picture of the students’ views (Franklin & Berman, 1998; Lewis, 2001).

In many cases, it is not feasible to include all student comments (e.g., if the course is very large or if students provide significant written feedback). When results are summarized and only mean or median ratings are included in a dossier, negative scores and comments are inadvertently given extra weight in a review. Administrators should be careful to include comments that are representative of the students’ views. Many administrators feel an obligation to include negative comments, even when they are not representative. Instead, compilers should focus on presenting a representative summary or sampling of students’ comments. In other words, a single negative comment should not be included if it represents a miniscule proportion of the written comments and/or would misrepresent the distribution of students’ comments.

One of the best ways to ensure that summaries of comments represent students’ views is to sort student comments into groups based on similarity and label the group with a theme (Lewis, 1991), then rank the themes based on the frequency of comments in each (see Figure 1). Note that many students include multiple topics in a single sentence so those should be broken into topical fragments and each sorted separately. Faculty members should focus improvement efforts on the first two to three themes, not the most negative comment(s). Some common themes include Labs, Homework, Teamwork, Lecture, Availability, Textbook, and Exams. Sorting written comments by theme not only helps highlight which comments are frequent and rare, it helps reviewers and faculty not to overemphasize isolated comments, whether positive or negative.
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Figure 1. Sample format for a thematic analysis of students’ written comments. Available at http://www.schreyerinstitute.psu.edu/tools/?q=template.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Section #</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th># enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Student Comments**

1. What helped you learn in this course?
   - Class Discussion
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 

2. What suggestions do you have for changes that would improve your learning?
   - Organization
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - Workload
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - Clarity Expectations
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - Assignments
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - Grading/Grading Criteria
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - Lectures
   - 

That said, the student ratings research community has repeatedly voiced concerns about students’ written comments being included in personnel decisions because they duplicate the information from the same students who have completed the ratings (Franklin & Berman, 1998). Arreola (2007) considers students’ written comments to be subjective and unreliable. Marsh (2007) provides an overview of the research on written comments, which is relatively small, but does indicate alignment between written comments and student ratings.

8. **Contradictory written comments are not unusual.**

It is a rare faculty member who does not receive at least some contradictory comments in the written feedback that typically accompanies student ratings (Marincovich, 1999). Neither administrators nor review committee members should consider this diagnostic. Administrators typically recognize that the situation is common because they see many more student ratings reports than do faculty who serve on review committees. New faculty can be particularly frustrated or concerned when students’ comments contradict each other given that they generally feel additional pressure to perform well on student ratings because they feel that their tenure decision or their reappointment depends on uniformly good student ratings and comments. Administrators and faculty who have served on review committees can help their junior peers focus on the most frequent ratings and comments.
Questions Asked by Administrators about Student Ratings: Providing Feedback and Responding to Faculty Concerns

Administrators, and sometimes faculty review committees, are responsible for providing useful and actionable feedback to guide faculty career development in pre-tenure reviews or reappointments. Both administrators and reviewers can experience discomfort with making life-altering decisions about other faculty based on student ratings data (though hopefully not solely on those data). The discomfort can be exacerbated if these individuals do not know about the history of student ratings at the institution, if they are unfamiliar with the research literature, or if they have been operating under misconceptions. Below are some of the most common questions asked by faculty and administrators; these are not just questions asked by faculty who receive low ratings or are unhappy with their results.

1. How do I know whether a faculty member’s ratings are “good” or “bad”?

Look at the distribution of the ratings across the scale, not solely at the mean or the median. Most student ratings distributions are skewed, i.e., not normally distributed, with the peak of the distribution above the midpoint of the scale. The mean misrepresents the ratings in a skewed distribution because a few low ratings in the tail of the distribution can pull the mean down. It is unacceptable to allow a faculty member “to be portrayed as a less effective teacher with lower ratings” (Berk, 2013, p. 74) because of an institution’s choice of which measurement of central tendency to report. Distributions that include the ratings of multiple faculty for the purposes of improving the teaching or curriculum within a department, degree program, or course can provide useful comparative information (Arreola, 2007; Berk, 2013; Hativa, 2013).

Most institutions in the U.S. use a norm-referenced approach to interpreting a faculty member’s ratings (Hativa, 2013b; McKeachie, 1997). For example, faculty with most of their ratings distributed across scores of 3.5–5 on a 5-point scale (or 5–7 on a 7-point scale) are doing well, even if they have a few stray scores in the lower ratings. If a large percentage of the ratings are clustered at the higher end of the scale, the faculty member is doing fine—even if a few students rate the faculty member at the low end of the scale. Student ratings are intended to represent the collective views of students, not the rare views. Even when a faculty member is doing fine, her/his history of ratings may include a couple of courses that were rated lower. Every faculty member receives some lower ratings at some point in her/his career.

Faculty members with a normal distribution of scores or a distribution with the peak below the midpoint of the scale likely have an instructional issue (or issues) that need attention (Arreola, 2007). The issues may be easily addressed or may be more serious, but all faculty members should be given the opportunity to address students’ concerns. In other words, do not ignore low scores!
2. *What should I say to a faculty member with ratings distributed across the low end of the rating scale?*

Faculty with many scores in the 1–2 range on a 5-point scale (or 1–3 range on a 7-point scale) or with scores relatively evenly distributed across the entire scale are typically facing serious challenges with their students. These kinds of distributions need to be addressed as soon as possible. Faculty members who receive these kinds of rating distributions in most of their courses need sufficient time to develop their teaching before coming up for a formal evaluation or a contract renewal.

These faculty members should also be reassured that even though some faculty seem “born to teach,” nearly all of the behaviors practiced by excellent teachers can be learned. Faculty members with low ratings should be reminded of the ways that the college or university provides support for effective teaching as well as online and library resources on effective teaching in higher education. Recommend that the faculty work with a senior faculty member who is a good teacher and mentor, or remind her/him of other resources that excellent faculty use, such as the resources provided by the campus teaching center (Wilson, 1986). The senior faculty member must be a good mentor as well as a good teacher because good mentors do not simply expect a mentee to copy her/his teaching.

If a pattern of low scores develops, the faculty member should be encouraged to seek mentoring, coaching, or advice from a professional in the campus teaching and learning center. Research indicates that faculty who work with an expert or knowledgeable colleague (one who does not simply say, “Teach like me”) do improve (Boice, 2001; Geis, 1991; Brinko, 1991). However, faculty should not simply be “sent to the teaching center” in response to low or problematic student ratings because the teaching center should not be seen as a punishment, but as a support offered by the university. It is far better to begin talking with faculty immediately upon their arrival on campus about the resources the institution provides as a way to ensure that all faculty are successful teachers.

Most teaching centers practice confidentiality with their faculty clients (cf. [http://podnetwork.org/about-us/pod-governance/ethical-guidelines/](http://podnetwork.org/about-us/pod-governance/ethical-guidelines/)). This means that even if an administrator recommends that a faculty member seek help from the teaching center, center personnel will not report back to the administrator about that consultation (Zakrajsek, 2010). Administrators are free to refer faculty to contact the teaching center, but most centers will treat the faculty member as if she/he voluntarily sought consultation. Administrators generally respond positively to these traditions and are more concerned that their faculty members be treated with respect and dignity than they are about getting a report from the center. Rather than request a follow-up from the center, administrators can take a more constructive approach by asking to meet with the faculty member at a future point to discuss what she/he has been doing to improve their teaching and address students’ concerns. Many centers also provide consultation services to administrators who are seeking advice about how to mentor faculty within their units.
3. How do I respond to a faculty member who says that “only faculty who give away ‘A’ grades get high ratings” or who argues that another faculty member who receives high ratings “must be giving away grades”?

Most faculty members at most institutions receive high student ratings (Arreola, 2007; Hativa, 2013a). Every institution has numerous examples of faculty with high academic standards who also receive high student ratings. Administrators may want to share the departmental or course distribution (as opposed to simply the departmental average) as a way for faculty members to calibrate their own results. Some faculty respond better to a conversation with a respected faculty member in the department who is tough, but fair, and who also receives high ratings; most departments have at least one such faculty member.

Student ratings researchers have long been studying the relationship between grades and ratings (Abrami et al., 1980; Eiszler, 2002; Marsh, 1987). While a number of studies have shown no relationship between grades (or expected grades) and student ratings (Marsh & Roche, 1997; Gigliotti & Buchtel, 1990), more research studies document that students’ grades are positively correlated with student evaluations (Abrami, 2001; Eiszler, 2002; Feldman, 1976). The most commonly cited correlation is 0.2–0.3, but researchers report correlation coefficients that vary from 0.1–0.5 (Abrami et al., 1980; Arreola, 2007; Feldman, 1976; Greenwald & Gilmore, 1997; Stumpf & Freedman, 1979). Marsh (2007) suggests that the majority of the research indicates support for the hypothesis that students who learn more earn higher grades and give higher ratings. More recently, Benton and colleagues have documented that students give instructors higher ratings when students are expected to take on some share of responsibility for learning (Benton, Guo, Li, & Gross, 2013 as cited in Benton & Li, 2013).

The positive though weak correlation leads researchers to recommend that evaluators use extreme caution when inferring that a faculty member’s grading policy has significantly impacted their ratings. The combination of high ratings and higher grades might represent student learning, grading leniency, or students’ characteristics unrelated to instruction (McKeachie, 1979, 1997). None of the stories that claim grading practices are responsible for grade inflation is widely accepted by the student ratings research community. In fact, McKeachie (1990) notes that faculty members who are effective working with poorer students receive higher ratings from those students than they receive from other students.

Most students do not equate faculty who have high standards with poor teaching. Faculty members who try to manipulate students’ ratings by “giving away As” should be advised that they are at risk of receiving low ratings from students who worked hard in the course and who turned in A work (Abrami et al., 1980; McKeachie, 1997). In other words, poor teachers who try to increase their scores by boosting grades are unlikely to fool students.

In a similar vein, some faculty members suggest that their low ratings are a result of “high standards” and students’ dislike of homework or even a reasonable workload. A heavy workload is not always synonymous with “academic rigor” (Franklin, 2001), so an over-ambitious workload could reasonably result in lower student ratings. Peer review of faculty teaching materials such as syllabi and assignments, course observations (Chism, 2007), and review of students’ work (Cashin, 1995) are the best methods for evaluators to determine
whether a faculty member is expecting too much or too little from students and whether students are earning undeserved high grades.

4. How do I respond to a faculty member who says that student ratings are “just a popularity contest” and that they are “not valid”?

As noted above, the purpose of student ratings is to gather students’ perspectives on the instruction or learning environment in a course (Hativa, 2013a). Their validity has been tested more than any other method for evaluating faculty teaching (Abrami, 2001; Abrami et al., 1990; Aleamoni, 1999; d’Appolonia & Abrami, 1997; Feldman, 1989; Marsh, 1984, 1982b; Marsh & Roche, 1997). The majority of the legitimate research on student ratings indicates that they are a more reliable and valid representation of teaching quality than any other method of evaluating teaching, including peer observation, focus groups, and external review of materials (McKeachie, 1997; Berk, 2005, 2013) and they are highly correlated with other measures of teaching effectiveness (Abrami et al., 1990; Berk, 2013). In other words, most other methods for evaluating teaching have not undergone extensive statistical analyses or been exposed to the scrutiny of student ratings, yet we continue to rely on them.

When faculty question the validity of students’ ratings, they are typically not concerned about the statistical validity of the ratings instrument of the results. Instead, faculty who question the validity of student ratings are generally most concerned that students view are wrong, but that their ratings being used against the faculty member. This provides an opportunity to talk about the value of students’ views and that student ratings are just one source of data in the faculty evaluation process.

Be honest that student ratings are unlikely to become obsolete any time soon, no matter what the latest headlines say. Because student ratings provide an effective and systematic way to gather feedback from students enrolled in courses, it is in the faculty member’s best interest to learn how to use these data to benefit his/her. Specifically, instructors who want to increase their ratings should focus their efforts on improving the learning environment for students through by building “communication, motivational, and rapport-building skills” (IDEA Research Note 1, 2003). Campus teaching and learning centers have many resources and strategies to help faculty develop these and other attributes of effective teaching. At Penn State, faculty from every campus and college may seek the services of Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence. To find out which of the Institute’s faculty consultants serve your academic unit, visit http://www.schreyerinstitute.psu.edu/Help/Liaisons/.

5. What should I say when a faculty member argues that students are biased against him/her?

Students, like all human beings are biased. But students, like other members of society, are not monolithic in their views. In other words, not all students are biased in the same ways. The real question here is whether student bias against some attribute of a faculty member is widespread and strong enough to overwhelm the students’ ratings of the faculty member’s teaching or course environment and solely reflect students’ bias.
Faculty who do not fit students’ perceptions of what a professor should look or act like can experience bias from the students. Student ratings researchers have identified among students the same biases that exist in society (gender, sexual orientation, political, religious, etc.). While these biases definitely exist, the research indicates that the biases rarely, if ever, fully explain ratings that cluster at the low end of the ratings scale.

The fact that student ratings instruments are not designed to capture rare student views is one reason why we hear contradictory information about whether or not student ratings are biased against women faculty, faculty of color, and other non-majority attributes of faculty. For many years, studies that analyzed large samples of courses from a variety of disciplines consistently showed no significant difference in ratings due to systematic gender bias (Feldman, 1992, 1993; Franklin & Theall, 1994). Yet, women faculty, particularly in male-dominated fields in the STEM disciplines (science, technology, engineering, and math) continued to suggest that these studies did not represent their experiences. Given the relatively small numbers of women faculty in these fields, ratings that reflect bias will be represented in the tails of the distribution, not in the peak of the distribution. As a result, these biases are more difficult to detect.

Over time, a growing body of research has documented gender effects on student ratings, but these effects are neither uniform nor consistent across all disciplines, nor do they apply to all women (e.g., Bachen et al., 1999; Basow, 1995; Centra & Gaubbatz, 2000; Hancock et al., 1993; Sinclair & Kunda, 2000). While recent stories in the academic press have generated a lot of attention, the articles cited (Bragaa et al., 2014; MacNell et al., 2015) have methodological issues, and significantly overstate the case (Ryalls et al., 2016).

The research on gender bias has a longer history than does the research on racial, ethnic, or cultural bias, in part because minority faculty still constitute a relatively small percentage of the faculty. The number of studies is increasing and evidence is mounting that such biases exist among students and may impact student ratings (Anderson & Smith, 2005; Davis, 2010; Galguera, 1998; Gilroy, 2007; Hendrix, 1998; Lazos, 2011; Reid, 2010; Smith, 2007, 2009; Smith & Hawkins, 2011; Smith & Johnson-Bailey, 2011/12). However, at this point the bias is not sufficiently strong or widespread to explain consistently low ratings across all courses for a faculty member.

6. How should I respond to a faculty member who suggests that online administration of student ratings resulted (or will result) in lower ratings?

Many faculty members feel that the move to online administration of student ratings has resulted in low ratings. This is generally not supported by the ratings data, i.e., ratings distributions of most faculty members continue to cluster at the high end of the scale as do most aggregate departmental and college distributions (Linse, 2010). In the early days of online student ratings, Northwestern University reported on a study (Hardy, 2003) that included both increases and decreases, as well one that showed a slight decrease (-0.25 on a 6-point scale). Faculty at The Pennsylvania State University (Penn State) had similar concerns, but one study showed only a small increase in scores of 1–3 on a 7-point scale, as well as a marked increase in
ratings of 7 (Linse, 2010; Linse & Xie, 2011). The IDEA Center, which processes student ratings from hundreds of institutions, reports no difference in online ratings (Webster et al., 2010) as do numerous other studies (Dommeyer et al., 2004; McGhee & Lowell, 2003; Stowell et al. 2012). No reports document an increase in bi-modal distributions in institutionally administered ratings. Now that online student ratings have become commonplace, it has become clear that students who are engaged in a course are more likely to complete the student ratings than students who are disengaged (Berk, 2013).

Other potential causes should be ruled out before attributing a ratings change to the method of administration, particularly because such changes are relatively rare (though not impossible). Request that the faculty member provide comparison data from paper and online student ratings distributions for the same course. If a faculty member has not taught the course for many years, during which the transition to online happened, the results may not be directly attributable to the online transition. The course material may be out-of-date or it may rely too heavily on out-of-date teaching methods. Students today expect at least some level of engagement in class, in both face-to-face and online courses (Barkley, 2010).

Some individual faculty members may be able to make a case that their ratings changed dramatically before and after the shift to online administration. When this can be substantiated, the department or program head should include a note in the faculty member’s dossier.

7. How do I tell a long-serving faculty member who has had poor student ratings for years that those ratings are no longer acceptable?

Poor student ratings may have been acceptable in the past, but the issue may also have been avoided for other reasons including not knowing what kind of ratings are acceptable, not knowing how to approach the faculty, or wanting to avoid hurting or discouraging the faculty member (Gunsalus, 2006).

The administrator can ease into the conversation by saying, “It may have been sufficient in the past to receive these kinds of ratings, but things have changed and students expect more now. The university has invested resources to help you take the next steps to improve your teaching. For example, …” Most colleges and universities have a variety of resources to support faculty professional development including experienced teaching mentors, faculty learning communities (Cox, 2004), and teaching and learning centers (Brinko, 1991; Ouellett, 2010; Sorcinelli & Austin, 2006; Sorcinelli et al., 2006).

8. How do I respond to faculty who have been told that “teaching doesn’t matter for promotion and tenure (P&T)”?

At many colleges and universities, it is true that faculty cannot expect to be successful in the promotion and tenure process based on excellent teaching and mediocre research (Glassick et

---

2. IDEA used to be an acronym for “Instructional Development & Evaluation Assessment,” a student ratings form developed at Kansas State University. The phrase behind the acronym is no longer used by the IDEA Center and does not appear on their website (http://www.ideaedu.org/) as of November 19, 2016. In other words, IDEA is no longer an acronym.
In the U.S., faculty on the tenure track at nearly all institutions (except tenure-line faculty at community colleges), have research responsibilities in addition to teaching and service responsibilities. At research-focused universities in particular, a largely unwritten rule exists that unless faculty research productivity is acceptable, they will not seriously be considered for tenure. Miller and Seldin (2014, p. 1) note that the importance of research and publication continues to increase in the faculty evaluation process, which appears to support the “observation that faculty members are paid to teach but are rewarded for their research and publication.”

There was once great hope that the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL; Boyer, 1990) would evolve so that scholarly teaching would “count” for more in the promotion and tenure process (Huber, 2002). Things have changed at some institutions so that SOTL does “count” in promotion and tenure decisions, but primarily when the SOTL has been published in peer-reviewed journals and/or resulted in grant support.

Today, what has changed is that poor teaching can now have a significant negative impact on a tenure and/or promotion case. This is particularly true if the faculty member does not have a strong research record, whether disciplinary or SOTL. This change is, in part, a result of Boyer’s and others’ work to broaden the definition of scholarship, but also because of tightening budgets, higher tuition, and increased calls for accountability. The bottom line is that in today’s world, few faculty members can afford to ignore teaching, not even “star researchers.”

9. **What do I say to a faculty member who says, “My response rates are too low to be included in my dossier”?**

Unless an institution has a set minimum response rate for inclusion in the dossier, all results will need to be included. There is no single standardized “ideal” response rate although a number of researchers have made suggestions (Franklin & Theall, 1991; Marsh, 1984; Nulty, 2008; the recommendations of the latter are reproduced by Barre, 2015). These recommended response rates are challenging to obtain for online student ratings, but it takes greater effort on the part of faculty to achieve high response rates. Response rates for online administration tend to fall by 25–30% below those of paper student ratings (Benton et al., 2010; Hativa, 2013a; Johnson, 2003; Nulty, 2008; Sorensen & Reiner, 2003). Response rates may rebound as students no longer expect paper student ratings and mobile versions allow in class administration.

Ultimately, faculty members will need to trust that their colleagues will be skeptical that results from extremely low-response courses are representative of students’ views. That said, colleagues and administrators are unlikely to tolerate extremely low response rates over multiple years, particularly since all faculty can implement at least some of the strategies known to boost response rates (Berk, 2006; Nulty, 2008). Effective strategies include discussing the importance of student ratings to the faculty member and describing faculty efforts to use student feedback to improve the course, noting that student feedback will benefit future students, and multiple reminders from the faculty. Many online systems are programmed to provide automatic reminders when a student has unrated courses; at Penn State students receive reminders only if they have unfinished SRTEs. Some faculty have had great success in rewarding students for reaching a particular response rate or providing extra credit points (Dommeyer et al., 2004), but other
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faculty feel strongly that such rewards amount to bribery for higher ratings. Two extremely successful practices are 1) granting students early access to grades or 2) granting access to results; the former may not be technologically possible and some faculty feel strongly that students should not see the results, especially when those results are used in personnel decisions. See http://www.schreyerinstitute.psu.edu/IncreaseSRTERespRate/ for the results of an informal study in which faculty described what they do to receive response rates at or above 70%.

A number of efforts can help, including repeated reminders from the online system, reminders from faculty, and sincere comments from faculty that their responses will be read and taken seriously (Nulty, 2008). Faculty members may also want to consider regularly collecting feedback from students during the term, which creates a habit of feedback and builds trust among students that the faculty member is sincere in his/her respect for students’ perspectives (Svinicki, 2001).

Some institutions have policies that allow faculty who want to experiment with new teaching methods or new course content to arrange in advance to exclude the student ratings for the experimental course from the faculty member’s dossier. For example, Penn State’s Statement of Practices for the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness for Promotion and Tenure states, “If there is some reason to explain the results or the absence of results in a particular case, the appropriate academic administrator shall make a note to that effect in the dossier. For example, in advance of a course being taught for the first time in an experimental way, an administrator and a faculty member might agree not to administer the SRTE [Student Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness]. Such agreements should be in writing” (http://vpaa.psu.edu/files/2016/09/srte_statement-248pj9j.pdf). Other universities have similar language in their reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) policies. We suggest that the student ratings be administered even if an administrator agrees to the exclusion because some faculty have found that their ratings do not decrease as expected.

10. How do I respond to faculty who say that the lower response rates of the online student ratings system make the ratings “invalid”?

As noted above, the validity of student ratings has been well established for decades. When some faculty express concerns about validity, they are actually concerned about the representativeness of the sample of responding students, not the statistical validity of the instrument. Faculty are wise to be concerned about the response rate as smaller numbers of responses are less likely to be representative (Benton et al., 2010; Berk, 2013). As noted above, average response rates typically decrease with the transition to online ratings. However, no research has reported a systematic or widespread decrease in average or median ratings and some have reported stable or increased averages (Ardalan et al., 2007; Dommeyer et al., 2004; Hardy, 2003; Venette et al., 2010).

Some institutions have begun to see response rates rebound as students become more accustomed to online ratings and as students who have experienced paper administration graduate (Johnson, 2003). Other institutions have been able to increase response rates by offering student respondents access to the results, early access to grades, or mobile versions of the online system (Berk, 2012; Kaplan, 2014). Many faculty have found success emphasizing how
important the feedback is to the improvement of the course and by providing examples of course improvements suggested by past students; for some of these strategies, see http://www.schreyerinstitute.psu.edu/IncreaseSRTERespRate/.

Faculty with low response rates in small-enrollment courses may have cause for concern because when the number of respondents is small, a single student’s rating carries a lot of weight. But as noted above, the lower response rates have typically not had a negative impact on faculty members’ average scores. Administrators should be wary of over-interpreting small-enrollment courses with low response rates.

**Conclusion**

The conclusions of research experts in the field of student ratings are not reaching the faculty and administrators who are responsible for faculty evaluation. Too often, faculty misperceptions about student ratings are instead obtained from the academic, and sometimes mainstream, press which largely ignores the more than 80 years of research on the topic. Second, student ratings are so important in the faculty evaluation process, especially in terms of personnel decisions, that we can no longer afford to ignore the misuse and misinterpretation of student ratings data.

While the two final sections of this report are written for different audiences, both focus on one important issue—that the appropriate use of student ratings data is fundamental to building a high-quality teaching ecosystem within an institution. Inappropriate use of student ratings breeds mistrust, fosters inequities and inconsistencies, and ultimately demoralizes the faculty. With increased appropriate and accurate use of student ratings data, faculty and administrators can begin to avoid other unintended consequences such as turning the important process of listening to students’ voices into a rote activity that has no meaning for the students or the faculty.

Research-based decisions can help to create a more coherent academic community that is empowered to take responsibility for high-impact work on campus. If student ratings data are used appropriately, faculty once closed to or dismissive of students’ feedback may be able to approach student ratings from a more open-minded perspective. A greater understanding of student ratings could lead to broader appreciation within the faculty community of faculty whose primary responsibility within the community is to help the institution meet its mission of educating students.
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University policy HR76 “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” establishes the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and defines the committee’s scope and operation. The committee may review petitions from a faculty member who asserts that he or she has suffered a substantial injustice resulting from a violation of academic freedom, procedural fairness, or professional ethics.

The 2015-2016 committee received six petitions, a number similar to recent years. Over the last five years, the committee has examined between seven and nine petitions per year. Two of the six petitions claimed violations of procedural fairness. Two petitions claimed violations of procedural fairness and professional ethics. One petition claimed violations of professional ethics, and academic freedom. One petition claimed violations of professional ethics.

Of the six petitions, one fell outside the scope of the committee, and was not reviewed further. The committee voted to conduct informal investigations for the other five cases. One case was not completed by June 30th and was referred to the 2016-2017 committee. Two petitions related to denial of tenure. The other cases related to workplace climate, annual review processes and research space, respectively.

The committee found sufficient evidence in one petition to recommend the remedies sought by the petitioner. Provost Nicholas Jones and Vice Provost Blannie Bowen accepted the committee’s findings and directed the appropriate administrator to implement the recommended remedy. For the other four cases, after investigation, the committee determined the claims were without merit or fell outside the committee’s defined scope of purview.

The chair wishes to thank the members of the 2015-2016 committee, each of whom devoted significant time and thoughtful consideration to each petition. The committee members express our appreciation to all ombudspersons across the University for their important contributions toward resolving conflicts and disputes. Additionally, the committee acknowledges the efforts of Blannie Bowen, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, to improve awareness of the policies and procedures related to promotion and tenure. These combined endeavors provide thoughtful and responsive support for faculty members and administrators and help to resolve disputes before they result in petitions submitted to this committee.

Changes occurred in membership throughout the 2015-2016 term of the committee. The list below includes all members who serve all or part of the term.

- Larry Catá Backer
- Lori J. Bechtel-Wherry
• Dawn G. Blasko, Chair
• Christian M. Brady
• Marie Hardin
• Jonna M. Kulikowich
• Timothy Lawlor
• Linda R. Musser
• James M. Ruiz
• Karen Wiley Sandle
• Kim C. Steiner
Introduction

This is the second annual PSU Libraries Collections Budget report for the Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology. While some things have changed, much has remained the same, so the report overall will not vary a great deal from the 2015 report. Information from the Law Libraries is much expanded and appears at the end of the report. Multiple factors affect the PSU libraries’ spending capabilities; we continue to be challenged by both rising inflation and publisher costs and scholarly publishing changes, especially because publishers increase costs when introducing digital information formats. Penn State is complex, and the Libraries reflect that complexity. As before we include a description of the challenges to the collections budget and discuss the opportunities coming from changes in scholarly communications.

The library strives to build, organize, and make accessible its collection to support the teaching, learning, and scholarship of the students, faculty, and researchers of the institution. Librarians provide subject expertise not only aligned with individual departments but also monitor publishing trends and collaborate with colleagues external to Penn State to build our collections.

This report begins with a description of who (Part 1) is responsible for managing the overall budget; who manages the individual subject allocations and who manages the interactions with publishers and vendors, and pays the bills. This section also describes the process of selection and provides a sample collection policy used to guide purchasing decisions by discipline.

Next we move to what (Part 2). This section describes types of funding available for library collections, materials and services.

The section on where (Part 3) describes the Penn State libraries supported by the collections budget.

When (Part 4) describes the timing of our budgeting and purchasing cycles.

Next there is a section describing the challenges we face, some longstanding and some we see facing us in the future.

We end with a description of opportunities the library is pursuing that embrace new directions in scholarly publishing and communications which may eventually relieve some of our greatest challenges.
The Information section features charts, tables and other numbers, a flowchart showing how the process works as we add items to the library collection, and ends with budget information for the medical and law libraries. This year we have included additional information about the databases we subscribe to as requested by the LIST committee.

**Part 1. Who – Roles and responsibilities**

This section describes who in the library is responsible for managing the collections budget, spending the money and paying the bills, and ends with a description of how we choose what to purchase or subscribe to, with a sample collection development policy.

**ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE**

The Senior Director of Administrative and Financial Services oversees the entire budget for the libraries, including endowments and the collections budget.

The Associate Dean for Research, Collections and Scholarly Communication has overarching responsibility for the library collections budget (endowments, state appropriations, etc.), with the exception of the medical and law schools. All of the librarians who are charged with selecting and budgeting for library collections (again with the exception of the medical and law schools) are either based in the Research, Collections, and Scholarly Communications division of the library, or are Campus librarians. The Acquisitions department reports to this associate dean.

**ACQUISITIONS**

This department is responsible for all aspects of procuring books, journals, maps, media, sound recordings, scores, serials, sets, databases, back-files etc. They manage electronic resources and respond to access issues. They work closely with selectors, vendors, and publishers. This year we have an interim Acquisitions librarian, as we plan for a national search to fill the position of Head, Acquisitions department.

**COLLECTIONS STRATEGIES AND SERVICES LIBRARIAN**

Fall 2016 the Libraries are interviewing for a Collections Strategies and Services Librarian. This librarian will be responsible for overseeing many of the aspects of the work of library Selectors. This position will manage the Joint Collections Group and will oversee the creation of allocation methods, collections assessment activities, vendor interactions and collaborative collection development opportunities.

**SELECTORS**

Selectors are librarians with subject area expertise who are charged with selecting library materials in specific subject areas and managing the budgets for those areas. There are 94 librarians who do material selection throughout the libraries. There are 128 different subjects ranging from Accounting to Women’s
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Studies. [https://libraries.psu.edu/about/departments/collections-services/university-park-subject-librarians](https://libraries.psu.edu/about/departments/collections-services/university-park-subject-librarians). The law and medical libraries manage their own selection and budgets.

Decisions by selectors about what to purchase or subscribe to are guided by the Libraries overarching policy for collection development, which is to collect and make accessible materials that meet the teaching and research needs of the university. Selectors also purchase in response to specific requests from faculty and graduate students, within the confines of the budget. Requests for books are nearly always purchased as well as new print and electronic content subscriptions. Packages, extensive backfiles, large sets and expensive databases that exceed the subject’s funding availability require a vetting process through a committee, and funds must be found or freed up through cancellations or through cost-sharing across disciplines. Undergraduates rarely request items, though their requests are taken into consideration if they fit the needs of the discipline. Otherwise they are directed towards interlibrary loan. Further, selectors are guided in their decisions by their own subject expertise and through a concerted effort to assess the needs of faculty, research programs, departments, colleges, and others. Selectors are organized into subject-based Collection Development Groups. Many selectors write collection policies to describe the parameters they use when selecting materials for broad subject areas. These are updated periodically, especially when there are substantive changes.

Sample Collection Policy

**Anthropology Collection Development Statement**

**Subject Specialist:**  
Nonny Schlotzhauer  
Social Sciences Librarian  
208D Paterno Library  
nonny@psu.edu 814-863-4644

**Department Liaison:**  
Nina Joblonski, Head  
Department of Anthropology  
409 Carpenter Building  
University Park, PA 16802  
ngj2@psu.edu 814-2509

**Fund:**  
ANTHY

**Purpose and Programmatic Information:**  
Anthropology documents, describes and explains the physical and cultural differences of societies, both past and present. Anthropology sees the individual as part of a larger social order that both impinges upon and is molded by those who belong to it. Anthropology investigates how cultures interact and relate within specific economic, political and ecological framework over time.

*The collection supports current and anticipated teaching and research needs of the Anthropology Department in the College of the Liberal Arts. The department offers the Ph.D., M.A., B.A., and B.S. degrees in anthropology. Undergraduates may major or minor in anthropology, or major in biological anthropology or archaeological sciences. Graduates programs are offered in archaeology, biological anthropology and cultural*
anthropology, and in anthropology and demography. The department has a strong geographic emphasis on the Americas.

The department has an empirical, scientific focus that is scientific in nature and is organized into three sub-disciplines or research concentrations:

1. **Archaeology**: Focuses upon past societies, both ancient and historic, in order to understand and explain the processes causing cultures to change over large spans of time. The archaeology program has a research agenda focusing on ancient, complex societies, especially those of the Americas.

2. **Biological Anthropology**: Seeks to describe and explain human biological variation today and in the past. Research and graduate training in biological anthropology at Penn State focus on human population, developmental, and evolutionary biology.

3. **Cultural Anthropology**: Strives to understand and explain differences and similarities among the world's many cultures as ongoing systems.

The Department is the academic home to 22 fulltime faculty members, and a number of adjunct faculty and research associates. The Department has about fifty active graduate students, seventy-five undergraduate majors and twenty-five undergraduate minors.

**Scope of the Collection:**

Anthropology is by its nature strongly interdisciplinary. Collections in anthropology may overlap with those in the following areas:

- African Studies
- Biology
- Geography
- History
- Latin American Studies
- Sociology
- Political Science
- Women’s Studies

**Library Locations for Anthropology Related Materials:**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Call Number Range</th>
<th>Library/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>CC 1-960</td>
<td>Pattee Library, BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Columbian period. Native Americans</td>
<td>E 51-143</td>
<td>Pattee Library, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States local history</td>
<td>F 1-975</td>
<td>Pattee Library, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America. Spanish America</td>
<td>F 1201-3799</td>
<td>Pattee Library, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human geography. Anthropogeography</td>
<td>GF 1-900</td>
<td>Paterno Library, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology (General)</td>
<td>GN 1-890</td>
<td>Paterno Library, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical anthropology</td>
<td>GN 49-298</td>
<td>Paterno Library, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnology. Social and cultural anthropology</td>
<td>GN 301-674</td>
<td>Paterno Library, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric archaeology</td>
<td>GN 700-890</td>
<td>Paterno Library, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Pattee Library, 1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manners and customs</td>
<td>GT</td>
<td>Pattee Library, 1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>HM</td>
<td>Paterno Library, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual life. Women.</td>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Paterno Library, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural history. Biology. Genetics</td>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Paterno Library, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human anatomy</td>
<td>QM</td>
<td>Paterno Library, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>QP</td>
<td>Paterno Library, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical anthropology. Epidemiology</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Paterno Library, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Materials Collected:

A. Languages Collected. Emphasis is placed on English language materials, with a small proportion of titles purchased in Spanish, German and French.

B. Geographical Limits. The department has a focus on the Americas, and the collection reflects this emphasis. No region or country is excluded, though some are emphasized more than others.

C. Chronological Limits. The collection is developed across all time periods. An emphasis is placed on current research.

D. Major Publishers
  - University Presses (e.g., Harvard University and Oxford University Presses)
  - Association publications (e.g., American Anthropological Association and Archaeological Institute of America)
  - Oxbow Books
  - Sage Publications

E. Reference Works. Collect encyclopedias, handbooks and biographical works. Current policy is to acquire reference sources, including indexes, in electronic format when applicable.

F. Periodicals. Includes scholarly journals from university presses, commercial presses, and professional associations at the state, regional, national, and international level. A majority of the journals are now accessible online.

G. Video/DVD collections. Videos are important to anthropology and archaeology researchers. Anthropological films and videos offer researchers an opportunity to "experience" another culture. Fieldworkers have used visual methods for years to record
how other cultures operate. Documentaries and films are frequently used/shown in the classroom.

**H. Generally Excluded**
- Textbooks
- Reprints of articles or other materials, especially if contained in journals owned
- Popular works (autobiographies of journalists, for example)
- Dissertations
- Juvenile materials

**I. Areas of Focus/Strength**
- Archaeology
- Biological Anthropology
- Cultural Anthropology related to Indians of the Americas
- Demography
- GIS

**J. Electronic Resources**

**Core Resources**
- Anthropology PLUS
- AnthroSource
- HRAF (Human Relations Area Files)
- Biological Abstracts
- Sociological Abstracts
- JSTOR

**Coordinating and Cooperative Efforts:**

**I. Related Funds**
- Area
- Biology
- Geography
- Global
- History
- Latin American Studies
- Sociology
- Political Science
- Women’s Studies

**II. Data/Statistical Collections.**
Collection and analysis of data are important skills for researchers in anthropology. Researchers use ethnographic and other social science data in archives such as ICPSR.

**III. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**
The Anthropology subject specialist and selector collaborates and communicates with other appropriate Libraries faculty and Anthropology faculty to assure that the most current, appropriate, and necessary materials are purchased.

Sources that are consulted for collection development include: Library Journal, Booklist and Anthropology News. Online bookstores, such as Amazon.com, and important anthropology library catalogs, such as Tozzer Library, are searched periodically for new acquisitions. Faculty members provide frequent input for new titles. Continuous assessment of the print and electronic collections is important to assure that
the collections are meeting the needs of all researchers, faculty, and students. This is done regularly, as time permits.

**Campus Locations.** The Abington campus offers a minor in Anthropology. Many campuses offer courses in Anthropology. Some duplication of key resources will be necessary to serve these classes.

### Part 2. What – Money sources and types of materials purchased

This section describes both the types and sources of money in the library’s collections budget and the types from the most recent budget year of materials we buy, subscribe, or procure licensed access to. This section includes a brief description of fundraising and library collections.

**Money Sources**

1. Allocated General Appropriation
2. Student Technology Fee
3. Grants
4. Endowments
5. Gifts

Descriptions:

1. State appropriation: Allocated fiscally, July to June. Distribution is determined by the Associate Dean for Research, Collections, and Scholarly Communications. Allocations are typically completed by the end of August for each fiscal cycle. These funds must be fully committed by March 15th. Uncommitted balances are pooled after that date for desiderata purchases as these funds must be fully expended by June 30th. Carryover is not permitted. Outstanding order encumbrances are reflected against the new fiscal year allocations.

2. Student Technology Fee funds: Fiscal management guidelines are the same as those for the state appropriation. This source of funding will not be continued after this fiscal year.

3. Grants: Some grants have designated funds for library collections.

4. Endowments: Income received on an annual basis, usually early fall. Distribution of these funds is based on the donor guidelines.

5. Gifts: These funds represent monetary gifts received through the Office of University Development and are added to the collections budget as received throughout the year. Distribution of these funds is based on donor instructions. These funds have no encumbrance or expenditure deadlines.

**Fundraising and Collections**
There are currently 144 collection endowments for the University Libraries for a wide range of disciplines and Special Collections.

Other development funds such as the For the Future Fund, discretionary funds, and portions of accompanying named librarianships and chairs are also used for collections.

Collection gifts and endowments hold a central piece of the library’s priorities in the university’s campaign, which began in July 2016. While the Libraries welcome unrestricted endowments, many of the campaign priorities for collections focus on underfunded or new areas of research and strategic directions of the university.

**Material types**

The Libraries purchase materials in a variety of formats, primarily physical, electronic, digital, and microform. Below is a brief list of material types we acquire, which is by no means exhaustive.

- *Books - Fiction/Non-Fiction/Textbooks*
- *Journals*
- *Newspapers*
- *Databases*
- *Cartographic maps*
- *Sound recordings*
- *Music scores*
- *Media*
- *Streaming video*
- *Art Museum exhibitions/ catalogs*
- *Conferences/Proceedings*
- *Juvenile fiction / picture books*
- *Atlases (Geographical, Nautical and Astronomical)*
- *Computer files, includes data sets*
- *Educational Kits*
- *Special Collections*
- *Encyclopedias, Dictionaries and other general reference books*

**Other expenditures**

**Equipment** - the item must be part of the circulating/reference collection. (i.e: calculators, globes, models, educational kits)

**Commercial Binding** - a long-term preventative preservation strategy which extends the life of books and periodicals (supports and protects), deters theft of single periodicals and keeps books in one physical piece.
ILL - interlibrary loan charges including document delivery fees for items that must be ordered quickly for special request.

Part 3. Where – Libraries at Penn State

This section lists the libraries who have separate budgets for collections and the campus libraries supported by the University Park collections budget, and describes what the libraries pay for jointly.

a. These four libraries have separate budgets, but share costs for some materials such as databases and journals:

   University Libraries
   Hershey Medical
   Penn State Law
   Dickinson Law

There are cooperative agreements to share database costs. Currently the Libraries maintain cooperative funding for eight databases. Penn State Hershey collaboratively supports partial renewal costs of over 558 electronic journals and databases at ~$1.61M annually. The Dickinson Law and Penn State Law libraries support university-wide access to more than 2,000 law and law-related journals and 120 databases in excess of $400,000 annually. Ten university departments reimburse costs to the Libraries at ~$80,000 annually. These are:

   Alumni Association
   Behrend's Black School of Business
   Dept. of Energy and Mineral Engineering
   Dept. of Geography
   Dept. of Political Science
   EMS/Office of the Associate Dean for Graduate Education and Research
   Office of the President
   Penn State Institutes of Energy and Environment
   Pennsylvania College of Technology
   Smeal College of Business

b. The centralized collections budget for University Libraries at University Park is used to purchase materials for the following:

   Architecture & Landscape Architecture Library
   Arts and Humanities Library
   Donald W. Hamer Maps Library
   Earth and Mineral Sciences Library
   Education and Behavioral Sciences Library
   Engineering Library
   Life Sciences Library
Part 4. When – the annual calendar of budgetary events

This section describes the fiscal year events for the collections budget.

Fiscal Calendar

July

Fiscal Year closeout
- Open orders rolled-over for new Fiscal Year (FY)
- Budget lines closed

New Year startup
- Information from university on state funds for collections available
- Information on new endowment and carryover gift and endowment funds
- Preliminary allocations entered into system
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• Ordering can begin
• 15th Deadline for journal cancellations must be completed

August
• Final allocations completed (if state has a budget)

September
• Documentation for selectors on previous FY budgeting completed

October
• Quarterly review of large item wants list by Joint Collections Group (JCG), formerly the Collection Services Advisory Group (CSAG)
• Journal renewals authorized

November
• Endowed funds must be 50% committed

January
• Quarterly review of large item wants list by JCG
• Endowed funds must be 70% committed
• 31st Deadline for Asian and non-European orders
• Rolling review for journal subscriptions begins

March
• Deadline for new print journal subscription
• 15th Deadline for non-domestic and European orders

April
• Quarterly review and prioritization of large item wants list by JCG
• Deadline for electronic resource orders (databases, journals, packages)
• 15th Endowed funds must be 110% committed
• 15th Average Inflation rates available from Library Journal

May
• Deadline for state funds for books 105% committed
• 12th uncommitted state funds pooled for reserve

June
• Inflation planning for rolling review of journal subscriptions finalized
• 30th Deadline all book and endowed funds fully expended

Part 5. Challenges

This section briefly describes challenges that affect the collection budget in adverse ways.

1. Inflation – has been averaging 4-6% for the last few years.

In the past, we have considered inflation increases on books as “loss of purchasing power” and have not taken them into account in calculating predicted inflation of the collection budget. If we include the monograph and approval lines as an inflation factor instead of "loss of purchasing
power," an additional inflation factor of 4% would add another $105,536 to the predicted inflation total for this fiscal year found in the Information section.

In recent years the library has been able to cover most of the increased costs primarily through annual journal cancellations, primarily in STEM fields. (Academic journal prices in STEM fields have risen more than 400% in the past 20 years. These huge increases in costs have occurred at the same time as the proliferation of new titles across all academic fields. Thus the portion of the library collections budget available for monographs has decreased because of the increased spending on journals. The number of subscriptions we are able to support has also decreased, so we are spending more money for fewer titles, including both journals and monographs.)

2. Publisher and vendor price increases – these are at the discretion of the publisher/vendor. See price increases in the WRDS example under #8 below.

3. Size of institution - subscription prices for databases, journals, and e-books are based on number of FTE students and faculty, and sometimes on number of campuses.

4. Flat or stagnant budgets - in years where the budget does not include an increase for inflation, or does not increase over multiple years affects the amount of things we can buy or subscribe to when their price is increasing.

5. Ever increasing numbers of students and faculty - affects licensing costs and agreements.

6. Pricing increases as materials move from print to electronic formats.

7. Streaming media - more and more films are available only via streaming services with pricing and licenses similar to subscriptions to journals, databases and e-books - based on FTE of students and faculty, not on the limited number of students who need to use for course work.

8. Licenses and license limitations, including bundling - Publishers no longer sell libraries journals, databases, or e-books; they license access to these items. Licenses often limit access to specific IP addresses and for restricted numbers of users. If we want to buy access to these things, we are limited to the access the publishers allow. Publishers also ‘bundle’ groups of journals or databases together and require multi-year license agreements. These lock up significant portions of a library’s budget and when the budget is flat, it is difficult to purchase other materials. Publishers may also modify license agreements in ways that make certain products excessively expensive. For example, Wharton Research Data Services (WRDS) and Standard & Poors (S&P) notified University Libraries that they were terminating our license agreement for WRDS and Compustat as of 12/31/16. The new agreement, based on business school accreditation, would require that University Libraries agree to four separate licenses for University Park, Behrend, Harrisburg, and Great Valley rather than the one license for which we had been paying. Over four years, the new agreement would have resulted in price increases of over $400,000.

9. STEM and Open Access - In the past 20 years, primarily STEM journal publishers (but not entirely STEM), have been increasing prices for subscriptions by more than 400%.
Because of this and some of the other challenges mentioned here, the Open Access movement has rallied for changes in scholarly publishing processes.

10. **Preservation** - these are the costs for maintaining the health and welfare of not only our print collections, but ensuring access to digitized materials into the future.

11. **New fields and increasing interdisciplinary fields** - academia is increasingly more interdisciplinary and new fields of knowledge are appearing regularly. This means new journals, databases and books to add to the fields for which we are already purchasing materials.

12. **Strategic initiatives** - new initiatives often require that the library acquire materials in fields where we have small or non-existent collections.

13. **World Campus** - providing access to library materials across the globe means adding licensing costs for more students and more IP addresses.

### Part 6. Opportunities

This section briefly describes opportunities that may affect the collection budget in positive ways.

1. **Open Access Journals** – there are now, and we will continue to see the rise of more high quality open access journals. As faculty take back control of the dissemination of their output the cost of journals will eventually be more reasonable.

2. **Open Access Repositories** – institutional and other repositories such as ScholarSphere and arXiv offer alternative forms of access to scholarly output.

3. **University Press and Library Collaborations** – as with our own Penn State Press these types of collaborations between libraries and presses and with faculty authors will explore new and more open avenues for scholarly output.

4. **Streaming Media** – In November 2015, the Libraries’ acting head of social sciences initiated a patron driven acquisitions model for on-demand streaming videos for educational institutions via Kanopy. The pilot began with two subject packages: Indigenous Studies (658 films) and LGBT (330 films). In June, the success of the program saw the addition of access to Global Studies / Languages and Social Science packages activated for Penn State. In total, patrons have access to 16,900 on-demand educational films streamed via Kanopy PDA but the University Libraries only purchases films used by patrons when the film is viewed four or more times.

### Information

This section provides tables, graphs, charts and other representations used to describe the money we have to spend, the resources we spend it on, the vendors we purchase the most from and the subject area cost and projected pricing break downs. The budget numbers are for the collections budget for University Park and Campus libraries and excludes the medical and law school libraries. The medical and law schools library budget information ends this section.

### Databases
We begin the section with a focus on the more than 800 databases to which the Libraries subscribe. In the past 25 years indexing and abstracting of information of standard reference works, such as handbooks and encyclopedias, and new forms of meta-information resources such as chemical structure searching resources are all available in digital format collectively called ‘databases’ in library jargon. The migration began even earlier with dial up services such as STN and Dialog, and transfer of information to searchable CD-Roms. We are now in a position where a large portion of the collections budget is spent on databases ($4.77M / 27% this FY). They range in subscription cost from hundreds of dollars per year, to a hundred thousand plus per year. Many are difficult to sort into neat subject areas because they cross multiple areas of research, and others are hard to describe by format because they may offer indexing, abstracting, full-text, and full image.

Many of our databases have been chosen over the years through a multi-subject representative group of selectors with an eye on supporting research, teaching, and general education needs. Selectors support new database subscriptions from their assigned pots of funding. New resources are optimally supported with permanent funds, however, we do pay for on-going commitments with temporary funds and seek renewal support annually. If a desired resource exceeds an individual group’s funding capabilities, Selectors will seek collaborative support from other Collection Development Groups, Commonwealth Campus Libraries and/or cooperative agreements with other University departments. Currently 19 resources are supported collaboratively within our group structure; Hershey collaboratively provides annual support for 11 resources; the law libraries collaborate partial funding for one resource. If collaborative support does not materialize, the Selector will submit the needed resource to the Wants List for committee consideration.

Funding support for existing databases has come from a variety of sources. Since the late 1990’s through 2012/13, the Libraries’ collections budgets were fortunate to receive annual increases to our permanent Base/IT1001. Balances not required to offset inflation from these annual increases were allocated to the Collection Development Groups to support database resources. As databases became more prevalent, Selectors were often able to cancel print continuations that duplicated electronic content. Internal redistribution of funds remains a common practice.

We have a project underway to add data elements to our renewal records for databases to enhance reporting granularity. Once this is complete we will be able to report on various factors such as numbers and costs of databases supporting different areas of research.

2015/16 Databases by General Subject Grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Subscription Cost</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>$2,099,848</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>$623,404</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$499,436</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>$367,675</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>$334,479</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$282,312</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This pie chart portrays data from the preceding table, titled "2015/16 Databases by General Subject Grouping"

**Collection Budget – By sources of funding for the most recent five years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>State appropriation</th>
<th>Student Tech Fee</th>
<th>TEMP reallocation from PSUL operations</th>
<th>TEMP From Univ. Administration</th>
<th>Endowments</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>$9,490,106</td>
<td>$4,258,000</td>
<td>$1,168,039</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$964,749</td>
<td>$16,012,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>$9,490,106</td>
<td>$4,516,608</td>
<td>$1,186,800</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$964,706</td>
<td>$16,295,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>$9,490,106</td>
<td>$4,516,608</td>
<td>$960,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$970,660</td>
<td>$16,035,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>$9,490,106</td>
<td>$4,866,608</td>
<td>$751,912</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,309,032</td>
<td>$16,495,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>$9,490,106</td>
<td>$4,866,608</td>
<td>$1,824,924</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,305,944</td>
<td>$17,590,925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inflation**
Five years of our projected inflation based on *Library Journal* percentage estimations for inflation on books and journals. Represents increase over the previous FY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Inflation</th>
<th>Base Increase</th>
<th>Resource Cancellations</th>
<th>Collections' Redistribution</th>
<th>Soft Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>$533,593</td>
<td>$124,462</td>
<td>$111,586</td>
<td>$113,114</td>
<td>$308,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>$582,884</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$126,015</td>
<td>$52,009</td>
<td>$404,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>$697,817</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$55,908</td>
<td>$179,909</td>
<td>$462,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top five expenditure sources for 2015/16**

- Ebsco Information Services – *vendor for the majority of our journals* $3,074,685
- Elsevier – *journals, ebooks* $3,329,852
- Big Ten Academic Alliance – *membership gives us discounted prices on a variety of materials. This amount is for the resources we purchase through the BTAA agreements.* $1,695,942
- YBP Library Services – *vendor for print books and ebooks* $1,543,972
- Otto Harrassowitz – *journals, books (Springer/Taylor & Francis)* $1,057,733

**Numbers of materials in the University Libraries**

- Total *titles* added to catalog prior to 7/1/2016 is 5,993,071
- Total *items* in the libraries collections as of 7/1/2016 is 9,090,786 (this includes all volumes in a set, all bound volumes for journals, and so forth)

Some breakdowns of a few material types in the catalog as of 7/1/2016:

- Total books, 3,289,834
- Total serials and periodicals, 1,277,148
- Total online items, 2,568,240
- Total microforms, 912,783
- Total archives materials cataloged, 228,454
- Total dissertations, 43,329
- Total master’s theses, 52,533
- Total musical scores, 72,265

Expenditures for fiscal year 2015/2016 by material types (not all materials are included)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Type</th>
<th>2015/16 Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books: print</td>
<td>$1,614,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books: electronic</td>
<td>$733,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals: print</td>
<td>$795,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals: electronic</td>
<td>$7,782,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers: print (electronic are part of Databases)</td>
<td>$34,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>$5,564,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartographic maps</td>
<td>$1,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound recordings</td>
<td>$11,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music scores</td>
<td>$47,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video streaming</td>
<td>$143,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVDs</td>
<td>$80,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile fiction / picture books</td>
<td>$23,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Kits</td>
<td>$2,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collections</td>
<td>$590,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopedias, Dictionaries and other general reference books</td>
<td>$49,348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015/16 University Park Campus Expenditures by general subject areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>$5,211,164</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This pie chart portrays data from the preceding table, titled 2015/16 University Park Campus Expenditures by general subject areas.
The above bar chart shows Fiscal Year Expenditures by funding source. Funding sources include the base funding which is our allocation from the university and the libraries portion of the students IT fee, endowed funding, gifts and State Library Services (SLS) funds.

**Other sources for materials available to Penn State through memberships and other arrangements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memberships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association for Information Science and Technology membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. Membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European consortium for political research membership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Center for Research Libraries membership.


LOCKSS alliance membership

Counter membership

CLOCKSS membership

**HathiTrust** currently provides us with 2,511,128 full-view titles. The number of full-view volumes is 5,347,429. The number of volumes in HathiTrust contributed by Penn State is 390,193. Of these, 226,804 are full-view. Penn State, as a member of the Big Ten Alliance, annually renews our participation (paid for operationally, 2015/16 cost $38,013).

Penn State, as a member of the CIC, participated in the **Google Book Scanning Project** from 2006 – 2014. Nearly ½ million books were shipped, digitized and returned to University Libraries over the course of the project. Selection for digitization was based on lists produced by Google that identified titles in Penn State’s collection not already included in the Google corpus. The digital files are now included in HathiTrust. The Libraries’ catalog displays both Google and HathiTrust emblems indicating snippet or full view digital access for those books.

**Materials stored off-site**

Approximately 17% of University Libraries’ tangible collections, including the collections of Law, Medicine and Commonwealth Campus Libraries, are held at three off-site shelving facilities collectively known as **The Annex**. Materials in every format are selected for inclusion at the shelving facilities based on low demand. Requests for books and articles are delivered daily Monday-Friday either digitally or via campus mail to University Park faculty offices, or a library pick up location at any campus. Expect a turnaround time for delivery between 24-48 hours.

**Library Journal AVERAGE 2016 PRICE FOR SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>AVERAGE PRICE PER TITLE</th>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>AVERAGE PRICE PER TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>$5,105</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>$2,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4,508</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>2,221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table is from the magazine Library Journal. It lists the average journal subscription price for 2016, for Science, Technology, Engineering and Math journals. The prices range from the highest, Chemistry at $5,105 to Agriculture at $1,687.

**Library Journal 2016 Average journal subscription prices for online journals in ISI indexes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>AVERAGE PRICE PER TITLE</th>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>AVERAGE PRICE PER TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>$4,712</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>$942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4,180</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>2,665</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2,431</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>General Works</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>Library Science</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: LJ PERIODICALS PRICE SURVEY 2016
This table is from the magazine Library Journal. It lists the average journal subscription price for 2016, for online journals from ISI indexes. The prices range from the highest, Chemistry journals subscription price is at $4,712 to Music at $334, average annual subscription cost. It lists the total average cost at $1,486.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>1,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Science</td>
<td>1,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military &amp; Naval Science</td>
<td>1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Religion</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; Literature</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AVERAGE COST</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,486</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prices represent print-plus-free-online, online-only, and the first tier of tiered pricing

SOURCE: LJ PERIODICALS PRICE SURVEY 2016

Flowchart from budget allocation to materials available for use
The flow chart above moves through the following steps: State and endowment money added to the budget, flows to Collections budget allocated to Subject Liaisons, flows to Liaisons choose materials to purchase OR respond to requests from faculty and students, flows to Acquisitions purchases or subscribes to materials, flows to Materials arrive physically in the library or digital access is turned on, flows to Information about the materials are added to the catalog by catalogers, flows to Materials are placed on the library shelves - paperbacks sent to bindery.
catalogers, and ends at Materials are placed on the library shelves – paperbacks are sent to the bindery.

Medical Library Budget Report

Penn State College of Medicine
Harrell Health Sciences Library: Research and Learning Commons

Introduction:

The Harrell Health Sciences Library (Harrell HSL), located within the Penn State College of Medicine and the Penn State Health Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, is the health sciences library for Penn State University. As such, the primary focus of collection development is the health and biomedical sciences. The library reports administratively to the Dean of University Libraries while also reporting to the Vice Dean for Educational Affairs, Penn State College of Medicine, resulting in a dual reporting structure. The Harrell HSL has a Memorandum of Understanding in place that describes the partnership between the Penn State College of Medicine and the Penn State University Libraries. The library retains a separate cost center with the budget originating through the COM. All direct costs associated with managing the Harrell HSL, including the collections budget, are a component of the budget determined by the Dean of the College of Medicine.

Revenue Sources:

As a cost center within the College of Medicine (COM), the library’s funding is derived from a variety of revenue streams. Academic support for the COM includes revenues from the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center (HMC) for services, the HMC Fixed Support Payment, the Dean’s percentage of professional clinical revenue, tuition and fees, a University contribution, lease income, investment income, and endowment returns. The Harrell HSL also has a small gift fund used to support symposia, sponsored speakers, professional development and other types of unfunded opportunities as well as occasional grants.

Development & Fundraising:

The Harrell HSL is currently working with Development & Alumni Relations staff in Hershey, PA, to develop a campaign in support of the Harrell HSL Renovation. Long-term the Harrell HSL has plans to build an endowment to support collections.

Roles and Responsibilities:

Administration & Finance

Administration of the library’s budget falls under the Director of the Harrell HSL, the Vice Dean for Educational Affairs, and the Dean of the College of Medicine. The Director oversees the budget and delegates responsibility for the collections budget to the Collection Development & Digital Resources Management Librarian.
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Collection Management

The Collection Development & Digital Resources Management Librarian, in partnership with the Collection Access & Support Services Librarian, is responsible for selecting library materials, managing electronic resources, responding to access issues, working with vendors and publishers, and working closely with the University Libraries Acquisition Services to procure and pay for resources. The collection management librarians also maintain the scoped database list and the eJournal list on the Harrell HSL website. The Harrell HSL maintains an active liaison program. Primary functions of the liaison program include: intelligence gathering, engagement and outreach; marketing, promotion and advocacy; and collection building. In their role as liaisons, faculty librarians serve as selectors in their assigned areas of responsibility, providing recommendations and input to the Collection Development & Digital Resources Management Librarian.

The Harrell HSL relies on the University Libraries Acquisition Services, Cataloging and Metadata Services, while also performing some acquisitions and cataloging functions onsite, and utilizes the Libraries automated systems supported through Libraries Technology (I-Tech) i.e. Serials Solutions, the SIRSI ILS, and the Illiad Interlibrary Loan system, etc. The centralization of these types of support services is both cost effective and efficient.

The Collection Development & Digital Resources Management Librarian is a member of the Collections Services Advisory Group (CSAG) representing the interest of the Harrell HSL. She also serves on ad hoc collections teams as needed in order to facilitate joint collection development efforts. For example, University Libraries provides primary support for the nursing collections across all campuses. The Harrell HSL collaborates in the acquisition of appropriate materials.

Materials Purchased:

The Harrell HSL has a Collection Development Policy (https://hershey.libraries.psu.edu/about/policies/collection-development) that describes in detail the types of material collected (primarily in electronic formats), core subject categories, and efforts to coordinate library purchases in partnership with University Libraries to build collections in the life, health and biomedical sciences. This relationship has allowed the libraries to leverage collection dollars and has proven to be both cost effective and beneficial for Penn State as a whole. By minimizing duplication between the libraries, students, faculty, and staff have access to the broadest range of materials.

The Harrell HSL provides an ILL service on a cost-recovery basis. Lending library charges are passed on to the individual/department requesting documents. ILL staff makes every effort to obtain loans free of charge; reciprocal agreements are in place with partnering Big Ten (CIC) Libraries. The library is a designated Resource Library within the National Networks of Libraries of Medicine and as such is a fully participating member in the NLM DOCLINE system.
The Harrell HSL no longer binds material since the vast majority of the in-scope collection purchased is in electronic format.

Shared Purchasing

The Harrell HSL shares costs for relevant in-scope materials with University Libraries. The library also acquires a subset of resources for Harrell HSL users only. The total collection expenditures in FY 2015/2016 were $1,917,786.43.

Of these expenditures, 86% was expended in support of resources accessible by all Penn State user groups. The remaining 14% of expenditures provided access for Harrell HSL users only to resources specific to the needs of the local campus, its vision and its mission.

In FY 2015/2016, the Harrell HSL contributed 12% of the funds for purchases from the University Libraries top 5 vendors as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>PSUL</th>
<th>Harrell HSL</th>
<th>Percentage Harrell HSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ebsco</td>
<td>$3,571,383.46</td>
<td>$496,698.41</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>$3,996,238.83</td>
<td>$666,386.76</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>$1,818,200.81</td>
<td>$122,258.76</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBP</td>
<td>$1,553,910.84</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrassowitz</td>
<td>$1,228,831.02</td>
<td>$171,097.58</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>$12,168,564.96</td>
<td>$1,456,441.51</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A small portion of the overall library materials budget at the Harrell Health Sciences Library is used for book purchases. The remainder of the materials purchased are various types of electronic materials.

The Harrell Health Sciences Library chooses to support databases that are critical to the four parts of the Penn State College of Medicine and Penn State Health mission:
1. Academic (education)  
2. Clinical  
3. Research  
4. Community Service

A breakdown of the Harrell HSL database expenditures for FY 2015/2016 is shown below, along with the distribution of contributions from University Libraries and the Harrell HSL.

![Harrell Health Sciences Library Database Contributions for FY 2015/2016](image)

**LAW LIBRARIES at PENN STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**FY 2015-2016**

Each of Pennsylvania State University’s two law schools has its own dedicated law library, both bearing the same library name, The H. Laddie Montague, Jr. Law Library. Each law library is co-located within its respective law school:

- Dickinson Law – Located in Katz Hall, 150 S. College St., Carlisle, PA  
- Penn State Law – Located in 214 Katz Building, University Park, PA

The primary focus of collection development for both law libraries is in the fields of United States and international legal and government resources. Each law library reports administratively to the Dean of its respective law school while also reporting to the Dean of University Libraries, resulting in dual reporting structures. A Memorandum of Understanding governs the relationship between the University Libraries and the two law libraries, describing the partnership and collaborative initiatives between the libraries.
SOURCES OF REVENUE

The budgets for the Law Libraries at Dickinson Law and Penn State Law are cost centers within their respective Law Schools. As such, all direct costs of the Law Libraries are a part of the budgets determined by the Deans of their individual schools. Annual Law Library budgets are determined by those deans who serve as the Law School budget executives and are managed by Directors of the respective Law Libraries.

ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

Administration of the Law Library budgets falls within the purview of the Director of each law library, under the oversight of the law school financial officer and dean. Each Law Library director oversees the library budget and delegates responsibility for collection acquisitions and expenditure monitoring to law library faculty or staff as appropriate.

LAW LIBRARY COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

The mission of both H. Laddie Montague, Jr. Law libraries is to support the instructional and research efforts of the Dickinson Law and Penn State Law faculty and students, specifically, and those of the greater Penn State University community, generally, by supplying access to, and support in the use of, all information resources, regardless of format or physical location, needed to support the Schools’ high expectations for teaching excellence and significant scholarly productivity.

Each Law Library director has final responsibility for all law library activities including guidance and oversight of all collection development policies and practices. Both law libraries have designated Acquisitions staff who are responsible for day-to-day selection and acquisition activities including supervision of all standing and blanket orders; service as the law library’s primary liaison with most publishers and information suppliers; and identification, recommendation, and ultimately ordering of new materials deemed to be of interest to school of law researchers. The law libraries liaise closely with each other to identify essential print and digital legal resources for collaborative purchasing, to forge expansive reciprocal resource sharing agreements, and to consult on matters of collection development and policy. Both law libraries coordinate with Penn State University Libraries' Acquisitions Department to regularly assess the appropriate level of collection development cooperation and to evaluate opportunities for resource sharing when it serves the mutual interests of the Schools of Law and the greater University.

ELECTRONIC RESOURCES

The Dickinson Law and Penn State Law libraries support University-wide access to more than 2,000 law and law-related journals, over 172,000 e-books, and 120 databases in excess of $650,000 annually. All of the law libraries’ e-resources are purchased collaboratively with each Law Library contributing a pre-determined share for each acquisition. Generally, the law libraries share costs roughly proportional to enrollment size, currently on a 60% (Penn State Law Library) to 40% (Dickinson Law Library) basis. The University Libraries contributes to the cost of some digital resources with the ratio determined on an ad hoc basis for each title.
The charts below illustrate the total FY 2015-16 expenditures for law and law-related digital resources along with the respective percentage share contributed by each unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL LAW LIBRARY E-RESOURCE EXPENDITURES BY UNIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our main Law Library digital vendors aggregate many types of legal resources, each of which allows us to provide the most comprehensive coverage for our law students, faculty, staff and the University as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law Library E-Resource Expenditures By Vendor</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomberg BNA</td>
<td>$63,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale Cengage</td>
<td>$46,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LexisNexis</td>
<td>$38,251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### % Spent on E-Resources by Vendor - FY 15/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bloomberg BNA</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCH/Wolters Kluwer Law &amp; Business</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale Cengage</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LexisNexis</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NELLCO</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProQuest</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William S. Hein &amp; Co., Inc.</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlaw/Thomson Reuters</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the content provided by each of our main vendors includes:

- **Bloomberg BNA** – Law school access to Bloomberg Law, which includes primary and secondary sources of law, a unique federal and state docket system, company reports, and judge and litigation analytics. University-wide access to the Bloomberg BNA Law Resource Libraries, which includes a collection of more than 200 law related news, analysis, and reference products, providing intensive coverage of legal and regulatory developments and case law covering a wide range of topics.

- **CCH/Wolters Kluwer Law & Business** – University-wide access to the CCH Tax Research, Business & Finance, and Health & Human Resources networks. These networks include access to primary sources of law, as well as research materials on federal, state and international tax materials, mergers and acquisitions, product liability and safety, corporate governance, banking, international business, securities, intellectual property, antitrust and trade regulation, labor and employment, pensions, benefits, and health care compliance and reimbursement.
• **Gale Cengage** – University-wide access to 18th and 19th Century News and other Collections, LegalTrac (an index of most major law reviews, newspapers, journals and law-related articles from general interest publications), and the majority of the Making of Modern Law (MOML) collections. The MOML collections include historical primary sources of law, historical trial resource, historical U.S. Supreme Court records and briefs, and foreign, comparative and international law resources.

• **LexisNexis** – Law school only access to Lexis Advance, which includes primary and secondary sources of law, Lexis legal publications, Lexis Practice Advisor, court documents, dockets, legal news, expert witness materials and public records.

• **NELLCO** – The NELLCO Consortium is an international consortium of law libraries that provides discounts on several legal resources offered by various vendors. Through NELLCO, we have access to Fastcase and the Loislaw Treatise Library, Ravel Law and Judicial Analytics, the Index to Legal Periodicals and Books, the Current Index to Legal Periodicals, and Investor-State Law Guide.


• **ProQuest** – University-wide access to ProQuest Congressional, which includes indices and abstracts of congressional publications back to 1789, including full text of congressional hearings, full text Committee Prints, full text Congressional Research Service (CRS) Reports, and legislative histories, and ProQuest Legislative Insight, which includes full-text PDF versions of publications generated by the United States Congress during the legislative process from 1836 to the present.

• **Westlaw/Thomson Reuters** – Law school access to Westlaw, which includes primary and secondary sources of law, Practical Law, Thomson Reuter legal publications, court documents, dockets, legal news and expert witness resources. University-wide access to Westlaw China and Checkpoint access to Tax and Estate planning materials.

• **William S. Hein & Co., Inc.** – University-wide access to Hein Online, which provides the full text of over 200 legal journals from their inception; includes databases for U.S. agency, Congressional, Presidential, Supreme Court and foreign relations documents, reports and texts.

• **Other Vendors** – University-wide access to many other legal resource databases and publications, such as the International Chamber of Commerce Dispute Resolution Library, ALM Legal Publications, various U.S. and International Legal Journals, and LLMC Digital, which provides full-text access to a vast collection of legal literature and government documents, including U.S. federal executive, legislative, and judicial materials.

While some content overlaps, the main benefit of providing content from so many different vendors is that each provides its own editorial enhancements, such as commentary, annotations,
and analysis so that our users are given a wide variety of options for researching the law, its origins, and its interpretations.

**LAW LIBRARY COLLECTION EXPENDITURES 2015-16**

During FY 2015-16, in combination the Dickinson Law Library and the Penn State Law Library expended $1,447,945 to acquire print and digital collections that further the teaching and research missions of both law schools and Penn State University.

The following pie chart depicts how total expenditures are allocated among various types of materials: electronic resources (43%), print serials and journals (52%), print books (4%), microforms (1%), and nonprint media (0%). The final two charts provide dollar amounts of expenditures in each separate law library, broken down by material type.

### DICKINSON LAW LIBRARY COLLECTION EXPENDITURES 2015-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIAL TYPE</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books (Print)</td>
<td>$32,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials, including journals (Print)</td>
<td>$373,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microforms</td>
<td>$5,189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INFLATION
Assuming the overall composition of the law collections and the law libraries’ acquisitions strategies remain constant, this table highlights an areas of serious concern. Inflation in our primary collection areas remained relatively static from 2011 through 2014, with a substantial spike in 2015. While the overall rate of increase from 2011 through 2015 averages out to 8.48%, it is clear that if 2015 marks the beginning of a new trend in inflation rates, the law libraries will face significant challenges to remain within budgetary constraints in future years.

INFLATION – LEGAL PUBLISHING*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Law Periodicals Per Title Price Increase</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>4.89%</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
<td><strong>18.10%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.95%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Legal Serials Services Price Increase</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>11.30%</td>
<td><strong>13.90%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.64%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Online Serials (Law) Price Increase</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td><strong>13.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.84%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Data extracted from the Library Materials Price Index (LMPI) compiled by the Association for Library Collections & Technical Services, a division of the American Library Association.

**CONCLUSION**
Data offered throughout this report illustrates that Law and Medicine combined, contribute approximately 20% of the overall expenditures for collections across Penn State University. Unquestionably, the collections of these two specialized libraries in the fields of law, health and biomedical sciences contribute significant value to all of Penn State University.

**Discussion and Conclusion**
State the implications for the faculty.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON OUTREACH

Online Education at Penn State

(Informational)

Section I: The History of Online Education at Penn State

Penn State University was one of the nation’s first higher education institutions to offer online courses for credit. Prior to the age of high speed internet absorption, however, Penn State was also a pioneer in other alternative course methods, beginning in 1892 with the offering of correspondence courses. (See http://www.worldcampus.psu.edu/degrees-and-certificates for Penn State’s initial correspondence course. Also, see Crotty, J. Distance Learning Has Been Around Since 1892 You Big MOOC. Forbes, 11/12/12.) It is, therefore, unsurprising that online courses existed before 1998 when the World Campus was launched, well before the majority of other universities offered similar virtual methods. Penn State’s World Campus has become a leader in both breadth and depth with respect to both online courses taken for credit and entire degree programs, both undergraduate and graduate. Online education has also been incorporated into Penn State for resident students as well. According to the 2016 ECAR study, 57% of Penn State’s residential undergraduate students took at least one online course as part of their undergraduate experience (D. Christopher Brooks. ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology, 2016. Research report. Louisville, CO: ECAR, October 2016).

Section II: Current Online Offerings at Penn State

There are several alternative online delivery methods and forms currently available at Penn State University, and they can best be described as (i) Resident “Web” Courses, (ii) Penn State World Campus courses, (iii) Digital Learning Cooperative courses, (iv) Hybrid courses and (v) Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). This report will focus on “Web,” Penn State World Campus, and Digital Learning Cooperative courses; however, a brief description of Hybrid courses and MOOCs is also included below.

Resident “Web” Courses

Resident “Web” courses are classes that meet 100% online (no face-to-face meeting) and are offered by a specific Penn State campus for that campus' residential student population on its own Schedule of Courses. These courses are identified in LionPATH by indicating “WEB” as their room location.

Figure 1 is a sample of “Web” classes offered at Penn State’s Harrisburg campus in the Fall of 2016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Days &amp; Times</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Meeting Dates</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 332 - Accounting Information and Decision Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Days &amp; Times</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Meeting Dates</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30013</td>
<td>001-LEC</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>Lydia Didla</td>
<td>08/22/2016 - 12/09/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 572 - Financial Reporting I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Days &amp; Times</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Meeting Dates</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5227</td>
<td>001-LEC</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>Thomas Amlie</td>
<td>08/22/2016 - 12/09/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMST 105 - American Popular Culture and Folklore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Days &amp; Times</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Meeting Dates</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16528</td>
<td>003K-LEC</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>Annamarie O'Brien</td>
<td>08/22/2016 - 12/09/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMST 196 - Introduction to American Folklore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Days &amp; Times</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Meeting Dates</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16548</td>
<td>002K-IND</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>Lasley Ham</td>
<td>08/22/2016 - 12/09/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 45 - Cultural Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Days &amp; Times</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Meeting Dates</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29027</td>
<td>001-LEC</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>Anne Marie Houser</td>
<td>08/22/2016 - 12/09/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 146 - North American Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Days &amp; Times</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Meeting Dates</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16538</td>
<td>001V-LEC</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>Bianca Gentil</td>
<td>08/22/2016 - 12/09/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3 - Visual Images on the Web</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Days &amp; Times</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Meeting Dates</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>001V-LEC</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>Jerrold Maddox</td>
<td>08/22/2016 - 12/09/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRO 1 - Astronomical Universe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Days &amp; Times</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Meeting Dates</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20474</td>
<td>005V-LEC</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>Jane Charlton</td>
<td>08/22/2016 - 12/09/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 401 - General Biochemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Penn State World Campus

Penn State World Campus is the delivery mechanism which allows the academic programs from the colleges and campuses to be offered to students nationally and internationally. Penn State World Campus was launched in 1998 with the mission of serving non-residential Penn State students from across the country and beyond who are not able to study at one of our physical campus locations due to work/life obligations by offering online courses and online certificate and degree programs. The Penn State World Campus mission focuses on convenience, flexibility, and quality in delivering accredited coursework. Although the original focus of Penn State World Campus was meeting the needs of adult learners, as online education expands its reach the Penn State World Campus student population has grown to include traditional age students as well. With the launch of five programs in 1998, today Penn State World Campus has grown to be one of the nation’s largest online university platforms. In total, over 130 degree programs and certificates at both the undergraduate and graduate level are currently offered, serving more than 17,000 students who called World Campus their “home” campus during the 2015-16 academic year. Students from all 50 U.S. states, 85 foreign countries and seven continents have been enrolled at Penn State World Campus.

Unless otherwise restricted by the offering academic unit, courses offered through Penn State World Campus are also open to current Penn State students who are affiliated with either University Park or one of the Commonwealth campuses (i.e., “resident instruction students”); however, priority is given to World Campus students in registering for its courses. Resident education students are typically able to register for a Penn State World Campus course one week before the course begins.

At Penn State, we are truly one University geographically distributed. Here “a course is a course” and “a degree is a degree.” There is no notation on a student’s transcript that indicates whether a course was taken online via Penn State World Campus, and students who earn degrees through Penn State World Campus receive the same diplomas as those that physically attend class on one of our other campus locations. All programs offered by the University (including those offered through Penn State World Campus) are accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (see www.msche.org). One additional source of competitive advantage belonging to Penn State World Campus is that the tuition rates paid by World Campus undergraduate students are set at a standard rate (typically the same rate as in-state tuition), no matter where the student lives. In the 2016-2017 academic year, per-credit undergraduate World Campus tuition is $542-$584 depending on the student’s seniority status.

Table 1 includes all Penn State World Campus Bachelor’s Degree offerings as of the end of 2016. In addition to these 31 degree options, Penn State World Campus also offers six Associates Degrees and 17 undergraduate certifications. Table 2 includes all Penn State World Campus Master’s Degree offerings as of the end of 2016. In addition to these 37 degree options, Penn State World Campus also offers 48 graduate certificates and one doctoral degree (Nursing).
<p>| Accounting                                      |
| Advertising/Public Relations - Strategic Communications Option |
| Agribusiness Management                        |
| Biobehavioral Health                            |
| Business                                       |
| Criminal Justice                               |
| Digital Multimedia Design                      |
| Economics (Bachelor of Arts)                   |
| Economics (Bachelor of Science)                |
| Energy and Sustainability Policy (Bachelor of Arts) |
| Energy and Sustainability Policy (Bachelor of Science) |
| Finance                                       |
| Health Policy and Administration               |
| Human Development and Family Studies           |
| Information Sciences and Technology            |
| Integrated Social Sciences                     |
| International Politics                        |
| Labor and Employment Relations (Bachelor of Arts) |
| Labor and Employment Relations (Bachelor of Science) |
| Law and Society                                |
| Letters, Arts, and Sciences                    |
| Marketing                                      |
| Nursing                                       |
| Organizational Leadership (Bachelor of Arts)   |
| Organizational Leadership (Bachelor of Science) |
| Political Science (Bachelor of Arts)           |
| Political Science (Bachelor of Science)        |
| Psychology (Bachelor of Arts)                  |
| Psychology (Bachelor of Science)               |
| Security and Risk Analysis                     |
| Turfgrass Science                              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2—World Campus Masters Degree Offerings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Demography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration - MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analytics – Business Analytics Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geodesign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Information Systems - GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Policy and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security Base Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security – Agricultural Biosecurity and Food Defense Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security – Geospatial Intelligence Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security – Information Security and Forensics Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security – Public Health Preparedness Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources and Employment Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sciences – Cybersecurity and Information Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning, Design, and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Learning and Adult Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritional Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Development and Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology of Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy and Sustainability Systems - Bioenergy Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy and Sustainability Systems - Solar Energy Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy and Sustainability Systems - Sustainability Management and Policy Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy and Sustainability Systems - Wind Energy Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy and Sustainability Systems Base Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Chain Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turfgrass Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Digital Learning Cooperative

The Digital Learning Cooperative (DLC) is a mechanism for sharing online, hybrid, and interactive video-delivered courses across Penn State’s physical campus locations that is managed through the Office of the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses. The DLC is not connected to Penn State World Campus, even though many of its courses are offered 100% online (see dlc.psu.edu). The DLC provides an enrollment reservation system where one campus can make “seats” in one of its courses available to other campus locations.

Campuses and colleges have made use of the DLC in order to:

- Provide other campuses’ students with access to minors or electives within their majors within the first two years of their programs;
- Offer course capacity in under-enrolled courses to other campus locations in order to increase enrollment;
- Implement single or multi-term/semester course sharing agreements;
- Provide students with courses they need to make progress in their major to help them avoid a required change of campus location;
- Support individual student needs (via guidance from advisors) so that students can take the best mix of courses for their programs; and
- Coordinate the delivery of courses as part of programs delivered as a consortium between campuses and colleges (See http://dlc.psu.edu/).

Hybrid Courses

Hybrid courses are defined by Penn State as those that combine “Web” and traditional face-to-face classroom instruction. Hybrid courses are organized to reduce or replace the number of required face-to-face class sessions in order to improve effectiveness and flexibility for instructors and students and/or to achieve other efficiencies. Hybrid courses reduce by approximately 40% or more of the number of required classroom sessions, although some classroom sessions are required (See https://weblearning.psu.edu/resources/penn-state-online-resources/glossary/).

MOOCs

Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) can be defined as “a model for delivering learning content online to any person who wants to take a course, with no limit on attendance” (definition from http://www.educause.edu). The general goal of MOOCs is to provide open access to educational experiences across the globe. At Penn State, MOOCs have been offered since 2013 through Coursera (http://www.coursera.org/psu). Beginning in Spring 2017, it will also be possible to offer a MOOC through FutureLearn (http://www.futurelearn.com). Currently, Penn State offers the following MOOCs:

- Epidemics: The Dynamics of Infectious Diseases (Eberly College of Science)
- Maps and the Geospatial Revolution (College of Earth and Mineral Sciences)
- Dairy Production and Management (College of Agricultural Sciences)
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- Creativity, Innovation and Change (College of Engineering)
- Geodesign: Change Your World (College of Arts and Architecture)
- Energy, the Environment, and Our Future (College of Earth and Mineral Sciences)

It should be noted that MOOCs cannot be taken for course credit at Penn State. Penn State has offered MOOCs as a strategy to stay relevant in the market for online education, to increase the University's global brand, and to attract students to Penn State resident and online programs. MOOCs also provide a way for students to become reacquainted with material that they may have not had for some time without adding a significant burden to their educational expenses or time to degree.

Section III: Budget Models for Resident “Web,” Penn State World Campus, and Digital Learning Cooperative courses

Resident Web Budget Model

Tuition for Resident “Web” courses is handled in the same manner that tuition is handled for face-to-face resident courses. In other words, for the purpose of budgeting, student credit hours generated by enrollments in “Web” courses are not considered any differently than student credit hours generated by face-to-face courses.

Penn State World Campus Budget Model

Penn State World Campus is the University’s self-supporting online education delivery unit, governed by University policy AD 55 (http://guru.psu.edu/policies/AD55.html) Unlike “Web” courses, tuition generated by enrollments in Penn State World Campus-delivered courses is considered “new” revenue that is shared between the World Campus and the academic units who provide the course content and instruction.

The Penn State World Campus revenue sharing policy was established by the University Task Force on Gross Revenue Sharing Models for World Campus: Final Report, January 31, 2011. “The purpose of the policy is to define revenue distribution categories (RDC) that ensure the long-term viability of World Campus and maximize discretionary revenue to Academic Partners. There are three categories (RDC-1, RDC-2, and SAVE) based on who takes primary responsibility for course development and instructional design. Penn State World Campus has no faculty of its own nor is it considered an academic unit. It partners with academic units, who, for all programs under RDC-1, RDC-2, and SAVE, hire, pay, and evaluate all faculty who develop and teach Penn State World Campus-delivered courses.” (See the Penn State World Campus Administrative Manual, https://weblearning.psu.edu/world-campus/working-with-the-world-campus/.) During the 2015-16 academic year $80.9M in revenue generated through World Campus was shared with the Colleges and Campuses. (See the Penn State World Campus Profit and Loss Statement 2015-16).

Digital Learning Cooperative Budget Model

Courses offered through the DLC follow the standard University tuition model for the campus that is offering the course. It is possible for the campus offering the course to charge a fee of $65 per student per credit hour to a campus which has reserved a seat (e.g., one student enrolled in a three-credit course would translate into a $195 fee). This fee helps the offering campus defray costs
associated with offering the course. Whether or not to charge a fee is determined by the campus offering the course. (See http://dlc.psu.edu.)

Section IV: Overview of College and Campuses that Offer Online Courses
Penn State colleges and campuses deliver courses online either through Penn State World Campus or as a “Web” course. The Colleges of Agricultural Sciences, Earth and Mineral Sciences, Information Sciences and Technology, the College of Health and Human Development, the College of Communications, the College of Engineering, the College of the Liberal Arts, Arts and Architecture, Eberly College of Science, Smeal College of Business, Penn State Great Valley, Penn State Altoona, Penn State Berks, Penn State Abington, Penn State Behrend, Penn State Harrisburg and University College all have extensive online course and program offerings, with their own fully developed administrative units and faculty support structures to help them oversee their online courses and programs.

Section V: Overview of University Resources Providing Faculty Support for Hybrid and Online Education
There are a variety of support services available to provide faculty support and development for online education, with several providing support for the entire University. (See https://weblearning.psu.edu/learning-design-support-at-penn-state/) These include:

- Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence;
- World Campus Learning Design, Outreach and Online Education;
- Education Technology Services, Teaching and Learning with Technology;
- ITS Training Services, Teaching and Learning with Technology; and
- The Clearinghouse for Military Family Readiness.

In addition, most colleges and campuses employ professional instructional designers (also referred to as learning designers) to provide support to faculty interested in developing and/or teaching hybrid and online courses. Additionally, some Colleges and Campuses have created centers and institutes to support their online programs, including:

- The Center for Teaching & Learning, Penn State Berks;
- Centers for Teaching and eLearning Initiatives, Penn State Erie;
- Office of Digital Learning, Eberly College of Science;
- e-Learning Institute, College of Arts and Architecture;
- eLearning, College of Agricultural Sciences;
- Dutton e-Education Institute, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences;
- Faculty Center, Penn State Harrisburg;
- Learning Design, College of Information Sciences and Technology;
- Outreach Office, College of Health and Human Development;
- eLearning Design and Innovation Group (eLDIG), Smeal College of Business;
- Instructional Design Unit, Penn State Great Valley;
- Continuing and Distance Education Office, The College of Engineering;
- Filippelli Institute for e-Education and Outreach, College of the Liberal Arts; and
Additional University Resources:

A wealth of information about hybrid and online education has been created across the University to support faculty and staff who are involved in these endeavors. For the latest list of resources, see the “Web Learning at Penn State” website - https://weblearning.psu.edu/resources/additional-university-resources/.

Section VI: Overview of the Penn State Governance Structure for Online Education at Penn State

The University has created a governance structure for online education to facilitate communication across administrative and academic units. The structure is composed of four integrated levels that focus on different aspects of the work of improving online education at Penn State.

1. The Penn State Transforming Education Steering Committee is the University's e-learning governing board.

2. The Penn State Digital Learning Academic Council focuses on the broad academic administrative issues that arise in digital learning. It is intended to align with the charge of the Transforming Education Steering Committee to advance topics that are directly related to academic matters.

3. The Penn State Online Coordinating Council aligns with the charge of the Digital Learning Academic Council and was created to support academic policy, particularly with regard to scale and planning in online operations.

4. The Penn State eEducation Council aligns with the charge of the Online Coordinating Council and was created to implement policy and best practices, particularly with regard to technology-enhanced teaching and learning.

More information about each of these governance bodies can be found on the “Web Learning at Penn State” website - https://weblearning.psu.edu/governance/.

Traci Piazza, Director of Academic Affairs for Undergraduate Business and Sciences, World Campus, and Ann Taylor, Director, John A. Dutton e-Education Institute, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences provided the Committee on Outreach with valuable assistance in the creation of this report.
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Report on Fall 2016 Campus Visits

(Informational)

The Senate Officers visited seven campuses during Fall 2016 including: Lehigh Valley (9/19), Berks (9/19), York (9/22), Mont Alto (9/22), Behrend (10/5), Shenango (10/6), and Beaver (10/6).

During campus visits, Senate Officers met with staff, students, faculty, and administrators. Each group was met with separately to encourage open and frank discussions. Two basic questions were asked in each meeting: “What do you enjoy about your campus and your position” and “What are the challenges faced at your campus or position?” These simple questions led to rich discussions.

Executive Summary

While campuses vary in their enrollment, academic programs, and the nature of their student populations, consistent themes were evident:

- All of our Commonwealth Campuses share a passion for helping students and all members of the academic units take pride in fostering this relationship. Their smaller enrollments create close knit communities, where faculty, staff, and students frequently know each other by name. Such relationships enable close collaboration across each campus. The recent efforts to centralize many key functions at University Park, however, are beginning to impact each campus’ ability to serve their students with the same care and efficiency that they have provided heretofore.

- Each campus shares a “Penn State pride” that is evident from the moment one steps on to campus. Grounds are immaculately kept and visitors are greeted warmly. Faculty, staff, and students alike are eager to share their love of their campus and explain how Penn State has made a difference to them and to their communities. Almost every student group, however, shared a desire to have a stronger connection to the resources and activities available at University Park.

- Recent efforts to centralize many University policies and procedures, such as the Common Schedule, registration timetables, room scheduling software (CollegeNet), advising records (Starfish), and student information (via LionPATH and iTwo), were points of frustration at each campus we visited. Campuses share a common perception that “University Park” is making changes to policies and procedures that result in negative consequences at Commonwealth Campus locations. Faculty and staff feel that campuses are either left out of key decision-making processes or that Commonwealth Campus input is not taken seriously.

- The implementation of LionPATH is seen as especially problematic. Advisors are challenged to complete the routine aspects of their job effectively and accurately (e.g., transcripts, degree audits, transfer credits, pathway to graduation). Registration staff are frustrated trying to coordinate and confirm bill payment and student aid. Admissions offices and programs are convinced that they have lost potential students due to non-
timely application responses. Overall, we heard loud concerns related to inefficiency (e.g., “What used to take me 2 steps now takes 5,” “I have to double-check all data coming out of LionPATH, as we routinely find errors”), Faculty, staff, and administrators alike were clearly stressed and cited lack of clear and regular communication from “central administration.” Many reported a decrease in overall morale among faculty and staff.

- Universally, campuses we visited reported that they are not using College Net for scheduling their classes and buildings and are effectively using their legacy systems to accomplish this task.

- Some programs at University Park are apparently not accepting same-numbered courses for degree requirements when those courses have been taken at Commonwealth Colleges. Given our continuity of degree intention across locations, “course is a course” concept, and 80%/20% shared vs. unique course content rules, this inequity needs to be addressed. Programs mentioned where this seems to be an issue include Administration of Justice, Business, and Meteorology.

- Depending on the campus, there is a need for “student space” in either dedicated buildings or increased space for libraries and other student common areas. Some campuses we visited recently had such a facility constructed and were very happy with this “community improvement.” Those locations that do not have such dedicated spaces claim it is challenging to build a campus community without one, particularly for those campuses with large commuter populations.

- There was general worry about the impact of the VRP (voluntary retirement program) on faculty lines and administrative leadership. At the time of our visits, the exact impacts were unknown, but campuses were concerned about the impact on smaller programs and majors, where potentially 2-3 faculty out of 4-5 total could be retiring and it was unknown whether those lines would be replaced, replaced with tenure-line or fixed-term faculty, and the speed at which jobs could be posted and replacements found.

- The role of both tenure-line and fixed-term faculty was also a common theme during our campuses meetings. Varying workloads, promotion opportunities, and professional development resources were raised as issues faculty would like to see addressed both at their individual campus locations and across the University.

- Staff workloads, promotion opportunities, and professional development resources were also raised as key issues during our visits. “We are continually being asked to do more with less” was a frequent refrain. Staff shared their suggestions for how to improve their ability to do their jobs and to be able to continue to provide the high level of service that has been a point of campus pride.

- Issues related to Risk Management were also echoed in our visits. There was a general feeling that Risk Management is too risk adverse, especially when they encounter something they haven’t heard about before. There has been a significant increase in paperwork and need for permissions, to a point where Risk Management requirements have become so onerous that it dissuades many events from even getting started.
Campus Summaries

In addition to the overall summary provided above, unique information was learned from each campus. Below is a campus-by-campus summary, while an appendix to this report provides detailed information. A careful read of this information will illustrate the unique attributes and successes of our Commonwealth Campuses, as well as the important issues they are confronting. It is our hope that this information will ultimately reveal pathways for improvement.

Lehigh Valley

Infrastructure is currently viewed as limiting the student experience and growth potential of this campus. The building is very nice and up to date, but student needs, especially extracurricular, are reportedly outgrowing this single structure. We heard about the need for a Student Activity Building that might be used for athletics, traditional student union/social functions, and fitness center activities. The Senate Officers observed that student options for these kinds of activities and gatherings seem to be very limited. Currently, the campus reports that athletic activities are in off-campus spaces being rented at other college/university locations; not ideal locations for promoting the Penn State brand. There was also a stated need for an academic building or addition to existing building. Faculty specifically discussed need for organic chemistry labs. It was also mentioned that some of the grounds immediately surrounding the campus may or may not be buildable due to underground mines/sinkholes that are in the area and that would obviously need to be evaluated. Our impressions were that the new Chancellor is working very hard to build an administrative relationship with Faculty and Staff and moving forward, has a growth vision for this campus.

Berks

This is a robust, growth campus from a student population/enrollment and diversity of strong academic programs being offered. It has an excellent physical plant with good quality, up to date buildings. The Senate Officers heard very vocal concerns expressed by faculty and staff about LionPATH impact and the potential loss of students during application process. Currently there is a wait list for spaces at their dorms and there was some discussion they could expand their dorms, but the impact on this current student demand might need to be tempered given new dorm construction at Abington and Brandywine. Students indicated that the library is problematic. They feel it is too small given student demand for the space and the multiple student uses for that space, which include studying and social gathering, together these two needs are incompatible. We were told the Student Union building rooms are scheduled for use and the cafeteria is used for eating (given the demand, it is an eat-and-get-out kind of space). As a result, students feel a gathering/socializing area is needed (or needs to be designated, somewhere on campus). Our conversations indicated the Campus Administration appears to have a very positive and proactive working relationship with both Faculty and Staff.

York

Faculty and students reported looking forward to the opening of newly renovated and expanded Student Union Building. All parties thought this was a very welcome infrastructure improvement that will improve campus community and student interactions. We discussed strategies based on their concerns for engaging incoming freshmen (e.g., team building, group cooking, outdoor activities first couple of weeks) as a way to foster a better campus climate and community, with their goal of making this less of a commuter campus and more of a learning community. We
again had very frank discussions about LionPATH challenges with Staff, Faculty, and Administration at this campus. Concerns were also raised here specifically about the effects of the VRP (Voluntary Retirement Program) on faculty, especially in small programs were the majority of faculty supporting some of the programs/courses were going to be lost during upcoming year. Our conversations indicated that Campus Administration appear to have a very positive and proactive working relationship with Faculty and Staff.

Mont Alto

The campus community shared their pride for their beautiful grounds and buildings and what they feel is a very nice campus and community environment. Students seemed passionate about their professors and academic studies. The biggest challenge they shared is that many students go home for weekends, so they say it is challenging to have engagement with activities and build community. That said, they report that there is a very robust athletic program which is enjoyed by students as both spectators and participants. One challenge reported is that their dorms are only half occupied. This reality represents both a challenge and opportunity. Popular academic programs include Nursing, Business related majors, and Forestry. Participants shared that Faculty, Staff, and Administration at this campus are a very tight-knit group, all working together with the goal of recruitment, serving students, maintaining enrollments, and building a campus community.

Behrend

Participants here were also proud of their campus’s grounds and buildings and campus and community environment. That considered, Senate Officers were also told that maintenance of some buildings, especially roofs, is a continuing challenge, especially given the winter climate and a limited budget. The other infrastructure issue discussed by staff and administration is the central road cutting through campus, one that apparently is township owned, which presents challenges in the winter with maintenance and snow removal, as well causing traffic flow issues. Apparently, conversations with the Township have not been productive and the campus views this issue as a safety issue for students and employees. Academically, this campus has strong programs in engineering, sciences, business, and nursing, with a strategic RN to BSN degree program. These programs have strong enrollments and student engagement opportunities at academic and extracurricular levels, and we heard from students about some of the internship and hands-on-learning opportunities available in their degree programs. Our meeting with the Administration indicated a very strong leadership team with a future vision for this growth campus.

Shenango

This is a small campus that takes great pride in serving its local community. We met with very passionate students, two notables were from under-represented backgrounds who were especially thankful for the educational opportunities and future employment opportunities this campus and their Penn State education will afford them. We were told that the allied health majors offered by Shenango are especially popular. Again, the participants share pride in grounds and buildings at this campus. The maintenance staff who attended were extraordinarily engaged and saw their role larger in the respect that positive impressions visiting families have when they step on campus and walk into buildings translates to admissions for their sons and daughters. Faculty discussed some of the dual, shared faculty positions between Shenango and Beaver Campus (Biology was mentioned) but also some of the frustrations over faculty searches for new shared faculty for
programs in Administration of Justice and Technology Areas, where they want to make sure both campuses have equal input in searches and hires. Student enrollments are reportedly challenged at this location, but administration shared their commitment to enhancing enrollments, student engagement, and faculty morale. They desire a continued, active involvement with Penn State central administration and University meetings and task forces that they feel have impact on the future of the campus.

Beaver

As previously mentioned, this campus is partnered with Shenango for some faculty lines and academic program support. Participants shared a pride in their grounds and discussed buildings that had been recently renovated, but they reported that continued work could be done on deferred maintenance and upgrades for some buildings. They have a dormitory that is not completely filled and again, as we observed at Mont Alto and some other campus locations that have partially filled dorms, this represents both a challenge and opportunity. At Beaver, we heard from both students and faculty about frustrations in transferring some identically numbered course credits to University Park Programs. This is important as course offerings should be confluent, similar, and accepted no matter the location in accordance with University Academic Policy, overseen by Faculty Senate. The other challenge faced by the Beaver Chancellor is coordinating joint faculty and programs offered at both Beaver and Shenango locations.

Further Information

The appendix to this report provides more detailed information regarding each of these campus visits.

Prepared by:

Ann H. Taylor, Faculty Senate Secretary, in consultation with Faculty Senate Chair James A. Strauss and Chair-Elect Matthew Woessner.
Currently on our space inventory there are 5,691 total restrooms throughout University Park and the Commonwealth Campuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restrooms</th>
<th># Rooms on Record</th>
<th>UP</th>
<th>Commonwealth Campuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unisex - Private</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unisex - Public</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2636</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>5691</strong></td>
<td><strong>3909</strong></td>
<td><strong>1782</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The desire to provide additional restroom opportunities for our Penn State community began to be communicated by various groups for our students, faculty, staff and visitors along with family and companion needs around 2000. We began to try to determine the number of restrooms at Penn State that were single user and ADA compliant. At the time “unisex” was the term used for these restrooms and this was added to the space inventory in 2002. A separate code was added for private and public as the information could be gathered and verified. This is still in process.

The Office of Physical Plant added a new requirement to the Manual of Design and Construction Standards to construct additional restrooms in 2006. This requirement is included for all major capital projects for new buildings or major renovations:

**05 Single User Toilet Rooms**

A. All buildings shall have Single User toilet rooms in the following locations:
   1. On the main floor level.
   2. On every floor level other than the main level, except where a Single User toilet room exists on the floor above and the floor below.
   3. Where required by code.

B. Every project shall consider the location of existing Single User toilet rooms, and shall include the construction of additional toilet rooms to meet the requirements of the
preceding paragraph. No exception is given to any project, except with written approval from the Manager of Design Services, Office of Physical Plant.

C. All single user toilet rooms shall meet the requirements of the current adopted International Building Code and Americans with Disabilities Act Standards.

D. Urinal shall be included within the room.

E. In "Family" designated rooms, a baby changing (Koala KB200 or prior approved equal) shall be included.

F. Contact Facilities Resources & Planning, Office of Physical Plant, for the appropriate room signage as defined by the PSU interior signage standards and Manager of Design Services, Office of Physical Plant for atypical plumbing fixtures and toilet accessories requests, if applicable.

This action addressed additional restroom opportunities within new construction but did not deal with the many existing and older buildings across Penn State that only includes men’s and women’s restrooms. The Facilities Resources Committee received several requests over this time to create or realign restrooms in some existing academic buildings. The time required to investigate building codes, research options, and design and consider changes, identify funding and move forward could take up to two years.

As the need to provide additional restrooms was becoming a national issue, the University decided to be proactive and work to create more opportunities within our existing major educational and general buildings. The Facilities Resources Committee supported the solicitation and engagement of an outside firm to complete a study of 100 buildings at University Park to identify restrooms that are accessible, could be re-signed within existing building codes, or could be re-signed with a small investment. Gannet Fleming was retained in October 2015 and the study was complete August 2016. We worked closely with the LGBTQA staff and representatives throughout this process to develop the RFP, select the consultant, review the study findings and develop priorities and funding requirements for a first phase. The study did not include any restrooms within auxiliary, residential or intercollegiate athletic facilities or buildings.

Signage, symbols and terms have also changed and existing signage all throughout the University is inconsistent. There has continued to be a national dialog on symbols and signage for gender inclusive restrooms. After working with our LGBTQA staff and community, it was decided that the restrooms will have the below signage:
The first phase of this project is to begin to change signs to make all consistent. We have funding to change around 400 signs in education and general buildings. We will further analyze our inventory of restrooms to determine how many additional signs are needed. We will need to work with our auxiliary and residential staff to change out all signs over time. We will also work with our LGBTQ Office to update their listing of All Gender restrooms and their map for University Park locations.

A total of forty restrooms at University Park have been identified that are accessible and candidates to be re-signed with minor investments beyond signage. The study completed at University Park will assist us in identifying similar alternatives at our Commonwealth Campuses.

The following restrooms at University Park now designated as men or women’s restrooms can be re-signed with minor investments. The first phase will include consideration of these restrooms to be re-signed. There are many additional opportunities to re-sign restrooms that will require site evaluation, design and investment beyond the locations listed below. This will be a multi-year process to work through all the opportunities and phases to provide more restroom opportunities for Penn State.

**Accessible Restrooms Considered for Changing to All Gender - University Park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Room #</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckout Lab</td>
<td>R007</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckout Lab</td>
<td>R008</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>R011</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>R301</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>R302</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower Chapel</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>R107</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUB</td>
<td>II033a</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUB</td>
<td>II034a</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>R221b</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>R221A</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IST</td>
<td>101R</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IST</td>
<td>101Q</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>R108</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>R109</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Elliott</td>
<td>R110</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Elliott</td>
<td>R109</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>R322</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>R113</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>R112</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Main</td>
<td>R110</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Main</td>
<td>R416</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noll</td>
<td>R20</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td>R206</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td>R208</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattee</td>
<td>WR104</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research D</td>
<td>R103</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research D</td>
<td>R107</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rider</td>
<td>R108</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritenour</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritenour</td>
<td>R102</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritenour</td>
<td>216F</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackett</td>
<td>R10</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackett</td>
<td>R12</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackett</td>
<td>R102</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackett</td>
<td>R201</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackett</td>
<td>R301</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwab</td>
<td>R101</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Lab</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Lab</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING
- James Adair
- Kevin Cockroft
- Peter Eberle
• David Gray
• Hengameh Hosseini
• Nicholas Jones
• Rodney Kirsch
• Binh Le
• David Lieb
• Frantisek Marko
• John Marsh
• John Messner
• Laura Pauley, Chair
• Vansh Prabhu
• Andy Reisinger
• Gavin Robertson
• Jeff Robzen
• Ira Saltz
• Shuang Shen
• Steinn Sigurdsson, Vice-Chair
• H. Ford Stryker
• Ming Wang
• Jong Yun
Steven Maruszewski, Assistant Vice President for Physical Plant, will report on the many ways that students participate in the Physical Plant activities including in the classroom, in the field, in internships, in research, and in engagement.
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History of Collaborations

Penn State Office of Physical Plant

Mission
OPP stewards Penn State’s physical plant and provides quality facility services and safety programs in support of the University’s mission.

Vision
We exceed customer expectations.
We provide excellent value.
We enjoy coming to work.
We are recognized nationally for excellence in facilities, environmental, and safety management.

Guiding Principles
We value and empower our employees.
We collaborate with academia.
We are committed to diversity.
We foster creativity, teamwork, and communication.
We champion the University’s commitment to sustainability.
We provide an enjoyable, healthy, and safe work environment.
We value leadership, accountability, and professionalism.

Strategic Plan 2014-2018

Goals
- Improve Operational Effectiveness
  - Implement Facilities Asset Management (FAM)
  - Develop and implement the IT master plan
  - Collect and distribute data to improve operations

- Foster a highly engaged workforce
  - Develop a retention strategy
  - Develop a robust training strategy
  - Develop a succession plan strategy

- Enhance relationships with customers
  - Strengthen service to Commonwealth campuses
  - Develop communications strategic plan
  - Expand academic partnerships
  - Identify external constituents and develop strategies to enhance relationships

Opp Strategic Plan
• 50+ internships/year
  • Number depends on business needs
  • Opportunity for growth & expansion

Internships

Research
Thank You!

Appendix X
3/14/17
MINUTES OF SENATE COUNCIL
Tuesday, February 21, 2017 – 1:30 p.m.
102 Kern Graduate Building

**Members Present:** M. Ansari, M. Aynardi, R. Bascom, C. Eckhardt, S. Geisinger, G.
Seymour, R. Shannon, J. Strauss, B. Szczygiel, A. Taylor, R. Troester, M. Wilson, M.
Woessner, D. Wolfe

**Guests/Others:** B. Bowen, P. Brown, R. Engel, D. Hagen, M. Hanes, R. Pangborn, F.
Preciado, S. Sigurdsson, M. Whitehurst

**Absent:** E. Knodt, P. Koch, E. Smithwick

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Strauss called the meeting to order at 1:39 p.m. on Tuesday, February 21, 2017, in 102
Kern Graduate Building.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF January 10, 2017**

The minutes of the January 10, 2017, meeting were approved on a Wilson/Szczygiel motion.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS**

Chair Strauss welcomed all members and special guests and expressed appreciation for the
increased funding for CAPS that was announced the previous week. He also commented on the
success of 2017 THON.

Additional announcements by Chair Strauss:

The following topics were discussed at the Faculty Advisory Committee meeting: Diversity &
Inclusion Issues; Rethinking E and G Budget Model: Zero Sum Game of State Appropriations,
Zero Tuition Increase Goal, Faculty Salaries, Faculty Benefits; Terminal degree qualifications
for graduate faculty status; Update on Searches-- Schreyer Honors College Dean; Executive
Director, Faculty Senate; College of Engineering Dean; Earth and Mineral Sciences Dean;
University Budget Officer; and Updates— Admissions; Canvas; and LionPATH; and
WorkLion.
Chair Strauss announced that an FAC meeting and Senate Council meeting are scheduled for Tuesday, April 4, 2017.

Executive Vice President and Provost Jones reviewed the status of administrative searches and commented on Canvas. He will give a presentation on LionPATH to the Board of Trustees at its meeting on February 24. The new student interface for LionPATH will be available in the spring. Accessibility of data in LionPATH continues to be a challenge and a solution to that issue is being pursued. WorkLion will be launched after June payroll has been processed. Councilors asked about an improved LionPATH interface for faculty and plans to accommodate international students who might not want to return to their home countries over the summer in light of the executive order on travel and immigration. The faculty and advisor interface is being developed, but the student interface is a higher priority. Accommodations for international students over Spring break are the priority at this time, but planning for the summer is underway.

Vice Provost Blannie Bowen announced a Big Ten Academic Alliance seminar for Administrative fellows will be held at Penn State in April. The selection process for Administrative Fellows for the 2017-18 year is underway. The process for selecting the Penn State Laureate is also underway.

Vice President Madlyn Hanes announced successful completion of Chancellor searches for the Wilkes-Barre and Dubois campuses. She spoke about the Research Experience for Undergraduate Students program and the seed grant program for Invent Penn State.

Vice President Rob Pangborn reported 102,000 applications have been received to date, an increase of 2.3% over last year for baccalaureate students. To date, 5,300 paid accepts have been received, approximately 1/3 of the target number. Councilors asked about the planned reduction in first-year enrollment at University Park and countries that represent the greatest number of applications from international students. The reduction at UP is to adjust for the higher than planned enrollment at UP for 2016-17. The number of applications from China (over 9,000) is larger than other countries. Applications have decreased from countries listed in the recent executive order.

Vice Provost Marcus Whitehurst announced the“All In at Penn State: A Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion” conference http://sites.psu.edu/allin/ on Tuesday, April 18. At the request of Chair Strauss, he will provide information to the Senate office for distribution to senators.

Interim Vice Provost Renata Engel reported World Campus experienced a lower than expected increase in enrollments in the past year, but enrollments are rebounding. A Student Affairs Office has been opened in World Campus.

Senate officers had no comments.

Executive Director Hagen asked Councilors to remind their units that the names of Senate Council representatives for 2017-18 should be sent to the Senate office as soon as possible.

Councilor Myers expressed concern about reported disparity in faculty compensation for World Campus and Resident Education teaching. After discussion, Rob Pangborn and Renata Engel offered to prepare a report on this topic for the April 4 Senate Council meeting.
**ACTION ITEMS:** The election of members for Committees and Rules was held. The following were elected for two-year terms: Victor Brunsden, Ann Clements, Amy Dietz, Rick Robinett, and Nicole Webster.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS:** none

**REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL**

Minutes from the January 18, 2017, Graduate Council meeting are available on the Graduate School website. Steinn Sigurdsson gave some remarks about the meetings of January 18.

**AGENDA ITEMS FOR MARCH 14, 2017**

G. FORENSIC BUSINESS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT, Educational Equity and Faculty. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Wilson motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS, WorkLion: Development and Implementation Plan. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wolfe/Wilson motion. Ten minutes for presentation and five minutes for discussion were allocated.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON OUTREACH, Penn State Adult Learners. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Szczygiel/Eckhardt motion. Fifteen minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Strauss reminded Councilors that the report, Revisions to Senate Bylaws Article II Section 1, introduced by Committees and Rules at the January meeting, will be voted on at the March 14 meeting.

I. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES, Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article II Section 6(k) Committee on Outreach. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wilson/Aynardi motion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION, Change to Senate Policy 43-00 (Syllabus). This report was amended on a Wilson/Wolfe motion to include a link to Policy 42-10 and a footnote regarding location of programs. The amended report placed on the Agenda on an Aynardi/Wilson motion.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION. Change to Senate Policy 47-70 Online Student Progress Report. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Eckhard/Wilson motion.

J. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT, Revision of AD 84 Preferred Name and Gender Identity Policy. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Miles/Wilson motion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS, Proposed Revision to HR21 Recommendation for Standardizing Titles for Nontenured Faculty across Units. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Ansari/Aynardi motion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS, Provision of Multi-Year Contracts for Fixed Term Faculty. This report was returned to committee. It was recommended that the committee consult with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES, INFORMATION SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY, Library Space Planning. This report was returned to committee, with the suggestion that the scope of the report be reduced to be aligned with the committee’s charge.

SENATE COMMITTEES ON OUTREACH, and EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT, Office of Educational Equity Middle and High School Pre–College Programs TRIO Upward Bound, Upward Bound Migrant, Upward Bound Math and Science, and Talent Search. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Ansari motion.

K. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES, New Member Information. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Aynardi/Grimes motion as web only. There will be no presentation.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES, Nominating Report for 2017-2018. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Le/Grimes motion. Nominations will be accepted from the floor during the Senate meeting. This report will be placed on the Agenda as the second informational report to be presented at the meeting.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT, CLGBTQE Commission Reads. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wilson/Wolfe motion Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

ELECTIONS COMMISSION, Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2017-2018. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Aynardi/Wolfe motion as web only. There will be no presentation.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS, Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (SRTE) Evaluations: Effective Use of SRTE Data. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Ansari/Aynardi motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, Annual Report for 2015-2016. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Aynardi/Wilson motion as web only. There will be no presentation.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES, INFORMATION SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY, PSU Libraries Collection Budget Report, 2016. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Nousek/Wilson motion as web only. There will be no presentation.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON OUTREACH, Online Education at Penn State. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Ansari/Wilson motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

SENATE COUNCIL, Report on Fall 2016 Campus Visits. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Nousek/Wilson motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

SENATE COUNCIL, Nominating Committee Report for 2017-2018. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Nousek/Wilson motion. Nominations from the floor will be accepted at the meeting on March 14. This report will be placed on the Agenda as the first Informational Report to be presented.

SENATE COUNCIL, Policy Harmonization. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Ansari/Szczygiel motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion. This report will be placed on the Agenda as the third informational report to be presented at the meeting.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING, All Gender Restrooms at The Pennsylvania State University Status Report. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Szczygiel/Aynardi motion. Five minutes was allocated for discussion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING, OPP Report: Connecting Operations with Students, Faculty, and Researchers. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Le/Wilson motion. Ten minutes for presentation and five minutes for discussion were allocated.

NEW BUSINESS: none

ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.
Next meeting: April 4, 2017

Dan Hagen
Executive Director
Date: March 6, 2017

To: All Senators and Committee Members

From: Daniel R. Hagen, Executive Director

Following is the time and location of all Senate meetings March 13 and 14, 2017. Please notify the Senate office and committee chair if you are unable to attend.

MONDAY, MARCH 13, 2017

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 14, 2017

8:00 a.m.

Intercollegiate Athletics – 502 Keller Building

8:30 a.m.

Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid – 203 Shields Building
Committees and Rules – 201 Kern Graduate Building
Curricular Affairs – 102 Kern Graduate Building
Educational Equity and Campus Environment – 213 Business Building
Faculty Affairs – 202 Hammond Building
Faculty Benefits – 519 J.R. Elliot Building
Intra-University Relations – 504 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building
Outreach – 216 Business Building
Research – 214 Business Building
University Planning – 324 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building
9:00 a.m.

Global Programs – 412 Boucke Building

Libraries, Information Systems and Technology – 510A Paterno Library

Undergraduate Education – 110C Chandlee Lab

9:30 a.m.

Student Life – 409H Keller 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 6, 2017

To: Commonwealth Caucus Senators (includes all elected campus senators)

From: Galen Grimes and Nicholas Rowland, Caucus Co-chairs

MONDAY, MARCH 13, 2017 – 8:15 PM
102 KERN BUILDING

Guest Speaker: Paula Milone-Nuzzo, Dean, College of Nursing
Will speak on Smoke Free/Tobacco Free Task Force charges and progress.

To join the evening caucus meeting by phone or video, dial 440351 for video or 814-867-5845 and enter the ID# 440351 for phone.

TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2017 – 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
   Nominations for Caucus Co-Chairs
III. Introduction of and discussion with nominees for the following positions:
   Senate Chair-Elect (3 minutes allotted)
   Senate Secretary (2 minutes allotted)
   Faculty Advisory Committee to the President (1 minute allotted)
IV. Discussion of Nominations for Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities; University Promotion and Tenure; Standing Joint Committee on Tenure
V. Adjournment and Lunch