



THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

THE SENATE RECORD

Volume 50-----March 14, 2017-----Number 5
Rescheduled for March 21, 2017 due to winter storm

The Senate Record is the official publication of the University Faculty Senate of The Pennsylvania State University, as provided for in Article I, Section 9 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and contained in the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Standing Rules of the University Faculty Senate*, The Pennsylvania State University.

The publication is issued by the Senate Office, 101 Kern Graduate Building, University Park, PA 16802 (telephone 814-863-0221). The Senate Record is on file in the University Archives and is posted online at <http://www.senate.psu.edu/senators> under “Publications.”

Except for items specified in the applicable Standing Rules, decisions on the responsibility for inclusion of matters in the publication are those of the Chair of the University Faculty Senate.

When existing communication channels seem insufficient, senators are encouraged to submit brief letters relevant to the Senate's function as a legislative, advisory and forensic body to the Chair for possible inclusion in The Senate Record.

Reports that have appeared in the Agenda for the meeting are not included in The Senate Record unless they have been changed substantially during the meeting, or are considered to be of major importance. Remarks and discussions are abbreviated in most instances. Every Senate meeting is webcast via MediaSite. All Senate meetings are digitally audio recorded and on file in the Senate office. Transcriptions of portions of the Senate meeting are available upon request.

Individuals with questions may contact Dr. Daniel R. Hagen, Executive Director, Office of the University Faculty Senate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	<u>Final Agenda for March 14, 2017</u>	Pages ii-iv
II.	<u>Minutes and Summaries of Remarks</u>	Pages 1-50
III.	Appendices	
	a. <u>Attendance</u>	Appendix I

FINAL AGENDA FOR MARCH 14, 2017

- A. [MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING](#) Page 2
Minutes of the January 24, 2017, Meeting in [The Senate Record](#) 50:4
- B. [COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE](#) Page 2
[Senate Curriculum Report of February 21, 2017](#)
<http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/senate-curriculum-reports/>
- C. [REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL](#) – Meeting of February 21, 2017 Page 2
- D. [ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR](#) Page 3
- E. [COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY](#) Pages 3-6
- F. [COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST](#) Pages 6-11
- G. [FORENSIC BUSINESS](#)
Educational Equity and Campus Environment
[Educational Equity and Faculty](#) Pages 11-17
Faculty Benefits
[WorkLion: Development and Implementation Plan](#) Pages 17-21
Outreach
[Penn State Adult Learners](#) Pages 21-25
- H. [UNFINISHED BUSINESS](#)
Committee on Committees and Rules Page 25
[Revisions to Senate Bylaws Article II Section 1](#)
- I. [LEGISLATIVE REPORTS](#)
Committees and Rules
[Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article II Section 6\(k\)](#) Page 25
[Committee on Outreach](#)

Undergraduate Education

[Change to Senate Policy 43-00 \(Syllabus\)](#) Page 26

[Change to Senate Policy 47-70 Online Student Progress Report](#) Pages 26-32

J. [ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS](#)

Educational Equity and Campus Environment

[Revision of AD 84 Preferred Name and Gender Identity Policy](#) Page 32

Faculty Affairs

[Proposed Revision to HR21 Recommendation for Standardizing Titles for Nontenured Faculty across Units](#) Pages 32-38

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](#) Page 38

K. [INFORMATIONAL REPORTS](#)

Senate Council

[Nominating Committee Report for 2017-2018](#) Pages 38-39

Committee on Committees and Rules

[Nominating Report for 2017-2018](#) Pages 39-40

Senate Council

[Policy Harmonization](#) Pages 40-41

Committee on Committees and Rules

[New Member Information*](#) Page 43

Educational Equity and Campus Environment

[CLGBTQE Commission Reads](#) Page 43-44

Elections Commission

[Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2017-2018*](#) Page 44

Faculty Affairs

[Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness \(SRTE\)
Evaluations: Effective Use of SRTE Data](#) Pages 44-47

Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

[Annual Report for 2015-2016*](#) Page 47

Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology

[PSU Libraries Collection Budget Report, 2016*](#) Page 47

Outreach

[Online Education at Penn State](#) Pages 47-48

Senate Council

[Report on Fall 2016 Campus Visits](#) Pages 48-49

University Planning

[All Gender Restrooms at The Pennsylvania State University Status Report](#) Pages 49-50

[OPP Report: Connecting Operations with Students, Faculty, and Researchers](#) Pages 41-43

* No Presentation of reports marked with an asterisk.

L. [NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS](#) Page 50

M. [COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY](#) Page 50

N. [ADJOURNMENT](#) Page 50

Chair Strauss: I would like to call our March meeting to order. Welcome. You can see all of the snow is melting. We're happy about that. So, as we always do, we lead off with a student presentation. Our student presentation is Jaden Rankin-Wahlers. She is the founder of Lion's Pantry, and currently serves as the co-president for this important organization.

The purpose of Lion's Pantry is to help those students in hunger by supplementing their food budgets with a variety of good nutritious foods. These donations are provided by community members and corporate partners. The pantry is located near the Blue Band Building above East Halls.

Why is all this important, you might ask? In particular, the 2016-2017 student class gift is a sizable donation to this pantry, noting that our current millennial students offer gifts for good causes and purposes, as opposed to the more traditional ones that we might be used to, that include things like benches and lights and clocks and statues. I, for one, am very impressed. So Jaden, if you could explain a little bit about Lion's Pantry to us all.

[Jaden Rankin-Wahlers, Co-President of Lion's Pantry, the student-run food pantry, described the pantry's efforts to address the issue of student hunger at University Park. Student poverty is an issue being faced at universities across the country. Many students are unaware of the pantry or feel comfortable using it as a resource. She encouraged faculty to learn about and to share information about Lion's Pantry with students.]

Chair Strauss: So a couple of quick remarks from the chair. First quick remark I'll say is that as your chair, it's actually the unexpected that you have to plan for, sometimes special powers that you might not know or completely understand. But in order for Senate to move forward, you've got to channel these nonetheless. And two Sundays ago, I was in just exactly that position, where I was faced with a really tough weather-related decision. And I decided that I needed to immediately charge the Special Committee on Weather and Prognostication.

I was pondering who to put on this special committee, and the folks in the Senate office were naturals for this: Dan Hagen, Paula Brown, Patti Hoppes. And these folks did yeoman's work to basically reschedule meetings, meeting rooms, make accommodations for this room, accommodations for your stay, and new rooms for your committees. And we really owe them a round of applause for that hard, hard work that they did putting this meeting together.

[APPLAUSE]

I will say, in the background of this decision, though, this committee needed a good strong chair who had special powers. And I decided this committee needed to be chaired by none other than the Prognosticator of All Prognosticators, our chief groundhog, Punxsutawney Phil. So upon contacting Phil, he first told me that the community that he represents rejects the name groundhogs, as well as whistle pigs, as well as woodchucks. He basically says, these were not great names.

He said, "We don't move piles of wood. We really aren't related to pigs. We're actually more closely related to squirrels. Believe it or not, we can actually climb trees. And we are truly champion hibernators." Instead, Phil told me that his community likes the name the Eastern Golden Marmot. And he says, "Please report that to faculty Senate." So I just did that.

Phil also wanted to make it known that many had doubted him on his "six more weeks of winter" prediction back in February because of the nice balmy weather that we actually had. But he says, he's used to the heat. This goes with the territory when you're asked to see far into the future, well beyond what so-called supercomputer models can see forward.

So I was like, "Well, OK, Phil. It's Sunday morning. I need a call. Do I call?" And he says, "Well, the answer is clear, but can you send me a bag of those No. 2, Grade A carrots, the organic ones without Roundup seasoning, please?" I said, "Sure."

And he says, "Well, I see the Nittany Lion statue with enough snow on it-- depending on what campus you might find that statue-- that I think maybe you ought to call it." He says, "I also see happy students and happy faculty frolicking with great glee." And I said, "Well, how much snow?" And he says, "Well, it's not always about the totals." And I said, "Really?" He says, "No." He says, "It's about your popularity." He says, "Both your and my vindication." He says, "People just love a snow day. It will help your popularity. Consider those long meetings that you've created." And I said, "Well, OK."

And then he also said, of course, most importantly, "It will vindicate my prediction of six more weeks of winter.

Anything else in your predictions?" And he says, "Yes, I predict that more important people than you will be contacting me shortly. Presidents of universities, perhaps the governor himself. They too believe."

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Strauss: So with that, Minutes of the Preceding Meeting.

Speaker: Move approval.

Chair Strauss: Wow, that was quick. So all in favor of accepting the minutes of the preceding meeting, please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Strauss: Opposed? Minutes are approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Strauss: The Senate Curriculum Report of February 21, 2017 is posted on the University Faculty Senate website.

REPORT FROM SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Strauss: Item C, Report of Senate Council. Minutes from the February 21, 2017 Senate Council Meeting can be found at the end of your agenda. Included in the minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President at the February 21st meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Strauss: Announcements by the Chair, Item D. Senators using Mediasite are asked to use the Ask a Question box to send a message that you have successfully connected to the live feed. That way we can add your name to the list of attendants. As a reminder to senators joining via Mediasite today, we're again using the voting system polleverywhere.com/facultysenate. Instructions for using this system were emailed to all senators and are posted on our website.

The link to the Online Committee Preference Form has also been sent to the 2017-2018 senators. Please check your inbox. Senators are encouraged to consult with their unit caucuses and senators to determine their most appropriate senate committee assignments. Please indicate that you would be willing to undertake a leadership role, if that is true.

Nominations for the University Faculty Ombudsperson-elect are due by March 27. That's next Monday.

At its February 21st Senate Council Meeting, the following senators were elected to the Committee on Committee and Rules for two-year terms. Our congratulations go out to Victor Brunsdon, Ann Clements, Amy Dietz, Rick Robinett, and Nicole Webster. Congratulations to all of you folks.

[APPLAUSE]

Allison Albinski, formerly a member of the staff of the Department of Psychology, has recently joined the Faculty Senate Office on March 1st as our Curriculum Recorder. Welcome, Allison.

[APPLAUSE]

And a slightly sad note. Cindy Zook has accepted a position with the Geography Department in the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences. Her last day in the Senate office was March 16th. We will miss her, but we wish her the very best in her new position.

At the February 21st Senate Council Meeting, council members voted to place the following informational reports on the Senate agenda as a website-only report. These include the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules new member information, the Elections Commission's Roster of Senators via Voting Units for 2017-2018, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities' Annual Report for 2015-2016, and the Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Sciences, and Technology report on the Collection Budget Report for 2016. These reports will not be formally discussed at today's meetings. If you have questions or comments about these informational reports, you can email the Senate at senate@psu.edu. Your questions will be forwarded to the appropriate committee chair for a response. The remaining informational reports are on the Senate agenda, and they will be discussed today.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Strauss: Item E, Comments by the President of the University. We're pleased to have President Barron in attendance today for some remarks. President Barron.

President Barron: Thank you, thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

Well, I know you have a busy agenda, and so I'm going to be relatively brief. First of all, I want to thank the Faculty Senate for sending nominations of three excellent candidates for the Faculty Athletics Representative, the FAR. And a very difficult choice, but I did offer the position to Dennis Scanlon, and he accepted. So he will be on board helping us connect faculty to our athletics programs.

You know, I also want to comment about Lion's Pantry. It is fascinating to see our students two years in a row pick class gifts, one associated with mental health and one associated with making sure that students that don't have access to food can get access to food through the pantry. You know, we're so used to seeing gates or some other physical class gift, that I think we see something rather remarkable going on in this institution, that for two years in a row, it's not a physical class gift. It's a class gift focused on helping students.

Interesting as well, because-- and I'm hoping the same thing is true for Lion's Pantry, because it's also creating record-breaking philanthropy for the class gift. That also is a rather profound statement, I think.

A heads up-- I am not going to describe the details, but I do want you to know that in very short order we will be releasing some new rules and several decisions related to Greek life at Penn State. I don't want you to be surprised. We have really gotten to the point where we know we have a tremendous number of positives that we have to accentuate, but we also have a number of negatives that we just can't afford to have continue, including the fact that from self-reported statistics, heavy drinking, six times as much as the typical student. And sexual assaults twice as frequent as the typical students.

And we really-- Penn State is, in some ways, in a very difficult position. We do not own the houses. We do not govern the houses. We don't sanction them. They have nationals. They have private owners. They're on private property. We have only the fact that we grant them recognition. And so that makes a rather challenging position, but that doesn't mean that this University doesn't have to change what is happening here.

Another quick item-- we are moving into a fairly activist mode and a very direct mode about the federal budget. There is an enormous amount of risk to multiple areas from the arts and the humanities to all sorts of different science directions that have the potential to impact our federal funding. We are a University with very open doors, for which access and affordability is incredibly important. And the current budget creates challenges in that space.

You know, we would love to see the Pell surplus go to support Pell in summer. We have an awful lot of students that could get their degrees more quickly and with much less cost if they could use Pell in the summer. And so we're working very hard, both on the access and affordability and the support for Endowment for the Humanities and Arts and for sciences to really talk about what the impact will be on this University and this state, and talking directly with our senators and congressmen.

Very last part: I'm happy to take a question on one of those topics or any other topic, and then I'll close.

Chair Strauss: Questions for President Barron? Yeah, Patty in the back.

Patricia Koch, Health and Human Development: Yes. Patricia Koch, HHD here at UP. Dr. Barron, you just mentioned about a report that will be coming out about fraternities. Could you give us kind of a timeline of when that might be coming out?

President Barron: OK. So, I don't think that you will view it as a report. There were several things that the task force agreed to and that we've begun to implement, but not a report. And they have many things that they couldn't come to a conclusion about. And the University has really decided that we have to make the decisions in those areas.

The data we see and some of the issues that we see, most notably what happened at the Beta House, this is-- we just can't let it continue. So we've decided to take several actions basically outside of the task force, while at the same time introducing some of the things that the task force recommended.

So for instance, the task force recommended a report card of excellence so that parents or a student could look at everything from trends in grade point, size, number of citations, the positives, the negatives, so that you could sit there and say, OK, this is the fraternity or sorority that I want my son or daughter to go to. But clearly that in itself is not good enough. The Beta House had a pledge, no drinking, and that any brother with alcohol would be expelled from the fraternity. Well, clearly you can see all sorts of things about that house that was of model behavior from the viewpoint of any statistics and measurement that we could take. And yet we had a real tragedy occur. And so this is a case where the administration has just had to decide, we're going to do more.

Chair Strauss: Other questions for President Barron? Yes, James in the back.

James Japp, Greater Allegheny: Japp, Penn State Greater Allegheny. President Barron, we've recently heard numbers that since the new administration, international applications are down at universities across the country, perhaps up to 40%. Have you seen anything in relation to our applications for international students? And if so, what are we doing to try to address that?

President Barron: So, we're monitoring this very closely. You might have seen the Chronicle article which suggested that about a third of the students that might be choosing to study from abroad in the US are rethinking it. We-- and Rob Pangborn can correct me if I'm no longer current-- but we're looking at about a 10% increase in the number of applications this year. So it's still very strong. And at least a week ago, we were off about 1% in the paid accepts.

Of course, we might worry whether there's a greater summer melt with international students. I don't know what might occur in that space. But at least from an application viewpoint and a paid accepts viewpoint, we're not seeing that national discussion play out here.

And of course, these students pay a significant amount of tuition. And so they're incredibly important for our diversity and for what it is that our students can learn and what we can learn from each other. They're also very important for our bottom line.

Chair Strauss: Rose?

Rosemary Jolly, Liberal Arts: Thanks. Rose Jolly, Liberal Arts. A question about what you mentioned, Dr. Barron, about how we actually go about enunciating the importance of funding for the arts and

sciences. So I understand the concern. I'm just wondering how one goes about literally lobbying in such a contentious environment. Thank you.

President Barron: So basically, the first step of this is that I have written a personal letter to each one of our federal legislators to talk about the potential impact for Penn State. It heavily stresses our role in driving the economy. It heavily stresses our role in providing access to a huge number of students that are first in their family to go to college. And that's a very high correlation with need based.

And then I will begin a process of meeting with many of the legislators. So this is coming up relatively soon. We also have, with our two individuals that support Penn State on the federal side of it, they're highly regarded. They are now playing a very active role, for instance, in groups like AAU, where I believe Penn State is having a very strong influence on the federal side of the equation. And so we're also working with APLU and AAU in having a position.

Many times, if issues are very controversial, you do it as a collective. This is significant enough that it's very important that I think the universities also speak on an individual level about what the direct impact will be, because I think in this case, talking about that direct impact, if you have a 6 to 8% decline in federal grants and contracts that are associated with NIH and Commerce, NOAA, DOE, EPA, what does 6 to 8% mean for \$836 million-- this is a big number. And so to be direct about that, to talk about the number of students that will be affected-- so this is the approach we're taking. It's more personal.

Chair Strauss: Other questions?

President Barron: And I apologize for a short stay. But I am glad that there was a piece of time, when the snow came along and you changed your meeting. I do want to say, with all due regard to Punxsutawney Phil, that NOAA put out their long-range forecast in January and pointed out that statistically, when January and February are very warm, the middle of March is cold. So, just thought I'd toss that in there into--

Chair Strauss: It's astounding that the groundhog knew this.

President Barron: Knew that, it truly is. But thank you.

Chair Strauss: Thank you very much, President Barron.

[APPLAUSE]

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

Chair Strauss: Item F, Comments by the Executive Vice President and Provost, Nick Jones. Nick?

Nicholas Jones, Provost: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I know we have a long agenda. As an engineer, I tried to come up with an algorithm that should guide how long I speak. And I had one. It was 175 minus the number of pages in the agenda. So I actually finished my remarks before Eric began, it turns out.

Just a few things to highlight very quickly. First, strategic plan implementation-- that process, I think, is going very well. We're in the middle now of a series of five regional fora. The first two have been held

already. There is one tomorrow on the transforming education theme at the Berks Campus, followed by another the week after at Behrend. And then there's a make-up on, I think, April 7th in Harrisburg on enhancing health.

The first two have been very well subscribed and supported, and I think really good conversations have taken place. And we're looking forward to that degree of engagement, of course, tomorrow at Berks around transforming education. And for those who can't make it to Berks but are interested in participating, we are live-streaming all these events, so you can participate in them through that mechanism.

We've also had the first couple of meetings of our Strategic Plan Implementation Council. And they've been a couple of, I think, exciting and quite lively meetings. We're making, I think, terrific progress. And I'm hoping that actually very early in the fall, we'll be in a position where we can share some rubrics with you and begin to show you the progress that we're making towards implementation. But that's going very well, and we're looking to ensure that everybody remains engaged in the process.

LionPATH-- Michael Busges is here if there are any detailed questions. But all of the key implementations of LionPATH are now complete. We know we still have a lot of work to do to make this a success. And I know that many across our community-- I'm in the middle of my campus visits now-- many locations I know-- there's still a lot of hard work going on as we complete this transition. I know the next month or so will probably be a little bit of a nervous time for people as we go towards our first large cohort of graduates. But I can assure you that we are doing everything we can do to provide the support that's necessary to help with that transition. But we do know that this is going to be a very important milestone for us.

I'm not going to talk about WorkLion because there is a presentation coming. The Canvas transition, I think, is going extremely well. We're getting great reports from the campuses about their work in that area. And I know here at University Park a lot has been accomplished. So that one seems to be on a very good path.

And just as a preview of coming attractions, we are having preliminary meetings about the replacement for the Business Information System. So that is the last of the big three coming along, but that is something that is necessary, and we will get to that fairly soon.

Search updates-- Schreyer Honors College dean search, we have had candidates in. Some of you may have participated in that process. We hope to bring that search to a successful conclusion very soon. There are searches for the deans of the College of Engineering and College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, both in progress now and going well, as are the searches for the Executive Director of the University Faculty Senate and the University Budget Officer. So a lot of searches in play. The search for Blannie Bowen's replacement, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, will be beginning very soon, actually.

I just want to follow Eric's comments. He focused on the federal budget. Just reinforce that, but perhaps more importantly, back to the executive order that first was issued Friday, January 27, about immigration and then the subsequent revised order. I think most of you may have seen the statement that was issued by the President on January 29 and the statement that was issued after the last executive order, which basically reaffirmed what was stated in the prior statement.

We take a little bit of time to get these out, because we try to provide useful information to people to point them in the right direction for resources and support. I'm not going to bore you by reading something that you can read online, but I am going to read one small section of that executive order, because I think this is probably the most important section in that it affirms our institutional position relative to supporting members of our community.

And it reads as follows. "Please know that the University fully supports all members of our academic community. We remain committed to respecting and honoring the dignity of each individual, embracing civil discourse, and fostering a diverse and inclusive community. We recognize and believe strongly that the diversity of faculty, staff, and students enriches all of us and enables our mission of research, teaching, service, and economic development. The best part of Penn State is our people, no matter what country they may call home. We support all of you."

So I think that really sums up what the institutional position is on this matter, and you can be assured that all our actions will be aligned with that. Eric talked a--

[APPLAUSE]

Eric talked a little bit about the budget. But I just want to, again, read two sentences from our statement there so you know exactly where we stand and where our energies will be focused moving forward. And they read as follows. And these are quotes from Eric.

"Federal support for student aid and scientific research plays a vital role in our efforts to educate the workforce of tomorrow, train the next generation of scientists and engineers, and serve the citizens of Pennsylvania, the nation, and the world. In the coming months, we will continue to advocate strongly with our US representatives and senators on behalf of our many students who depend on federal funding to help them complete their studies and on behalf of our researchers whose discoveries and livelihoods depend on its support." So that is the core of our position on the federal budget developments. And again, I can assure you that that will frame our approach to this issue independently as Penn State and with our partner colleges and universities as appropriate. So I'll stop there, and I'm going to take questions if we have time.

Chair Strauss: Questions for Provost Jones. Oh, I'm sorry. Willie?

Willie Ofosu, Wilkes-Barre: Willie Ofosu, Wilkes-Barre campus. Thank you very much, Provost Jones, for all your comments, and also in relation to what the president said about diversity on that. I think that's a great thing happening. But as an engineer myself, I depend on results.

And right at the very first Senate meeting, a whole bunch of young people came up. And they did a presentation on diversity. My question is, has anything been done to follow up with them to see the type of developments, or the progress that has been achieved since then?

Nicholas Jones: Yeah. So Marcus Whitehurst is sitting in the front row. And so, Marcus, I can maybe-- Marcus can maybe speak to that explicitly, I think.

Marcus Whitehurst: Great question. And actually, I have my notes. I actually submitted a report, a follow-up to Mohamad earlier this semester. But there are several things that have taken place. But I

think one of the things that we're looking at-- and I see Jorge, one of our student leaders, who was here on the panel. One of the things I know that students would like to see done is the Report Bias website added to the syllabus. And that's something that can only be initiated by the Faculty Senate.

So we're hopeful to see the faculty play a role in hearing what the students ask for. The panel was geared toward the students to speak directly to the faculty. And so they provided some recommendations. I believe one of those recommendations was accepted. But still, there's one that's still outstanding, and that's the uncertainty if the Report Bias website will be added to the syllabus.

But we continuously work with the students. And Mohamad has a report that I prepared. So feel free to share that report throughout the Senate to see some of the results that we have in place. So I don't know if Jorge wanted to speak from the students' voices as to additional things that need to be followed up on. But the students are still here.

Chair Strauss: Yeah. Mohamad? But I think we--

Mohamad Ansari, Berks: Thank you so much, Vice Provost Whitehurst. Thank you. What I received was in response to implementation of one of the reports that we passed last year as an Advisory/Consultative Report from the Joint Diversity Committee. But I would be happy to send that report to Jim, and Jim can disseminate that to the entire Senate, if that's what your wishes are.

Marcus Whitehurst: I'm fine with that.

Mohamad Ansari: Thank you.

Chair Strauss: Jorge?

Jorge Zurita-Coronado, Student: Hello. My name is Jorge. I'm an undergrad here at Penn State, majoring in political science. How Dr. Whitehurst was saying that something that the student body really is pushing for, and for the support of faculty, is this report bias requirement on syllabi. We did have a panel come up here a semester ago and really tell their stories to this Faculty Senate about the experiences that they deal with.

And our University is really centered around being all-in and being a more inclusive campus. But we often just have these conversations. We often just sit in these rooms and talk about how we want our University to be more inclusive, more diverse. We want to be more welcoming. And while those conversations are important, it's important to also follow up with these conversations with actions, because if we don't follow up with actions, those conversations were just useless.

So I encourage you all to support a report bias on syllabi. It would mean a lot to students. It would send a strong message to students that the faculty stand with them. And they're there to support them whenever they feel as though there's an act of bias, not just in the classroom but outside of the classroom. Thank you.

Willie Ofosu: In other words-- if I could follow up with you, Sir, in other words, there have not been any actions actually that follow, but you're talking about the possibility of actions to follow. And so that brings me right back to--

Chair Strauss: Well, if I could offer something, because I think we're missing a real obvious one. The Faculty Diversity Conference, which we sent everyone here a personal invite to, which is April 6--

Marcus Whitehurst: 18th. April 18.

Chair Strauss: 18th-- is a whole day that's really devoted with nationally prominent speakers on this, geared really to faculty and how we can provide more inclusive classrooms and programs and things. So I'll plug that again.

Marcus Whitehurst: Right. Very good. So Willie, the point to your question, I'm not sure if it's a question that the provost or I can answer on behalf of the Faculty Senate. The students were here to speak to the faculty about some specific recommendations that the faculty can do to assist the students moving forward. So the question remains-- the question should be maybe reversed to the Faculty Senate, has the Faculty Senate followed up with the students based on the recommendations that they presented to the Faculty Senate?

Willie Ofofu: So I guess it will get to a point where somebody will have to be identified to actually in reality follow up, either by the Trump administration or by the Senate or from--

Marcus Whitehurst: From the Senate. From the Senate, as Jorge indicated.

Nicholas Jones: I can maybe add a-- well, if you're looking for some specific things that have happened, even in the last several months. I had a conversation with the president just this morning about-- and actually Jim can probably speak to this and I think has in the past-- about the rather successful effort that the Eberly College of Science undertook to bring the World in Conversations model into the College of Science and really expose this to all freshman students, if I'm getting that right. I think that's an extraordinary accomplishment in a very large college. And the conversation that I had with Eric was, how can we go about bringing that experience-- given that Eberly could do it, how can we take it to other colleges and campuses across the University? So I think that's an exciting development that was developed effectively, inadvertently as a pilot in a large college that we're going to look to replicate.

I will add also that you'll be hearing from Susan soon about WorkLion. But the Office of the Vice President for Human Resources has just appointed a new Senior Director for Talent Management and Recruitment. And a primary focus of that individual is to help us recruit and retain a more diverse workforce across Penn State. So this is an appointment at a pretty senior level in the Office of Human Resources.

And I can go down the list of what-- there's action on a number of fronts. I wish I could report great progress. But you know-- this is why you're asking the question-- it's hard to turn this on a dime. But it takes just constant steady pressure on the tiller to move us in the direction that we need to go.

Willie Ofofu: So I do appreciate all of these wonderful things being done, really I do. But going back to that particular incident, or the student event, I should say, when the young people came up, one of their students was almost to a point of actually breaking down and crying. I don't know if you would remember. And the point of that is that we're talking about an emotional and psychological situation that these young people are experiencing.

And all these wonderful things-- maybe I'm missing something, but none of them actually seem to point to a personal and one-on-one type of situation that can actually help these young people. And just to put that point in, that with all these wonderful things being done, that aspect would be nice and would be-- well, better than nice, in fact-- would be useful in these young people's lives. Thank you.

Nicholas Jones: Yeah. I actually do think the World in Conversations experience is something that-- I mean, we can't just throw the switch and have it all happen tomorrow, of course. But I think figuring out ways to bring that program much more broadly across the institution, I think, in a relatively short time period can be quite successful. I think it has been successful in the College of Science, and it's really, I think, a remarkable accomplishment that they had there.

Chair Strauss: Yeah. And I'm going to just further add a couple things, that at the last Board of Trustees meeting, we talked specifically about these things at the Governance Committee, and some of the strategies that might be evoked. And Senate this year, I think, has worked very hard to make sure that every one of our meetings has at least one diversity component, including the Millennium Scholars, including today's forensic discussion on report bias. EECE Committee has three different reports today. Is it three? Yeah, three. Four-- excuse me, four today.

So I think we're taking this seriously, and we're trying to address these kinds of things. It does take a little bit of time. But I think we're doing some tangible good. Other questions for Provost Jones? Rose?

Rosemary Jolly: It's just that I think it would be helpful to have some statement on the University about the aboriginal lands and the original inhabitants of this area in terms of the inclusivity measures. At the same time as we're targeting folks that are being targeted in other areas, I feel that this is an issue that we need to, if we are going to be inclusive, address. Thank you.

Nicholas Jones: Thank you very much.

Chair Strauss: Other questions? Thank you very much.

[APPLAUSE]

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Strauss: OK Item G, Forensic Business. We have three forensic business items for today. The first is from Educational Equity and Campus Environment. And it appears in Appendix B. Vice Chair Julia Bryan will lead the discussion. Ten minutes has been allocated for the presentation and discussion.

Julia Bryan, Education: Hi. Good afternoon. I'm Julia Bryan, and I'm standing in for Rob Loeb. And I'm on the Educational Equity and Campus Environment. And this is Lauren Teti, who is from the President's Commission on Racial and Ethnic Diversity. I must say, I appreciate the urgency in the room. I get a sense that all of us, given the daily climate that we live in, are feeling our hearts beating faster and feeling a sense of urgency about these issues. And hence, I appreciate you sharing your urgency with us.

I think the questions I bring to you are important, and they're coming as a result of the report from the President's Commission on Racial and Ethnic Diversity. Lauren will be able to answer any questions. I think given our focus here at Penn State, across Penn State in terms of the All In Initiative, in terms of

our desire to make our campus more inclusive, and given the external threats that we're beginning to feel of racial and ethnic intolerance across numerous groups as well as gender intolerance, as well as some of the threats internal, close to home-- some of you will have heard about the flyers going around that said that international and immigrant students are not welcome here, that immigrant and international people are not welcome.

And so given all of this, I feel the sense of urgency. And so I think these questions are particularly pertinent to us. And they're also a follow-up coming from the students and their concerns, so you might want to say something about this.

Laureen Teti, Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity: Yes. Thank you. So we were approached by University Park Undergraduate Association to ask them to add to the Advisory and Consultative Report that was produced in January. Some of these questions originally were on that report, and Jim Strauss wisely asked us to take them off and open them for discussion with the full Faculty Senate.

So, we feel that especially in this climate, there's been a very large increase in the Report Bias website usage. But one thing that was very clear immediately in the weeks after the election is that there are many students who are experiencing bias who are not aware of the existence of the Report Bias website. They are going to the Multicultural Resource Center, they're reporting that things are occurring, but they're not aware that this website even exists.

So this says to us that there are probably far more incidents occurring than what are being tallied on the Report Bias website. And it's really-- the data that we are collecting there is the only data we have on what is occurring here on campus. So that's one of the three items, recommendations, that we would like to get your feedback on as far as whether it's supported by the Faculty Senate, can we move forward with an additional report to have the Report Bias website placed mandatorily on all syllabi.

Chair Strauss: So being respectful of time and the idea that a forensic should be a discussion, I'm going to suggest if we could at least discuss each of these three questions in order so we have some sense of how the faculty feel about these important ideas.

Julia Bryan: So I'll read the first question. Considering that faculty from under-represented 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?

Chair Strauss: So, do we have any comments on that, either for or against that idea? In the back. Yes, please.

Kathleen Hodgdon, Engineering: Kathy Hodgdon, ARL. Have you determined what methods you want to use to analyze the bias? Or are you waiting to have that question decided before you discuss methods? Or had you already considered an approach that you could share?

Laureen Teti: Well, the idea would be that there would be no changes made to the SRTE. What we would do is we would just look probably-- and the actual analyses will be determined later. But my guess is that there would be correlational analyses looking to see if faculty of certain racial or ethnic groups

receive poor responses to specific questions on the SRTEs, to see whether there is some systematic sense of bias there.

Chair Strauss: Hang on. Kim Nelson?

Kimberlyn Nelson, Science: This is Kim Nelson, College of Science. I think it's really hard to talk about searching an ineffective tool for the presence of bias and try to attribute that bias to a particular reason. We know SRTEs are flawed, and they're greatly flawed. I could get super SRTEs if I gave all my students A's. Even being a female, if I gave all my students A's, I could get better SRTEs. So yes, I think we need to be aware of this. But I think we need to fix our tool first before then we try to figure out how to use a broken tool to assess some other issue.

Chair Strauss: Thank you very much. Mohamad has a--

Mohamad Ansari: Thank you. I see some merit in the one that you said, the first one. I wasn't born here. I have an accent. But I do not wish to be distinguished just because I wasn't born here. So as a faculty member, I would like to be a faculty member just like Kim that spoke.

So for us to consider analyzing SRTEs based on the person's background, it is not the right way to approach diversity. I think the question is, we all have to abide by the University policies. And therefore as such, we do not need to create another class of faculty that were not born here just because they look different or they sound different. Maybe the students are biased against them.

I have been here 34 years. And to this day, no one said, you know, where the hell did you come from? No one. I mean, everybody respects what we do as a professor. I apologize for the word H. But to be honest with you, I am totally-- I see there's merit to it, but I'm totally against that because I don't want to create another group of faculty. That is wrong. This is not the way to address diversity. We all have needs, but this is not the way to do it. Thank you.

Chair Strauss: We'll take Patty, and then we'll take Willie.

Patricia Koch: Patricia Koch, HHD in University Park. And since we have on our agenda today an informational report on the SRTEs, which is very comprehensive, and the person who is an expert on these is here today, Dr. Angela Linse, I just wondered if you could give us some insight as to can we be analyzing these SRTEs to get the outcome that's suggested here? Would you comment upon that?

Angela Linse, Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence: We actually discussed something like this in Faculty Affairs this morning. But one of the Faculty Affairs members, I think, came up with a better approach to this than singling out faculty who may have some difference. By doing some analyses and seeing where the potential problematic student ratings are, and then looking at the characteristics of those courses and seeing whether we're seeing patterns in this. So approaching this in a slightly different way, that would also be able to address some of the questions about whether women in certain fields have biases.

Now, I would like to point out that the research doesn't support that the bias is significant enough to shift somebody's mean significantly. Now, we haven't looked at the data, but there's lots of research on this--

less on faculty of color than on women. But I would encourage you not to believe everything you read in the academic press, but to maybe go for the research literature on this. But we're open to it.

Chair Strauss: Thank you. Willie, we'll take your question. And then, I think, to move things on after Willie's question, we need to go to two and then three.

Willie Ofosu: Willie Ofosu again, Wilkes-Barre Campus. Thank you very much for all the work and analysis and everything you're doing. But let's face it, data can be collected for all sorts of situations also of things and be analyzed to death. The fact of the matter is, we're talking about people's emotions and psychological state.

What has happened-- let's take Tamir Rice, a 12-year-old killed, a child, went to a playground, a designated area for children to play at, and he got dead-- like, graveyard dead. Are you going to stand here and tell me that we need all this analytical approaches to get to understand what is really happening here? I doubt that we need that. It is known.

But the question becomes, what are we really doing? Do we need to keep doing all this analytical stuff, or data collection? And where is that going to get us in real-life situations? This is what I'm talking about. Maybe Penn State is not the right place to talk about these things. Maybe Penn State, Pennsylvania State University as an entity, as an institution, is not the body to resolve this situation. Maybe I'm just way out in left field. If that's the case, then tell me so. But for God's sakes, we're forgetting humanity.

Chair Strauss: To try to focus things, maybe we could do the second.

Julia Bryan: So I'm not sure about procedure. But I just wanted to make a comment. Is that OK?

Chair Strauss: Absolutely.

Julia Bryan: Just to highlight that this research has been done extensively. This is not new. We are behind. Many campuses when I was at University of Maryland, implicit bias and bias in SRTEs was regularly analyzed. And then, of course, action taken. And I just want to say to-- I'm not sure your name.

Mohamad Ansari: Mohamad.

Julia Bryan: Yes. But whether you're aware of it or not, other people may put you into boxes. I have been here a long time, not as long as you, and I'm put in a box. And I also recognize-- I've also experienced bias, whether I've wanted it or not. You may not want it. You may not even know you are in the box, but you're put in the box.

Chair Strauss: Can we-- wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Because we do have a meeting. We've got to get through some things. So as chair, I'm going to ask that we examine the second question and get some comments. We're trying to hear what you folks think about this, so we can maybe craft some legislation. That's really our goal. So for item two, if you could read that, please?

Julia Bryan: Should the Senate support the University Park Undergraduate Association's request to change Faculty Senate policy 43-00, Syllabus, in order to include the Report Bias website as a requirement for all syllabi at the Pennsylvania State University?

Chair Strauss: [INAUDIBLE]

Samantha Geisinger, Science: Samantha Geisinger, University Park Undergraduate Association Representative. So I kind of wanted to start talking about why we decided to bring this up and why we came to CORED with this back in October, I think it was, actually. So after our first Senate meeting, when we did have a panel of students up here talking, Jorge and I came together, and we figured out that this was something we very much wanted to approach for the coming year.

And we know it's a huge concern for a lot of faculty that syllabi tend to just be this catch-all place where we're throwing all these resources in for students. But we do want to very much stress that from the student opinion. Syllabi are one of the only things that are consistent across the University, that every single student will see, no matter what, while they're here as a student. And we feel very passionate about this report bias being a resource added to syllabi, because like was mentioned already earlier, many students don't even know that this exists as a resource. As an involved student, I didn't know that this was a resource until this past October. And like was mentioned earlier already, in the first week after elections, when our new president was coming into office, I might be wrong on this number, but I'm pretty sure in that first week after elections, there was more report biases indicated through the Report Bias Office than there had been in the two or three years previous before. So this kind of just shows that it's an issue for our students.

And I'm not sure if I do this. Jorge already talked. I was going to yield the floor to him. Did you have anything more to add? No? OK, thank you.

Chair Strauss: Yes, please.

Nancy Welsh, Dickinson Law: Nancy Welsh, Dickinson Law. I would like to speak in support of this. There are plenty of other policies that we're required to acknowledge within our syllabi. I think this would absolutely make sense.

I have only one request, and that would be, one of the other things that the students said on the panel, they acknowledged faculty who had done a good job. And I would really like to see there be some sort of a report-- excellent response to bias website, so that that third item of yours, we're actually able to learn from each other and acknowledge when things have gone well.

Chair Strauss: Thank you very much. Other-- Matthew?

Matthew Wilson, Harrisburg: Wilson, Penn State Harrisburg. Given the political climate and the reports that we've been hearing in the national news about an upsurge in bias reports, I want to speak in favor of this. I think, sorry, before the election I would have said, well, we really don't need this. But given the climate change in the United States now, I do think we need this on the syllabi.

Chair Strauss: Thank you. Mohamad, quick comment.

Mohamad Ansari: Thank you. Mohamad Ansari, Berks. First of all, I appreciate your comments. I respectfully disagree with you that I'm in the box. But that being said, I 100% support UPUA's request. As Chair of the Senate in the past year, I worked with that organization. And they are on target for us as faculty members to put that in our syllabi.

And therefore if someone is interested in looking at what means diversity, then they can go to that website. And I think it's a fantastic addition to our syllabi. Thank you for putting it out.

Chair Strauss: I'm going to simply ask, does anyone have any substantively different comments on this so that we can maybe go on to number three, a different perspective? Yes, sir.

Themis Matsoukas, Engineering: Themis Matsoukas, Engineering. Perhaps not substantively different. I'm not entirely sure that the syllabus is the best place. I totally agree, this information should be up there. When syllabi are loaded with a lot of information, you have to think whether it will actually serve the purpose that we intend. My guess is that many students will see identical syllabi between different courses, and some of that will just be ignored.

Chair Strauss: All right. Let's go on to question three if we could, please.

Julia Bryan: Question three, should the Senate recommend that colleges sponsor workshops for all faculty to raise awareness of, and how to properly handle implicit discrimination, stereotypes, threat, and microaggressions in the classroom?

Chair Strauss: So the question is-- yes?

Kevin Reuning, Student: I'm Kevin Reuning, the Graduate School, or graduate student representative to the Faculty Senate. The only thing I'd have to add is that this would hopefully be open to graduate students and welcoming to them as well. Because a lot of things that have happened since the inauguration, trying to get more out to help faculty, have often ignored graduate students who are often either teaching or TAs and dealing with students one on one.

Chair Strauss: Good point. Jamie, in the back.

Jamie M. Myers, Education: Myers, Education. I had the opportunity to have World in Conversation do workshops in my classes over the past several years. And it's been an exceptional experience. I think it's a superior program. It's a Penn State house program, comes out of Sociology. It is something that I think in terms of this bullet, the faculty component, I would see a recommendation that faculty have something like a World in Conversation workshop in every course they teach, at least once a year.

I think that workshops outside of the classroom for faculty don't have the same impact as a workshop with your students in the classroom. And then I of course support the other audiences for these types of workshops, which might be different. Although I think World in Conversations also does things at a staff level or another level. Thank you.

Chair Strauss: Thank you. Other suggestions for item three? Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel, Arts and Architecture: Szczygiel from Arts and Architecture. And just to pick up on Jamie's comment, I've been thinking about ways to engage the already in place organizations that we have. And it strikes me that we've got a Special Committee on Engaged Scholarship, which goes sort of hand-in-hand with the spirit of today's comments, that if there were a way to actually get students on the ground out there next semester working on a project with a community, or within a community on

campus on these issues, that perhaps that would be a way to see some progress done very quickly. So I would encourage that connection.

Chair Strauss: OK. Yes?

Asad Azemi, Brandywine: Azemi, Penn State Brandywine. I support the recommendation here. But the question coming to my mind is, before acting on this, do we have data to know how widespread it is? That based on those data, you're putting a recommendation, and then I don't know how we're going to assess that thing then. If it's widespread, then we need to put a lot of resources. If it's not widespread, then we have to put less resources. So before doing this recommendation, I'd like to see some data, how widespread it is, or at least we guess how widespread it is. Thank you.

Chair Strauss: And given the time-- and I will say we have allowed things to go 10 minutes over what we had allotted, we'll take one more question on this topic. Any more? Thank you very much, Julia.

[APPLAUSE]

Our second forensic item is from Faculty Benefits and appears as Appendix C. Committee Chair Renee Borromeo and Vice President Susan Basso will lead the discussion on WorkLion. Ten minutes has been allocated for the presentation, and additional five minutes for discussion.

Renee Borromeo, Mont Alto: The Committee on Faculty Benefits invited Susan Basso, Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer, to speak to the Senate about WorkLion, which will affect all of us very soon. We are pleased that Susan has agreed to make a very short presentation, which is included in the Senate agenda, and then spend some time with us listening to our questions and ideas. Thank you, Susan.

Susan Basso, Vice President and Chief Human Resource Officer: Thank you, Renee. And thank you, Chair Strauss, for the invitation. I heard the emphatic very short presentation, so I think I've been allowed a minute per slide. You do have a copy of the slides, which I'm going to go through very quickly because I want to make sure I have enough time to answer your questions, hear your concerns, and then we can get to the forensic business.

I'm very excited and pleased to be able to present to you information on WorkLion. It is Penn State's next significant system implementation, providing human capital management and payroll services. I did want to take a minute to acknowledge our executive sponsors, Provost Jones and Senior Vice President David Gray, who are both here. Also co-sponsor with me on the project is our controller, Joe Doncsecz, who's here. And also our project leadership, Michael Busges, who is leading the Project Management Office, and Rina Kumar, who has actually been providing the leadership to our specific project.

Also in the audience we have someone from our Communication and Training Team, who's here to listen to the issues and concerns that will hopefully help inform our future communications and training, which we'll be rolling out very shortly. I also wanted to acknowledge the Commonwealth Campuses. I had the opportunity last evening to speak to the Commonwealth Caucus and got lots of really great questions and great information.

Moving forward-- so you may all be aware that HR is in the midst of a very significant transformation. Part of that transformation is a technology implementation. We are implementing two significant technologies. One is Workday, which is the human capital management payroll system. It is cloud-based. It is very user friendly-- very, very intuitive-- and it will help us to enable data-driven decisions. There's going to be a much greater visibility to data, and the structure is set up based on a supervisory organization with roles-based security. Just to clear up any confusion, WorkLion is our brand. So it will be the overarching name of everything related to HR payroll.

We're also implementing Neocase, which is the front face of Workday. It is our HR portal, our inquiry management system, and our knowledge base. So this is the system that's going to replace what you currently know as ESSIC, which is the self-service portal for employees. It is also the system where we will document all of the inquiries that employees raise—so, very simple benefit questions to more complex inquiries-- so that we can manage that information and streamline and improve processes for our employees. And it will also serve as a consistent database of information so that our HR employees can answer policy-related questions consistently across the University.

There are a number of key impacts that WorkLion and Workday are going to have. Because obviously I'm speaking to a faculty group, I thought I would just highlight what some of the key impacts for faculty and academic leadership are going to be. This is a system that you will have to access for one thing or another. So it is not something that you'll be able to avoid.

You will, for example, need to do things like view, enroll, and make changes to your benefit elections. So this will be where you will go in the future state for open enrollment. You'll be able to make changes to payment elections such as your direct deposit. So there'll be lots of things that you will now be able to do on your own that you were not able to do previously.

Faculty managers will have additional responsibilities. And I did put managers in quotations. So these are responsibilities that a faculty department chair might have. So if you have responsibilities that are more akin to a supervisory responsibility, you will have responsibility in the future state for approving time worked, submissions, or time off requests for any staff you may be supervising. We have paid special attention to this. We understand faculty workload. This is something that in Workday we will allow you to delegate. But I was reminded last night by the Commonwealth Caucus that this was something they wanted me to call special attention to because as you depart for summer, if you do need to delegate this responsibility, it's something that we're going to want you to do.

We also are going to have a new shared service center. I'll talk a little bit more about that in a minute. But one of the things that's going to go on there is very robust onboarding for all of our new employees. Something that we do not do very well at Penn State, at least in my opinion and based on what we've heard from new employees, is create a very consistent positive experience for new hires. And so we will be handling that. So we will make sure that employees can fill out all the paperwork they need to do in advance of actually arriving, so when they get to the campus or get here to University Park, they'll be able to get into their academic unit and really hit the ground running, not have to be worrying about running around to do paperwork, get a parking pass, get their access ID, get their IT situated. This will all be stuff that we can take care of in advance.

Workday now also will house academic appointment information. This is information that you'll be able to see and that your leadership will be able to see-- things like tenure status, faculty rank, et cetera. And

now also academic units can roll up to create an academic hierarchy. So this is just very much akin to having an academic organizational chart, if you will.

Additional positive changes-- Workday is going to allow you to have multiple direct deposits. Right now that is something that our current system does not permit. You'll be able to have two, plus the additional third with the Penn State Federal Credit Union. You'll also be able to now designate your own beneficiary information. We like to think about this in terms of you being the masters of your own information.

New and existing employees will also be able to upload dependent verification information. This is something that's been a bit of a hassle for folks. If someone has a new baby, has gotten married, has to get a copy of their birth certificate or their marriage certificate and provide that to our third party vendor, that will no longer be the case. This is information that you'll be able to upload right in the system, and then, as a result of that, immediately become eligible for benefits.

Also, as a final point here, Workday access is completely secure and role-based, creating consistency across Penn State. There's been lots of questions that have already arisen about security because we are moving HR-related data into the cloud. But we really have absolutely no concerns about this. It has been thoroughly vetted by our own internal IT security, and also the protocols that a company like Workday has in place are probably far better than anything we have currently with our homegrown legacy systems. It's also a company that's providing HR payroll services to organizations like Google, Bank of America, Goldman Sachs, and many companies that are global and have a far bigger footprint than Penn State.

And then the last thing I just wanted to mention, just so you are aware of key time frames. Since January, we have been in very, very robust testing. We are doing end-to-end system testing, payroll reconciliation testing, and moving into user testing. And I cannot reiterate this issue enough about testing. We know we cannot mess up employee paychecks. And so we want to be absolutely certain that that is not going to happen. And I stand before you today to assure you that while we are marching very rapidly toward a June 11 go live, if we are not 100% confident that we can deploy this system with a very, very high degree of accuracy, we will be going to our executive sponsors to ask for a little bit more runway.

In January, we also launched WorkLion Ambassadors. These are the HR strategic partners and the FOs that are embedded in your units. Hopefully by now you're starting to see information that they are deploying. It's more or less right now just sound bites because we haven't really gotten into the detailed training phase. But hopefully this is not something that you're just hearing for the first time. April and June, we will be in end-user training. We are very specifically focused on faculty, because we know that come May, many of you may be departing for the summer. And we want to make sure that anything that you need to know before you leave you will know.

Those of you who may have chosen to take the voluntary retirement program, I had some questions about that last night. This is not something you'll be able to ignore. Because even in retirement, as a Penn State retiree, this is the system that you will use to access your retiree benefits.

And then we are also then launching Workday. The plan is June 11. And at that time, we'll also be launching our new HR portal. We're super excited about the portal because right now if you're someone who has tried to navigate our website, it is crazy. It's very difficult to find information. It's not unique to you.

In the future state, when you log into the portal, it's going to recognize who you are, and there will only be information there related to you. So as a faculty member, you're not going to be looking at benefits that pertain to staff or a teamster or an executive or anyone other than faculty.

Chair Strauss: Thank you very much. I'm going to say we've got five minutes left, and let's have some questions.

Susan Basso: Yes. So these are the three-- whoops. So we have three forensic questions that we're interested in talking with you about. And also any other questions that you may have, you can certainly raise at this point in time. But can you provide insights on how best for us to manage training in order to transition faculty to the new system?

Now, we certainly have some ideas about this. We are planning lots of videos, lots of demos. This is a very intuitive system. Quite frankly, if you've ever shopped on Amazon, you're going to be able to utilize this system. It's that intuitive, particularly for the average employee experience, going on to do self-service kinds of things.

Chair Strauss: Nick?

Nicholas Rowland, Altoona: Rowland at Altoona. One of the things that might be useful is, while I'm in support of videos and all manner of other things just in general, it'd be nice if it was on demand. So instead of having a need and then tracking down the video, only to find out five minutes later the video either is or isn't relevant based on what anticipatable problems there were, if there were some way to just have something on demand at any time, even if it's just a chat service, I think that would probably make a lot of difference.

Susan Basso: Great. Great suggestion, thank you.

Chair Strauss: Other comments? We can move on to two, then.

Susan Basso: Next question. Are there any specific thoughts on communication or tools for faculty that we should adopt for effective change management? There are going to be big changes. I think the point here is, there are going to be big changes in our future state with how we're delivering HR services, how systems are going to be utilized. We want to make sure that our employees are comfortable with the service delivery model for HR and with the tools, the technology tools that are going to be different.

Are there any thoughts about-- concerns about the change? We know we're coming on the heels of LionPATH. So we know that obviously there's been some angst and some concern. Things are getting much, much better there. But we want to learn from those experiences and be able to improve here.

Chair Strauss: Michael Bérubé?

Michael Bérubé, Liberal Arts: Bérubé, Liberal Arts. I just want to say as a member of the committee about WorkLion, the committee has been informed about this all year, you seem to be on track. And it seems to be-- I don't think we're looking at LionPATH here. I'm reassured. And the fact that you've done this all along is also reassuring.

My only question-- and it's not for me. It's on behalf of the faculty managers. I think once it's rolled out, once it goes live, there will be questions as to how they actually have to manage. That's going to be completely new. And we talked about this at the last meeting, maybe devising modules for that, or just getting ahead of that. Because they will inevitably raise questions. That's really my only concern.

Susan Basso: Great. Thank you.

Chair Strauss: I'll ask a quick question. I'm assuming that a couple weeks prior to the rollout of this, there'll be a general announcement made to all faculty, and maybe a different one to staff, just telling them this is going to happen, here's where you go for information, those kinds of things.

Susan Basso: Yes. So, as I said, in probably the next three to four week time frame, we've really made a commitment to do a real robust analysis around our readiness. And so we intend to know in the third or fourth week of April if we're going to really be pulling the trigger for the June 11th, which is the first biweekly pay, or whether we're going to ask for a little bit more runway. So you'll have very advanced knowledge before you depart in May as to whether we'll be in the old system for a little bit longer, or whether we're moving into the new one.

Chair Strauss: Being respectful of time, Nick, you've got the last question.

Nicholas Rowland: At Altoona. Unlike the Canvas and Angel, we're not going to have a lot of overlap in these two systems, if I'm understanding that right. And so I know that last night we were talking about maybe people printing off their old pay stubs to make sure that things are consistent, because there are some very critical issues that are going to happen at that transition point. And if it means I need to print things, I definitely have to know.

Susan Basso: Yeah. So thank you for reminding me of that. That did come up last night. And I was able to confirm this morning that archived in the old system, you will have access to seven years' worth of W-2 and payroll information, even in the old system. Beyond that, I mean, we're not legally required. That's kind of the retention management schedule.

But as I heard last night, if you're one of those individuals that-- I forget who was the person that said they did that, that prints off all of their pay stubs for the multiple decades that they've worked here, and you want to have that historical folder of paper, then you better get to it.

Chair Strauss: OK. And on that note, thank you very much for your presentation.

Susan Basso: Thank you very much.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Strauss: Our final forensic item for today is from Outreach. It appears as Appendix D. Committee Chair Beth Seymour will lead the discussion. Fifteen minutes is allocated for presentation and discussion.

Elizabeth Seymour, Altoona: It's going to take us a few minutes to get set up. So hi, I'm Beth Seymour, Chair of Outreach. And we have with us-- oh, sorry. I should introduce everybody.

Martha Jordan's joining me here. She's the Senior Director of Adult Learner Advocacy. But really, we want to hear first two students. We initially had three planned, but as with life as an adult learner, a family emergency happened, and he wasn't able to join us today. And he was from Altoona. So we have one student from World Campus and one student from University Park. And I'll let them speak. But as you look at our questions, I think they're going to be really helping us with the first one, and then we'll probably more focus on the second and third one.

Nathaniel Sealoover, Student: Hi. My name is Nathaniel Sealoover. I'm a senior here at Penn State, majoring in psychology. I'll be graduating in May. I'm also the president of the Adult Learners of Penn State student organization here.

I was in the military. I served in the Navy for four years prior to coming to Penn State. And as far as the major difficulty or barrier that I seemed to encounter a lot with adult learners is, there seems to be a lack of communication between them and the more traditional students. Like, for example, a lot of them, even though they took a break after high school before coming to college, they are still new students. And a lot of them seem to get thrown in with transfer students, with those who have already been here for a few years. And they seem to have a little bit of an issue as far as navigating the campus, knowing where resources are located, things like that.

James Alami, Student: Is it my turn?

Elizabeth Seymour: Yes. Go ahead, James.

James Alami: I'm sorry. I can't see to the left or the right. My name is James Alami. I'm from Houston, Texas. I'm a senior here at Penn State World Campus. I've been here since '13, 2013. I'm majoring in a bachelor of science in management and marketing, with a first minor in energy business and finance, and a second minor in entrepreneurship.

I'm a father and a husband. We have three children, nine, seven, and six. It makes it very, very challenging to do this. And thank goodness that a medium like Penn State existed for me to return to school and be able to finish my education. I'm also a member of the honor society of Phi Kappa Phi and Alpha Sigma Lambda. And I also serve on the Inaugural Student Advisory Board. I'm on the marketing and communications committee.

The reason-- no, go ahead. I'm sorry. I know that I'm supposed to sequentially answer some of the questions. I'm not sure if we're taking a pause, or I should run through them.

Elizabeth Seymour: No. I'll facilitate. Thank you.

James Alami: Thank you.

Elizabeth Seymour: So the students have brought up some of the issues of difficulties and barriers that they face. I don't know if the faculty want to comment on that at all at this point. Is there any comments to that, or additions?

Chair Strauss: Michael?

Michael Krajsa, Lehigh Valley: Yeah. Krajsa, Lehigh Valley. I teach in the BSB program on the World Campus. In situations like the student from Texas describes, I get a lot of requests for exceptions. And I know World Campus is-- and I know most faculty like to lock things down. If it's not in by 11:59 on a Sunday night, you snooze, you lose on that. I just think that faculty have to be a little more understanding about these scenarios, not only with the military ones that I have to deal with, but cases like this, where family issues [INAUDIBLE].

And it seems like in the last two or three semesters, there's been an increase in stress and anxiety amongst a lot of these students. So I think it just needs more understanding from faculty. And although they can't submit back in a Dropbox or something, I have them email it to me outside of that to accommodate that. That's all.

Nathaniel Sealoover: Yeah. I actually really agree with you on that. Prior to coming here as well, while I was still overseas, I was attending the World Campus. And some of the professors, they were very flexible in extending deadlines. And other ones, they were very-- you know, 11:59, regardless of what came up. So I do definitely agree, that's an issue.

Elizabeth Seymour: Just in the interest of time, if we can move on to question two. How can faculty address the need of flexibility that many of our adult learners experience, as they juggle course requirements, employment, and parenting? We've already been talking about that a little bit. Besides our flexibility, what else can-- does anyone have any ideas about other things we can do?

James Alami: May I comment just on both of those parallels, with respect to the flexibility? I think it is important. I know that there are situations over the course of the four years that have created an environment for me not to be able to turn something in on time. But I know that as I finish up in the capstones, a lot of the students that I work with in groups-- because now you're forced to really do a lot of group stuff-- a lot of students don't feel the same way about grades as perhaps I do or somebody else. Some people are just fine with making C's or just getting the diploma or whatnot. I think I operate on a different level. I'd like to get the best grade that I can possibly get.

And an example of that, when you do give the leniency, it creates, I think, problems for other people in the group. I know that one of the group members in one of my courses this semester, his grandmother died four times in the course of the semester. So you know, essentially he removed himself from participating in each juncture of the assignment. I think yes, there should be a case-by-case extension, but a blanket rule probably is not a good idea because in the real world, I don't know that the employers will give us the same extensions.

Elizabeth Seymour: Thank you. Let's move on to question three. World Campus has created an online course, OL 3100, Teaching Adult Learners, to help faculty better understand how adult learners approach learning. And if you haven't taken a look at this material, I suggest that you do. It's phenomenal. But what additional resources can you think that might help faculty?

James Alami: I actually had an opportunity to do some research on this subject matter. I was looking at what the Khan Academy had been doing. And I know that they came into an investment through Bill Gates. And one of the things that they were working on was providing teachers with a dashboard application that lets them see the instant a student gets stuck in an assignment.

Running congruent to that, I know that Imperial College in London has probably one of the best software applications out there. And what it does, it can read-- they use it in the graduate program, but it can read students' expressions to the point where it can tell when a student is struggling or is bored with coursework.

Technology obviously is the course here specifically, because of the application or the median distribution system that we're using. But probably investing into perhaps companies or ideas that already have these things on the market and implementing them into the Canvas dashboard would be something that I would recommend.

Elizabeth Seymour: Thank you. Do we have a question?

Nicholas Rowland: This is Rowland from Altoona again. It turns out actually, to the student, the robo-student, that's what won just this last weekend. Teaching and Learning with Technology ran their open innovation challenge, and the winner was a face-recognition software program. So Penn State is working on that. Whether it will be applied to World Campus I don't know, but it just is some kind of strange coincidence. We're on it. We don't even know it yet.

James Alami: You know, obviously the students that we have, particularly the adult learner like myself, we're not digital natives. So that also is something to take into consideration. And I know that that course that they just started is to on-board the students that are not used to the technology spur that we've had.

Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture: Shapiro, Arts and Architecture. I think one of the beauties of teaching adult learners is that they are adults. And I think one of the things, as faculty members who teach them, that we might want to keep in mind is that we try to treat them like we want to be treated, as adults. And to extend that a little bit farther, most of our students are over 18 years old. If necessary, they could be drafted. They can vote. They're adults as well.

And I somehow think that we need to be cognizant that they have-- we don't want to take their responsibilities away from them. And if they choose to do what they need to do, that's a decision that they make on their own and that will have ramifications. And somehow I believe that if we can build that into our teaching structure, we might make a student-- or help a student to be maybe a little bit mature, or after they graduate, have maybe a little bit more self-responsibility.

James Alami: My wife would argue the fact that I'm an adult, so it's a good thing she's not here. I agree. But I do think that working inside-- and I'm sorry, you cut out a couple of times on me when you were speaking. I didn't quite get the full context of the message. But I think what I'm hearing you advocate is being more lenient to the adult because of the fact that they're adults and allowing them to do what they need to do as a priority over the schoolwork. Is that my understanding? Sorry.

Keith Shapiro: I don't necessarily think that lenience is the key here. I think it's that if they choose not to do the work, that's really-- at some point, it has to be their decision, and that I don't think it's in their best interest, or in the best interest of the class or the instructor, to slow things down necessarily, in order to ensure that they get all the work done, as they need to.

I think especially in terms of teaching online classes, and if you do have group projects, the instructor has to be cognizant of the fact that somebody is not going to do the work. However, I still think that that's an

adult responsibility that the student takes on. And at some point, it needs to be their problem and not the instructor's problem or the class's problem.

James Alami: Yes, I 100% agree with that.

Elizabeth Seymour: Any other questions? Well, thank you. Thank you very much. And our committee is working on a report on this.

[APPLAUSE]

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Strauss: OK. We now move on to Unfinished Business, with a quick note. Who would have guessed that a robotic representation would have more to say than the entire body of the Faculty Senate? Unfinished legislative business-- we will use clickers for voting today. The system provides a precise count of each vote taken. It allows for confidential voting; gives immediate results. Senators should have received a clicker before entering the auditorium. Raise your hand if you need a clicker.

We have one unfinished business item that was introduced in the January meeting on best practices for Senate Council members. It is a proposed change in the bylaws. It is found in Appendix E. Any further discussion on this topic? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? Those in favor of the measure can press A. Those who wish to vote against the measure may press B. Senators on Mediasite can vote on polleverywhere.com.

Anna Butler, Faculty Senate Staff: On Poll Everywhere, I have 16 accept and one reject.

Chair Strauss: OK. Legislation requires 2/3 vote in favor. I believe we have that. So this passed. Congratulations.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Strauss: Item I, Legislative Reports. Our first legislative report is from Committee on Committees and Rules. It appears as Appendix F in the agenda. Committee member Keith Shapiro will respond to questions on this. I believe this is membership and responsibilities for the Committee on Outreach. The report is brought to the floor by committee. It needs no second. Any questions for Keith? Question, Jamie Myers in the back.

Jamie Myers: Small piece of editing. Item 4 should say the Committee on Outreach, I believe.

Keith Shapiro: Can we make that change?

Chair Strauss: Any other comments? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 20 accept.

Chair Strauss: OK. The motion carries. Thank you very much, Keith.

Our next legislation-- actually, we have two legislative reports from Undergraduate Education. The first of these appears as Appendix G. This is on 43-00, the syllabus, the incorporation of learning goals and objectives in that document. Committee Chair Matthew Wilson will respond to questions. Matthew? Any questions to Matthew about this? Anyone like to offer any comments? Yes, in the back?

Themis Matsoukas, Engineering: My question, really, is there a place where there is a standard listing of the approved objectives of the course so we know what to put in, or what constitutes a deeper sense of what we put in the syllabus? I mean, do we have access to what has been approved as instructors?

Matthew Wilson: Yeah. In the curriculum archive, almost all course approval paperwork is available.

Themis Matsoukas: That information--

Matthew Wilson: There are going to be courses that are very, very old where we don't have them. But what we're talking about is-- I think in the language of the legislation, it says, in the last five years, all course proposals have included course goals and objectives. And all course changes that go forward from now on have to include course goals and objectives.

Themis Matsoukas: Then this place, I think, should be advertised a little more widely because I wouldn't know where to find it. I mean, for the courses that they teach, for example, where to find what's on file.

Matthew Wilson: Curriculum archive, that's all you have to do.

Themis Matsoukas: My suggestion is that should be advertised. I don't think that people can find that as easily.

Matthew Wilson: So are you suggesting that language gets added?

Themis Matsoukas: No, no, no. Not as legislation, but somehow faculty and instructors should be given information where to find--

Matthew Wilson: OK, good. Thank you. And I'll relay that to Curricular Affairs. Thank you.

Chair Strauss: Other comments on the legislation? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? To accept the motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B. Senators on Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com.

Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 21 accept and four reject.

Chair Strauss: The motion carries. Thank you very much.

Matthew has a second legislative report from Undergraduate Education. This is early online student progress with reporting through Starfish.

Matthew Wilson: Yeah. Could David Smith join me up here?

Chair Strauss: Absolutely.

Matthew Wilson: Thank you. I just need a little backup on this one. Just a few words. I know we're pressed for time today.

This is something that's been done at Commonwealth College Campuses for-- how many years? Quite a few years. And Starfish makes this much, much easier. We're not asking you to provide progress reports on all students. We're asking you to provide progress reports on students who are in danger in the course. That's not predictive in any way, but what we're trying to do is to give the students a shot across the bow and say, you've got to pay attention, you're doing poorly in this course. And in my experience at Penn State Harrisburg, you know it does get the students' attention.

Chair Strauss: Any questions or comments? Kim.

Kimberlyn Nelson: So while I think this is probably best practice, I think on the practical implication of it, it can be quite difficult on instructors. I certainly understand why it's not hard to implement at Harrisburg or other commonwealth campuses. But if I have multiple classes of over 700 students and there's no direct interface currently between Canvas Gradebook and Starfish to automatically implement these. It's a considerable amount of time required to go in and input this data across the board.

David Smith, Executive Director, Division of Undergraduate Studies: We are absolutely--

Kimberlyn Nelson: When you're talking 2,000 students per semester--

David Smith: We are aware of that challenge.

Kimberlyn Nelson: --20% of them might be in danger.

David Smith: We're aware of that challenge. And there is an active effort underway now between the Canvas implementation team and Starfish to build that integration so that we can find ways to manage those large classes. So that is absolutely the goal and objective there.

Chair Strauss: Question? In front. First, Samantha.

Samantha Geisinger, Student: Samantha Geisinger, University Park Undergraduate Association representative. I did kind of want to comment onto Kim's concern. So I think that it is important to remember that this isn't just a professor thing. It doesn't have to just come from the faculty. It can be the TAs in the class as well. And I know that I am a Science student. So obviously I'm in those large classes. But I do recognize the importance of it. And I think that even in those large classes, it will make those students recognize even more how important it is, because it just shows that their faculty in these large classes really do care, which is something that a lot of students don't feel right now.

Chair Strauss: I'm going to give it back to Kim, because I think she's got a comment.

Kimberlyn Nelson: So in order to allow a TA to do this kind of thing for you, you have to provide them with those privileges in LionPATH, which then provides you with privileges that-- that, again, I don't think that sometimes as a TA you should have access to the entire class worth of grades, which I simply

don't do. I believe in protecting my students' privacy and limit the exposure my TAs have to the entirety of my gradebook.

Chair Strauss: Carrie, you had a question? In front, here.

Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: Eckhardt, Liberal Arts. Just a point of clarification. I thought I heard you say at the beginning, Matthew, that you're not asking us necessarily to enter for all students. Is that correct? Because I may then have an outdated version of the report itself on my laptop. But this was a little unclear. It says instructors should submit early progress reports for all undergraduates. Is the key that we're supposed to understand "should" as advisory, because it doesn't say "must"?

I just want to have things really clear. Because if it's not "must," then I think that the very valid concern of the previous speaker could be addressed. In other words, she could enter the early progress report simply for the students who are at C or below C or whatever the cutoff is, and not be obliged to enter for all of the other hundreds of students.

Matthew Wilson: I read that as advisory. If it's not advisory, then I'm in violation of University policy because I only warn those students, give the progress report to those students who are in danger in a class.

Chair Strauss: Other questions? Comments? Yes. Behind you. Right behind you.

Richard Singer, Altoona: Sorry. Singer, Altoona. I believe the original intent of the early progress reports was basically for the freshmen who were making their transition from high school into college and might not understand how they were doing or what the implications were for what they were goofing off on, or et cetera. And so I would believe by the time students got to be sophomores, juniors, and seniors, they would have figured this out by now. And this strikes me as a little bit of babysitting. And so I heartily agree with doing this for the freshmen, and maybe if you want to do extended into the sophomore or the 200-level courses, that would be fine. But I think that putting this University-wide, at all levels, is a bit of a [INAUDIBLE].

David Smith: How I would respond to that, Richard, is to think about what President Barron and others commented on today. We had our student speaker that started our session talking about homelessness among students. We know that the class gift this year is to support the food pantry. We know the student gift the previous year was to support the issues around mental health, right?

Those are the issues that affect all students. And what we're really trying to say is that all of our students, at some point in their time of earning their degree, may encounter a difficulty. And as an institution, are we creating policies that really support their success. We see our students out there doing that, right? The food pantry and a class gift to help mental awareness on campus is absolutely our students taking this initiative to say that we want our students to be successful. We should likewise have policies that support that student's success, is how I would see that.

Chair Strauss: Jamie and Laura next.

Jamie Myers: Myers, Education. On a different issue, we have an oxymoron here in terms of early progress reports by the late drop deadline. The late drop deadline is fairly late. And if I would project, the

only action that you would find in response is not a student improving their performance in the course but dropping the course. If you really are sincere-- and I support the idea of letting students know that they are falling below a C so that they have a chance and time in order to remedy that-- then I think the late drop deadline is too late.

David Smith: Agreed. And I think some of that is word usage there. I think you have to recognize that with Starfish, what's different there from what we had in ISIS and eLion, that those were pushed out at a particular window of time. In Starfish, an instructor can raise a flag for a student at any point in the semester. So you could do it in the third week. You could do it in the fourth week. You could do it in the sixth week.

So there are ways to package that, which we do through Starfish in the surveys. But beyond that, you can, as an instructor, go in and raise the flag at any point in time. So the real goal there is to raise alerts early enough. I think that one of the issues with progress reporting in the past was that we knew that many of them were being done at the last minute. And the problem there is then your only option often is to withdraw from that class, late drop that class.

So the earlier that any kind of intervention can occur, then the more options I think are in front of a student to correct, to improve, to find ways to manage that class, or to come to the decision that that's more than they can be doing this semester. They need to drop it.

Chair Strauss: Laura?

Laura Pauley, Engineering: Pauley, Engineering. The current policy wording says "between the third week and the end of the sixth week." And we should include, I think, that range in the proposed policy, because an early intervention is important. By the late drop deadline, they're just deciding whether to drop the class.

David Smith: So again, I think part of the challenge is that there are so many different ways that classes are set up. We have to recognize that early reporting is critical. And within that window of time between the start of the semester and that late drop deadline, what students need is some form of outreach to say, there's an issue or there's not an issue. And so I think we need to learn how to use the tool well and not necessarily confine it to a particular period of time. Because again, there are so many different ways that classes are set up in terms of when their tests are given, when their evaluations occur within that class.

What we find often is that evaluations are happening outside of that window. That was a problem with the old EPR, the Early Progress Reporting, that they appeared at certain points in time, but they didn't necessarily adhere to how individual courses were designed. So we're trying to create some flexibility there so that instructors have some leeway as to what makes best sense for how their course is designed and allow them to take some judgment as to when is the best time to alert students to a potential issue.

Chair Strauss: OK.

Timothy Farley, Business: Tim Farley, Smeal Student Senator. So just to sort of put some of the student input in this, as to why wording goes through the late drop deadline for the time-frame as well as the reasoning for why we want to see this for the full range of classes, is the two main focuses we have are trying to increase the collaborative nature of the student experience in education, so it's not just on the

faculty member or the student in terms of grades. But when you use that Starfish system, raise that alert, let the student know. You're also letting their adviser know. So yes, the most value would be for freshmen. But there still is value in having that conversation and having someone that can sort of be a checkpoint outside of that faculty member to help you get things on track.

As well as-- one of the other main reasons outside of that collaborative aspect is some students have complained about not having visibility into their gradebook until after the late drop deadline. So they're not able to make a fully informed decision on if they should stay in a class or drop a class based on what their grade is at that point in time. So this is just saying, worst case, I just need to know so I can make a fully informed decision, because there is very favorable senate policy in terms of having no limit to late drop credits. But to have to push yourself back a semester, are you going to stay in school longer, it sort of plays into that overarching theme we have of trying to get students out sooner. So just to make sure through a mandated policy that they have all the information needed, instead of trying to say, well, I'm not sure, maybe I got an 85 on that paper, maybe I got a 57, I don't really know what the variability is, it allows them to have a greater role in their course selection.

Chair Strauss: OK. We have a Mediasite question in the back.

Anna Butler: This question is from Ira Saltz from Shenango. Is there a possibility that early progress reports can be handled through Canvas? We replaced eLion with a million new software, and it is very confusing what software is for what, and how to access them is not always clear. The more software programs that have to be accessed by faculty, the less compliance rate.

David Smith: There is an effort underway now to allow for Canvas information, Canvas data to be integrated, so that flags could be raised more automatically in Starfish. So that doesn't provide the progress reporting directly through Canvas. But the intention is to integrate that so that people who are using Canvas could have ways to make it more manageable for them. I think there are other ways that there could be conversations about how to perhaps collapse or put some of these technologies into a more sort of user-friendly portal, but that's a further conversation that could happen. But there are ways to work at integrating Canvas and Starfish.

Chair Strauss: OK. Being mindful of time, do we have comments that are substantially different than what we have already heard on the floor? Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel: Szczygiel, Arts and Architecture. This is just a clarification. I heard the last in-house speaker suggest that this was a mandatory action asked or required of faculty, versus advisory.

David Smith: No. "Should" is the word that's used in the legislation.

Bonj Szczygiel: Thank you.

Chair Strauss: Jamie in back.

Jamie Myers: Myers, Education. Just so it's in the Senate Record, the follow-up on Bonj. A faculty member does not need to do this, because you're using the word "should," and that's your intent.

Lisa Posey, Business: Posey, Smeal. It says "mandate" behind it, so that's why I'm confused. Because if I vote yes, then that means a mandated progress report.

David Smith: The actual legislation is in the agenda for today's meeting, and it does not say "mandate."

Matthew Wilson: Yeah. That's not our language. That's not our language.

Chair Strauss: Two more quick questions. Whomever is closest first.

Themis Matsoukas: If it's advisory, then it shouldn't specify Starfish. I sympathize with the intention of the policy, but it looks like one size fits all. In my class, I give out a grade. I have a midterm exam four weeks into the semester. I have an absolute scale. I don't curve. A student who gets a 50, they're failing. They know that when my grade is posted. I don't have to go into Starfish and say, your grade is 50.

David Smith: I think what helps there-- right, I understand that. There are good ways and different ways to communicate with students.

Themis Matsoukas: No, my point is this. If a student is in a class where their paper will be graded by some nebulous grading policy and they don't know if they're going to get an A or an F, I understand that they need that feedback. But I give a grade distribution right after my exam in the lecture. I talk to my students. As far as I'm concerned, I'm communicating your intention to those who care to come to class on the day of the lecture. I shouldn't have to go out and get on Starfish. So, suggesting feedback is important. But don't specify Starfish.

David Smith: Well, the value of doing it through Starfish is that it allows for others who need to be aware that a student is struggling to be aware of that. And so as an advisor, if you know that a student has a flag in one class, that's one kind of response. But if you see a student that has flags in four classes, that's a different kind of outreach that may need to happen, right?

So it's how do we provide good information to the range of people that can really support our students and help them succeed here at Penn State. And so I understand what you're saying, and I appreciate that. But I also understand the value of communicating and providing that information to the teams of people that we're really investing in to help with student support. And that's what's facilitated by using the progress reporting through Starfish.

Chair Strauss: OK. Judy and Nick, and then we'll re-evaluate where we're at here.

Judith Ozment, Abington: Ozment, Abington. I have a simple request. Can we change the policy name to Student Progress Report Online? Because I thought it was about online students. Student Progress Report Online is a little clearer wording for the policy.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

Chair Strauss: I believe, because of the way this is submitted, we really need to do a formal motion to do that? No, we don't. OK. Our parliamentarian says we do not require a formal motion to do so. So is your committee fine? Matthew says they are.

Matthew Wilson: Yeah, please.

Chair Strauss: OK. Great. Nick?

Matthew Wilson: Thank you, Judy.

Nicholas Rowland: Rowland from Altoona. With all due respect, I think if all courses had the same kind of grading structure as the one we were just talking about, Tim wouldn't have been saying that the students need and want this. So on that account, I'm going to vote for it. I have no problem with that. But on the fact that the students want us to do this, I think that that is a voice we need to follow up.

Also, I didn't notice that anybody had any serious problems with the report itself, that I generally think is well done. So I think it's time to call the question.

Chair Strauss: So we can do a voice vote on the call question. All in favor of calling the question?

Senate: Aye.

Chair Strauss: Great. Those opposed? OK, motion carries. So we're ready to vote. If you support the legislation, please press A. If you do not, please press B. The chair needs a clicker. Thank you.

Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 16 accept, 14 reject.

Chair Strauss: Motion carries. Thank you very much, Matthew. OK. That completes our legislative reports.

ADVISORY AND CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Chair Strauss: We have three such reports today. The first report is from Educational Equity and Campus Environment. It appears as Appendix I in your agenda. Vice Chair Julia Bryan will respond to questions. This is on a rewrite of AD policy, AD 84, the preferred name and gender.

Julia Bryan: Yes. This is some changes to AD-84, preferred name and gender identity policy. EECE, we have reviewed the changes and support the proposed revision.

Chair Strauss: OK. Any questions about this report? Seeing none, we are ready to vote? If you accept this advisory/consultative report, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B.

Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 16 accept, eight reject.

Chair Strauss: OK. The motion carries. Thank you very much, Julia.

Our second advisory consultative report is from Faculty Affairs. It appears as Appendix J in the agenda. It is the HR 21 revision, the standardized fixed-term titles. I will tell you that from the committee, by unanimous consent, the report has minor changes that Michael Bérubé will explain. And then it will be up to the audience to accept this.

Michael Bérubé: Great. Thank you. Thank you, Chair Strauss. OK. As you remember from January, this report is sort of the counterpart and follow-up to our report last year, where we created fixed-term review committees and promotion procedures. Now we have a three-tiered promotion structure, and now we need titles to correspond to them that map more or less parallel onto the three-tiered structure for tenured faculty.

What we were trying to do was come up with titles that took into account terminal degrees but did not create two different systems for people with terminal degrees and people without. And we also left it to units to determine what counts as a terminal degree-- say, an MFA or a JD. That's not going to be our call.

At the same time, we did not want a single system for fixed-term faculty and tenure track faculty. Scroll down a bit. That came up in January. And the second paragraph here, committee does not recommend using a single system of titles on the grounds this will obscure the ratio of tenured to non-tenure line faculty, and allow units to hire more aggressively off the tenure track, thereby subverting the tenure system itself.

Over the last week, various units have asked for exemptions to this because their hiring practices are vastly different from everybody else's. College of Medicine was already in there. Dickinson Law voted for this, I wrote University Park, I meant Penn State Law, and the University Library. So these are the exemptions from this overall title system. I don't think it affects the real point of the report.

And again, as I said in January, there are still going to be anomalies. There are going to still be a handful of faculty in EMS and a handful of faculty there who struck deals or agreements that will not be affected by this policy. For the anomalies, basically the anomalies can remain anomalies. And when the people holding these anomalous titles retire, there will not be any anomalies anymore. In the meantime, it won't be a problem. But this is the revision since you last saw these exemptions.

Chair Strauss: So to move things along, I'm going to ask the Senate floor, are you accepting of these revisions in this legislation to be voted upon on the floor today? OK. So we can proceed, then, with the substitute.

Michael Bérubé: OK. Now the substitute report.

Chair Strauss: OK. Do we have any discussion on this report? Mohamad in the back.

Mohamad Ansari: Hi, Michael. How are you?

Michael Bérubé: Holding up, Mohamad. How are you?

Mohamad Ansari: Thank you. As I said in January, you have done a great job. As you know, the language as it stands in HR 21, ranks and titles vary among units for our fixed-term colleagues. And the way I understood the logic behind this report was to present a uniform title for our colleagues who hold fixed-term appointments. Is that correct?

Michael Bérubé: Yes.

Mohamad Ansari: OK. So I have an issue with columns five and six, as it relates to clinical faculty for the Smeal College of Business. I have read, and I can read to you part of the outline of guidelines/principles for clinical professors from the Smeal College of Business that was established in 2009. And in fact, last year I sent it to you for your discussion during deliberations of Faculty Affairs Committee.

I see no contradictions with what's written in the guidelines and having the same title as we have for our fixed-term faculty that we are using as teaching. For example, under one it says, appointments to clinical professorships will generally have a PhD as their terminal degree. Well, that can fall into one of your columns.

The second one it says, clinical professors may be employed in the same ranks as regular faculty with appropriate designations. And I think that designation could be teaching, as you have suggested. Finally, I think the term "clinical" perhaps is associated with the College of Medicine and not with the Smeal College of Business, because that could be confusing.

So with what I said, if you could convince me that we still need five and six, then I defer to you. Otherwise I'm prepared to motion to remove it.

Michael Bérubé: Myself, I'm agnostic. I know that some faculty in-- really-- Smeal feels very strongly about the title "clinical." I do not. So I think it's up to this body.

Mohamad Ansari: So Michael, let me ask you another question. How come they did not ask to be exempted like the others did?

Michael Bérubé: Precisely because the "clinical" term was in there, I think.

Mohamad Ansari: Right. So Mr. Chairman, I'm going to withhold proposing the motion until we hear more discussions from our colleagues.

Chair Strauss: OK. So this is relative to your potential proposal, then, these discussion questions? OK, go ahead.

Lisa Posey: Posey, Smeal. Yeah, I think it's something that is done in many business schools. It's something that's not just being done at Smeal. So although you think it is common for medical schools, that this has become something that's more common in other business schools and would be recognizable for somebody hiring somebody from another school, and other schools recognizing what that means. So that's why we wanted to have that. It was something that was put together by our previous dean as a result of a lot of research and things like that, so it's not just within our college. So that's why we'd like to keep that.

And it was in there originally without us-- I don't know whether we asked for it, but it was in there from the beginning. So we are happy to see it. And we never had any reason for an exemption. So we're happy to see it.

Michael Bérubé: Sure. No, I've gotten some commentary from faculty in Smeal. I've also had commentary from people who believe "clinical" really should only be clinics, in the medical sense. But again, this is nothing I feel very strongly about personally. So I'm happy to turn this over.

Chair Strauss: OK. So question down the line here.

Rajarajan Subramanian, Harrisburg: Raja Subramanian from Harrisburg campus. So is it OK if we have Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Teaching? OK. Why do we have to include "teaching" or "research" or "clinical"? We can just put in par with tenure track as Assistant, Associate, and Professor.

Michael Bérubé: Are you suggesting-- are you in favor of that, or are you skeptical of it?

Rajarajan Subramanian: Yeah. I'm trying to just propose, you know, if it's possible on this floor, you know, to have Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor for all, because it's World Campus. We need to have equality here.

Michael Bérubé: Understood. And actually, last year, I would have agreed with you. But I think as the report suggested, we scroll back up a bit, there is an important distinction to be made between fixed-term faculty and tenure track faculty, quite apart from the fact that the latter have continuous employment with termination for cause, that a single system-- a little further. Thanks.

We have a situation here now where we are a majority FT faculty. It's a 52-point-something percent. And a lot of units and a lot of faculty, I know a lot of people in this body are concerned that that ratio not get any worse. And so giving people a single system of titles obscures that. I still want the term Professor in there for people in the fixed-term ranks, with terminal degrees, as determined and so forth, and so on. But removing the Teaching, Research, Clinical, I think, opens the door to unintended mischief.

Chair Strauss: Senator Welsh, you had a comment. In front here.

Michael Bérubé: And intended mischief.

Nancy A. Welsh: So, Nancy Welsh, Dickinson Law. Thank you for acknowledging our need to not be bound by all of this. However, I should let you know that at least within our school, we do have assistant clinical professors, associate clinical professors, and hopefully down the road, we will have full clinical professors. So that was not one of the sets of titles that created difficulties for us.

Chair Strauss: OK. Any further comments?

Michael Bérubé: I should just follow up on that, because I don't know whether in our exchange and email I made this clear. Another title that was created by this body 10 years ago and agreed to by then-president Spanier was Professor of Practice. We're not touching that. And any unit can use that for distinguished people, with or without terminal degrees, with a long track record of distinction in business, industry, the arts, whatever.

Chair Strauss: OK. In the back.

Terrence Guay, Business: Yeah. Terence Guay, Smeal as well. I just want to emphasize what my colleague said a few minutes ago. As someone whose title myself is Clinical Professor of International Business, that's just a common terminology used in law schools, business schools, and other professional programs. We're not trying to become doctors. It's just the way that is typically used in business schools across the country.

Chair Strauss: Keith? Oh. And there's a Mediasite question. Let's take that first, and then Keith.

Anna Butler: This is a question from Mari Pierce from Penn State Beaver. These are questions from faculty at the Beaver campus. Chair Strauss, there are three questions. You want me to just take them one at a time?

Chair Strauss: Please.

Anna Butler: OK. First one is, does the rank of lecturer distinguish between part-time faculty and full-time faculty not holding a terminal degree?

Michael Bérubé: This covers only full-time faculty. If you scroll up a bit again-- we had a little subtitle. I should have mentioned this. Standardized titles for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty across units, as HR 21 does.

Chair Strauss: Question two.

Anna Butler: Question two, the difference between assistant teaching professor and lecturer suggests that faculty with a terminal degree in a full-time teaching position hold a different rank than faculty without a terminal degree in a full-time teaching position, when their jobs are identical.

Michael Bérubé: I have heard that argument not only from Penn State Beaver but from my colleagues around the country, who think that it's more egalitarian to have the same title for the same position. The counter to that is that the people who put in the time and the opportunity cost to achieve the terminal degree deserve some recognition for that, and that's the balance we tried to strike here.

Chair Strauss: Question three?

Anna Butler: Question three is, why lecturer over instructor? Consensus among faculty that this feels like a demotion to current instructors. At Beaver, fixed-term are instructors, and part-time are called lecturers.

Michael Bérubé: That's OK. It is lecturer or instructor, if we can scroll back up a bit. I mean, down. For some reason-- I don't know how this happened-- the report and the accompanying revised HR 21 speak of lecturer or instructor throughout. But it wasn't in the table. So now it is.

Chair Strauss: OK. So it seems we've strayed a little bit from the original question towards Senator Ansari's comment. So are you looking for additional--

Mohamad Ansari: Yes.

Chair Strauss: OK. Any further comments on-- so what, this is the use of the term "clinical" professor, associate professor, assistant professor. Any further comments on that? OK. I see none.

Mohamad Ansari: I only heard from two colleagues from Smeal because they have the vested interest. Is anyone else feeling the same way that I feel about the word "clinical"? Great. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I will not make that motion. Thank you.

Chair Strauss: Well, there's been a call to question. I'm going to recognize Mark Casteel first, because Mark's had his hand up for a while. In fairness.

Mark Casteel, York: Casteel, York. Michael, I want you to know off the bat, I'm in support of this. I have a colleague in York, though, who will remain anonymous, but this colleague wrote me an email, and there's a concern. It can be addressed really simply, maybe simply by a statement of you on the floor, or maybe a proposed one-sentence addition. But here's the concern.

The person writes, "I have absolutely no problem with the concept. But I do have a problem with the fact that nothing in the proposed legislation protects the standing of those of us who already hold the rank of senior instructor. The proposal identifies three levels of rank for those of us who are not on the tenure line-- lecturer, assistant teaching professor, and associate teaching professor. The description of assistant teaching professor matches the description of senior instructor. However, the only reference to the transition from the current titles to the new titles indicates that those with the rank of instructor or lecturer have the option to be eventually promoted to the assistant level. Nothing indicates that current promotions will be honored. I strongly believe that there needs to be a line indicating that those who already hold senior instructor ranks will automatically transition to the assistant teaching professor rank. Based on descriptions, it is clear that these are equivalent in nature. Otherwise, administration will have the ability to, quote-unquote, demote faculty through the transition process."

Michael Bérubé: Thank you. I guess-- this is one of the things, and I've said this in a number of exchanges with you over the past couple of weeks, that I thought went without saying. But it maybe did not. Absolutely. Senior instructors now would be converted automatically to assistant teaching professor, or assistant research professor. It would be a demotion in rank. We've created this three-tiered structure. It would be like being demoted from associate to assistant professor. So I don't know what kind of speech we actually have to perform to make that clear. But that was the intent of the committee throughout, that people now in the second rank would convert to the second rank. And should they not have terminal degrees and wind up getting terminal degrees, then they'd be eligible for the third rank as well. But no one would lose rank as a result. That would be perverse and very much contrary to our intentions.

Chair Strauss: OK. So I'm going to try to be fair. I believe it was Michael who had the call to question. Was it Michael? OK. So we had a call a question, but we would need-- so it's been seconded. We can do a voice vote on whether or not we'd like to call the question. So all in favor of the call the question?

Senate: Aye.

Chair Strauss: Opposed? Motion carries. So we move to vote. For all who accept the motion as Michael has presented, please press A. For those opposed, please press B.

Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 24 accept, six reject.

Chair Strauss: The motion carries. Congratulations, Michael. And thanks for the very hard work on the committee.

[APPLAUSE]

Michael Bérubé: What's that New Order song? I guess I thought this day would never come. Thank you all so much. And Faculty Affairs thanks you. There are two small things, just so I can be anti-climactic. One, if we go all the way down-- oh, no it's not here. B3-- ranks for non-tenure line, fixed-term or standing, teaching faculty. All the way down. Deep into the weeds. Here we are. B3.

This speaks to that question also. "Must have demonstrated exceptional ability as a teacher and advisor while in the rank of senior lecturer or instructor." I just missed that one. We have to fix that, since that no longer exists. Well, the rank of assistant teaching professor. And Provost Jones reminds me also that we have to clean up the titles with-- it's not University Park. It's Penn State Law. So if we can just change that in the very beginning. I have no idea how to work a Mac.

Chair Strauss: These strike me as editorial. So I think that we can move on to other things. I will let you folks do this after the meeting, because we already voted on it. Yeah. So, thank you.

The final advisory/consultative report is co-sponsored by Outreach, and Educational Equity and Campus Environment. It appears as Appendix K in the agenda. Outreach Committee Chair Beth Seymour and EECE Committee Vice Chair Julia Bryan will respond to questions. This is about Upward Bound programs, which are pre-college programs.

Julia Bryan: I hope you see how hard my committee works. So we're here, Beth and I, to present to you the-- well, we need the vote for this report. We've looked at it, and we support this report. The people who have put it together are not here. And so we're here for them.

Elizabeth Seymour: Yes, due to weather and the rescheduling of our meeting, they were not able to make it today. So we stand for any questions that you might have on this report.

Chair Strauss: Any questions on the advisory/consultative recommendations on the Upward Bound pre-college programs? I see none. So we are ready to vote. Let's expedite. Sorry for the folks online. But all in favor of this committee, we'll have a voice vote. Please say aye.

Senate: Aye.

Chair Strauss: Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very, very much for your hard work, Julia and Beth.

[APPLAUSE]

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Chair Strauss: OK. Item K-- we're getting there, folks. Informational Reports-- the first informational report is from the Senate Council Nominating Committee, which has made nominations for Chair Elect, Secretary of the Senate, and the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. You will find these

recommendations in Appendix L of your agenda. Senators may make additional nominations from the floor, provided that they have secured prior approval from those whom they wish to nominate. Mohamad Ansari, the past chair of Faculty Senate, served as the chair of the Senate Nominating Committee for this year. He will present the nominations.

Mohamad Ansari: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have four nominees for Chair Elect of the Senate, listed in Appendix L. And all nominees have given permission to have their names placed on the ballot.

Chair Strauss: Do we have any additional nominations from the floor to add to the current ballot? OK. I see none. Let's move on to the secretary position.

Mohamad Ansari: For the office of Secretary of the Senate, we have four nominees listed in Appendix L, and all nominees have given permission to have their names placed on the ballot.

Chair Strauss: From the floor, are there any additional nominations to add to the position of Secretary? I see none. You may proceed.

Mohamad Ansari: With the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, one will be elected for a three-year term, expiring 2020. The four nominees are listed in Appendix L, and all nominees have given permission to have their names placed on the ballot.

Chair Strauss: Do we have any additional nominations from the floor to serve on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President? I see none. May I have a motion to close nominations and approve the entire slate? OK, and seconded. All in favor of the agreed upon ballot, please say aye.

Senate: Aye.

Chair Strauss: Any opposed? Great job. Thank you very much, Mohamad, and the Senate Council Nominating Committee.

Chair Strauss: Our next informational report is from Committee on Committees and Rules and appears in the agenda as Appendix M. Keith Shapiro, who is a member of the Committee on Committee and Rules, will present the names of those who have accepted nominations for one of the three extra-senatorial committees. And those three committees are Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, and the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. Senators may make additional nominations from the floor, provided that you have first received permission from the person whom you would like to nominate. Keith, will you please present the slate of nominees for the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities?

Keith D. Shapiro: Thank you, Chair Strauss. The nominees for Faculty Rights and Responsibilities are presented to you in Appendix M. An updated version of the report is displayed, and we will deal with each section separately. We need to elect four University Park faculty. One will serve as a member, and three will be alternates. The member and two alternates will serve three-year terms. The third alternate will serve a one-year term.

Chair Strauss: Are there additional nominees from the floor? Can I say it? 4:20. Boy, that's complicated. I see no-- yes? OK. So we have no new nominations. I think we're actually going to go through each of these three and then close for all of these. Is that correct? OK. So let's proceed, please.

Keith Shapiro: We need to elect one faculty member from locations other than University Park. The term will be three years.

Chair Strauss: Do we have any additional nominations beyond what are presented before you? I see none. You may proceed.

Keith Shapiro: We need to elect two deans or chancellors. One will serve as a member, and one will be an alternate.

Chair Strauss: Any additional nominations for these positions? I see none.

Keith D. Shapiro: For Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, we need to elect two-- one member and one alternate-- each serving a three-year term.

Chair Strauss: Do we have any additional nominations from the floor? I see none. You may proceed.

Keith Shapiro: Finally, we have the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. Four members are to be elected for two-year terms.

Chair Strauss: Any additional nominations? I see none. May we now have a motion to close nominations? Moved. Do we have a second? OK. All in favor of approving this entire slate of nominees, please say aye.

Senate: Aye.

Chair Strauss: Any opposed? Ayes have it. Thank you very much, Keith, for the hard work on creating these ballots. Senate Online Elections will begin on March 29th. Due to the change in the Senate Standing Rules approved by Senate action in January, the election results will be reported to senators after those results are certified by our tellers. That's a little bit different this year. You'll hear earlier.

The next report is from Senate Council. It appears as Appendix N in your agenda. Ten minutes has been allocated for the presentation and discussion. Vice President Susan Basso will deliver the presentation.

Susan Basso: Thank you. Also, as part of the HR transformation, we've obviously had to look at all of our HR policies. And the purpose of that is to update policies, provide greater clarity, ensure legal compliance, and improve accessibility. Right now, there are 104 HR policies and 18 guidelines. Quite frankly, that's far too many, and they're incredibly difficult to navigate.

So at some point, post go-live of Workday, we are going to be coming to you to recommend some new policies, to recommend some enhancements to policies, and right now we're proposing the reclassification of some HR policies to academic policies. We believe in HR, after we've reviewed a number of HR policies, that many of them that are currently classified as HR, it would be far better if the steward of those policies was actually within the Provost's purview. So we believe that this will bring

policy into alignment with practice. We won't be proposing any changes to those policies. And of course, HR will continue to assist in the administration of academic policies.

This is just an example-- sorry, this is actually just an example of some of the policies that we're talking about that would be better served if they were under the Provost office's purview. So HR 21 is an example that you just discussed. We would be proposing a reclassification. We've already had detailed discussion with the Senate leadership about this, and we believe we have socialized it, but wanted to have further discussion with all of you.

All this would mean is we'll be changing the prefix. We'll probably keep the numbers the same, because it's what people are used to. But we would propose changing the prefix to something like AC or AA, to be more in line with the Provost's stewardship. So any comments, thoughts, discussion? I'm seeing some thumbs up-- from Faculty Affairs, that's good.

There are about-- Gerry Henry, who is our strategic partner in the College of Education and Arts and Architecture, has been providing a tremendous amount of leadership to this initiative. And I think there are about, Gerry what-- 13 or 17 of these policies that we believe would now come under academic affairs? OK. A little over 20.

Chair Strauss: Any questions, comments? Thank you very much, Susan. I'm sure this will keep Faculty Senate entertained next year.

Susan Basso: It will. Thank you.

Chair Strauss: Thank you very much.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Strauss: If there are no objections, I would like to reorder the remaining information reports and move to the information report from University Planning that appears as Appendix X. Steve Maruszewski? The Assistant Vice President for Physical Plant, will present the report. Ten minutes have been allocated for the presentation. Five minutes have been allocated for discussion. Steve?

Steve Maruszewski, Office of Physical Plant: Thank you. Maruszewski. And nobody gets that right, but that's OK.

So as is mentioned, I'm from Physical Plant. And I want to change your paradigm a little bit on how you think of Physical Plant. Obviously we're responsible to snow plow the roads, keep the spaces clean, keep the lights on, et cetera. But we also have other opportunities that I think might be of interest to you.

In our business unit, we basically interact with some of the best professionals in the world. And we also engage with the superior faculty and researchers here at University Park and throughout the campuses. And throughout those interactions, there are opportunities not just for the faculty and researchers but also for the students at all of our locations. We have a history of collaboration going back to the 1960s, where we've called upon faculty to help us solve very complex problems, the first one being in the '60s, our wastewater mitigation. And this stemmed out of some problems we had with DEP back at that time.

But we called upon faculty within our ranks to help us solve this problem. And we became very good at that. We became good at contacting faculty throughout the campuses, finding the experts within our own boundaries, and solving the problems that we have on our campuses. Some of the latest ones were the challenges we had with the Elm Yellows and the Dutch Elm Disease, where we mitigated how quickly the elm population is dying here on our campus.

We have now incorporated it into our strategic plan. So it's a way of doing business for us. So we're continuing this effort and this focus throughout all of our operations. Some of the ways we do it, we participate in the classroom. We have professional practitioners that are actually teaching classes or supplementing the classroom learning. We also would serve as guest lecturers and we sponsor many class projects, some of which actually focus on problems we're trying to solve right here on our campuses.

We also have projects in the field, where we have students working on physical projects where they get valuable experience pertinent to their area of study. In Physical Plant, we have roughly 50 internships per year. So we sponsor a lot of students. Now, we can do this because, frankly, we get a commensurate benefit from these students. They get the practical experience, but we also get the benefit of their knowledge and assistance in our work.

From a research perspective, we sponsor numerous research activities, as I said, solving some of the many problems we have right here in our boundaries. If you think of finance and business at-large, we have virtually every business opportunity you can think of. Anything that's being studied in the classroom is probably being practiced here in some form, manner, or shape. So why not use the best and brightest to help solve the issues we have right here?

And finally, engagement-- I think the student food pantry was mentioned earlier. I'm the advisor to the student food pantry. Many of our staff are advisors. Deb Howard is up here. She's also an advisor to one of the student groups. So we participate in the many engagement issues as well.

So again, I just want you to think more broadly what we bring to the table. Hold us accountable for what we're responsible for, but also think of the other opportunities that maybe we can engage on. So if you can think of it, I think we have an opportunity maybe to supplement some of the things you're doing in other parts of the University.

How do you do that? On our website, if you go to our contact page, we call it Living Lab Opportunities. It's become a term I've kind of grown tired of, but frankly it's one that people understand. So we're still using it. So there's my 10 minutes. Five minutes.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Strauss: Any questions for Steve?

Peter Dendle, Mont Alto: Hi. Thank you. It occurs to me that one area you could also be very-- I'm sure you are already engaged in, but could perhaps be even further engaged in, relating to sustainability-- has to do with, I think, light bulbs. And I tried to educate myself a little bit about how I could recycle some various kinds of bulbs in my community and quickly found out that you can't in my community, and you can't in most communities-- in many communities, anyway. You can ship them off in a box at your own expense to Oregon, or something like that.

So I certainly am completely ignorant about what's involved or expense or recycling opportunities. But if Penn State could serve as a leader in this state, in either providing information or providing facilities for local communities, even within the Penn State community and hopefully outside-- so once again, I know absolutely nothing about it, other than I've got lots and lots of light bulbs in my house, which I would love to get rid of in a sustainable manner. Thank you.

Steve Maruszewski: So we do do that. We generally don't take other people's products because of the chain of custody and the concern over-- some of the light bulbs have mercury in them, and things like that. But certainly something we can look into.

Chair Strauss: Yes. Senator Welsh.

Nancy A. Welsh: This is really great. And it's really interesting to think about how students could be involved and there can be research. So for example, if in any of our buildings we're aware that disability-related issues have come up, would that be the kind of thing that potentially there could be students within our building who also might be engaged in working with you in addressing those kinds of issues.

Steve Maruszewski: Yeah, absolutely. So that's kind of the general concept, is engaging the broader community in some of the solutions.

Chair Strauss: Other questions? Thank you very much, Steve.

Steve Maruszewski: Thank you.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

*New Member Information**, [Appendix O](#). Overview of the purpose, duties, and membership of the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules.

Chair Strauss: Our next report is yet again from Educational Equity and Campus Environment. It appears as Appendix P in the agenda. Committee Vice Chair Julia Bryan will give a presentation on the CLGBTQE Commission Reads Program. Julia, you're doing yeoman's work today.

Julia Bryan: Hello, again. This time I'm here to introduce Dara Purvis, who is from the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Equity. And she will share information about Commission Reads.

Dara Purvis: Thanks. Good afternoon. I can be quick. So as Julia said, I'm a member of the Commission on LGBTQ Equity. I'm a member of our curriculum integration committee. We started a new program this year called Commission Reads, patterned on the Penn State Reads program, which has been very successful giving students in University Park, incoming students, a copy of a work of literature that they then have shared discussions about throughout the year.

Members of the LGBTQ Equity Commission have often proposed different suggestions for the Penn State Reads program. And so this year, we decided to pattern our own programming on that. To that end, we selected a book that pairs two plays by the playwright Larry Kramer, *The Normal Heart* and *The*

Destiny of Me. They're both semi-autobiographical stories set in the early days of the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

Members of the commission received copies of the play. The commission publicized the program and its slate of events to faculty, staff, students, and members of the community, and have had a slate of programming throughout the academic year. We've had displays at the University Library, book discussion facilitated by a few professors. The Palmer museum has a Day Without Art demonstration shrouding the paws at the entrance to the museum. A film screening of *The Normal Heart*, and so on. And the capstone was Larry Kramer himself came and gave a talk back in October.

I've attended most of these events myself. Attendance has been great. Engagement has been wonderful. And it was clear to me that a lot of people are coming, and I began to see familiar faces at many of the events, have indeed read the plays, and are engaging with it in different ways. So we've regarded it as a big success. We're planning on making it an annual program. So keep an eye out for the next selection of the Committee Reads. That's it.

Chair Strauss: OK. Any questions?

[APPLAUSE]

ELECTIONS COMMISSION

*Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2017-2018**, [Appendix Q](#).

Chair Strauss: Our next informational report is from Faculty Affairs. It appears as Appendix R. Committee member Angela Linse will respond to questions. The report is about SRTE effectiveness. Ten minutes is allocated for our discussion.

Michael Bérubé: OK. Actually, this was two years in the making also. We were charged last year with coming up with a report about SRTEs. And it sort of devolved into a debate about whether it be advisory/consultative, or informational. And so we regrouped over the summer and decided, A, it should be informational, and B, it should not be an assessment of SRTEs, so much as a guideline to best practices of the uses and misuses of SRTEs.

And since we have a sort of preeminent SRTE expert on the committee, I decided, let's just turn this over to Angela. And it's really her report. It comes largely out of the Schreyer Institute. But we thought, not only should it be guidance from Schreyer, it should be a Senate statement, informational, that can be used by any unit head as guidance for how to use SRTEs wisely.

Angela Linse: All right. So I will say that the purpose of this report is to address the use of this-- student ratings as they currently exist. That doesn't mean that SRTEs can't be revised to improve other things about them. That would be a Faculty Affairs decision.

I do want to say, it's a very detailed report. And so we wanted to summarize. One of our members suggested we do an executive summary. So, I have two slides. These are the key starting points. So until the Faculty Affairs Committee decides to get rid of their instrument initiated by the Faculty Affairs Committee in 1985, it probably isn't going away anytime soon.

Michael Bérubé: Because I think point five is really important, but so is point two. We got a lot of commentary on this throughout the year. Because I think it's a sort of occupational hazard for faculty members. We like to think that when students think we're doing a good job that they're actually learning something. Usually that is the case, but there's no correlation.

So this is not a measure of learning outcomes. And any attempt to make them a measure of learning outcomes fundamentally misunderstands what they are. We want to make that clear.

Angela Linse: It is not the goal of any student ratings instrument to measure student learning. And then, the final-- sorry-- a lot of items on this. They are the eight key points made in the middle of the document to guide faculty who serve on review committees as well as administrators who review committees. And the reason why-- and I have to say, the idea for this report came from the faculty and administrators. The reason why it's important to think about this is that there has been more than 80 years of research on student ratings. And pretty much every question that everybody has concerns about has been really thoroughly researched. The only one that we still could use a lot more research on is the impact of student ratings and student bias on faculty of color. The body of literature on women is fairly substantial now.

There is bias. Students are biased, just like all of us are biased. They are not sufficiently biased in their ratings to change a faculty member from a pretty good faculty member, somewhere in the range of five and above, to a faculty member in the one to three range. So that's what the current research says about this. That doesn't mean we can't investigate what's going on here at Penn State. And I think it's a good idea that we do.

Item number one is probably the biggest problem that we have with student ratings here at Penn State, because doing other kinds of evaluation of faculty take time. And nobody has time. So we definitely need to think about this, especially for fixed-term faculty. Go ahead.

Michael Bérubé: We didn't rehearse. I agree with Angela not only about this but about everything. Number one is the most important. But I would also stress four and seven, because we've heard all kinds of reports about mischief-- again, unintentional and intentional-- people taking a faculty member with overwhelmingly positive responses and giving a sample of the positive responses and a sample of the one crank who didn't like the class. And that's not actually fair and balanced. That's actually unfair.

And because we now create a promotional review process that is substantial, it is not just a roll over a one year contract, there's all the more reason to make the evaluation of teaching more robust, not SRTE-dependent, and more wise, especially with regard to points four and seven, about how to use the SRTEs themselves.

Angela Linse: Questions?

Chair Strauss: Laura Pauley first.

Laura Pauley: Pauley, Engineering. Item five there, the distribution of scores, doesn't appear on our self-reports. And we only have averages. Would you recommend that when we have annual reviews, when we have P&T reviews, that those distributions be included?

Angela Linse: I really wish that they were, because particularly for small classes, if you have one person who's very unhappy and you only have seven students, it can pull your mean down. But that doesn't mean that 90% of the students don't still rate you in the five to seven range, which means there's nothing to worry about, really. So I really wish we could do that. I don't know if Digital Measures can do that. I certainly think it should be looked at in the reviews, for sure.

And also, to emphasize-- number six, or the anomalies, four. If you distill everything down into one score, which I know some units are still doing, you essentially give the anomalous ratings equal weight to the overwhelming pattern that says, "Doing good." So that's why the emphasis is on treat anomalies like anomalies. And don't treat them as if they're more important than the rest of them, the five-year record.

Chair Strauss: Keeping a mind on time, I'd like to take two more comments. In the green. I'm sorry.

Jane Sutton, York: Jane Sutton, York. I have a question. It's towards the end of the report, under the section about increasing response rates. And you provide a website for strategies. Thank you for that. Those are very helpful. But in reading this report, I was surprised to learn about the strategy of extra credit-- offering extra credit for increasing response rates. And I'd like for your committee to comment on that, please.

Angela Linse: These examples come from you. They come from people who have 70% or higher student ratings. They come from a selection of at least 30 students. So it's not just the people in the tiny classes who love their faculty member who get 70%. And we eliminated really highly specialized courses and graduate courses. So they're a big sample.

And this is what one person suggested. So there are absolutely plenty of people who disagree with that approach. And I think there are even colleges and campuses who have said, don't do this. And that's within the purview of the college or the campus. There's going to be a new one added that is perhaps a better way of giving extra credit, if you're going to give extra credit, which is to give them access to an academic extra credit if they reach a response rate of a certain level, instead of saying, you reached this response rate, you get extra credit. But have it more tied to the learning in the class. So there are vehement opinions on this. So you definitely need to make a decision about this as a faculty in your unit.

Yes, if there are people who are opposed to this, that needs to be made clear that it's not acceptable, or they need to be talked out of it. So the decisions about those things are made at the college and campus level.

Chair Strauss: Michael?

Michael Krajsa: Krajsa, Lehigh Valley. Angela, for those of us who teach an accelerated course, like I just got done teaching an eight-week course, there's no SRTEs for that class.

Angela Linse: What?

Michael Krajsa: The students don't-- it doesn't come up for them.

Angela Linse: If it's in LionPATH as a regular course, not a certificate course.

Michael Krajsa: No, it's a credit course.

Angela Linse: There should be-- if it's not set up, that's a problem that happens at the unit level.

Michael Krajsa: OK. Well, I just completed that--

Angela Linse: If it's in LionPATH and it's not a certificate program, it should be able to be rated.

Chair Strauss: I have one Mediasite question, in the back.

Angela Linse: But we can talk.

Anna Butler: This is from Colleen Connelly-Ahern, from the College of Communications. Is there any plan to address the drop in the percentage of students filling out SRTEs in the online environment?

Angela Linse: Excuse me. The drop in response rates was expected. It dropped about 20% to 25%. So, that was expected. There are only two things that have worked nationally, or internationally, to increase those by a reward system, and that is giving students access, or giving them early access to grades, neither of which will work here. So that's why we interviewed faculty who get high student response rates, above 70, and people do. So that is one way, go look at that and see what they're doing. I hear that it works.

The other thing is to use the mobile version of the SRTEs. There is a mobile version. It's been available for two years. But we haven't seen a lot of use of it. This is the-- you can do it in class now. You can do it in the last 10 minutes of class, like you used to do, by asking people to use their computers or their phones, or taking them to a computer lab to do that. All of those have been done.

So I would highly recommend-- it's not an app that you download. It's just a button that you select on the Rate Teaching site, and they page through it one question at a time. Please leave the room, just like you used to do for paper.

Chair Strauss: OK. Thank you very much.

[APPLAUSE]

FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

*Annual Report for 2015-2016**, [Appendix S](#).

LIBRARIES, INFORMATION SYSTEMS, AND TECHNOLOGY

*PSU Libraries Collection Budget Report, 2016**, [Appendix T](#). Overview of the second annual PSU Libraries Collections Budget report for the Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology.

Chair Strauss: Very good. We will move on. Our next informational report is from Outreach. It appears as Appendix U. Committee Chair Beth Seymour, who is here, will present the report. Ten minutes are allocated for her discussion.

Elizabeth Seymour: Hi. I just wanted to give you a little bit of information. The Committee of Outreach decided that there was enough confusion, I think, with all of the online ways in which courses are offered between the different types of those online offerings. And so this report was really an effort on our part-- and we asked the help of Annie Taylor and Traci Piazza-- to help us write a good report that had the content to really explain the difference between web courses, World Campus courses, Digital Learning Cooperative courses, hybrid courses, MOOCs, et cetera. And so that's really what you see before you. It's just an attempt to help clarify that.

It's also for now-- it's going to go out of date quickly. All of these things do. But it can also be used to give to faculty, I would suggest, to help them understand some of what the resident and online and hybrid and mixed environment looks like at Penn State right now. I think it's very, very useful in that regard.

Ann Taylor, Earth and Mineral Sciences: If I can just put a plug in. There's also kind of a community-grown website called Web Learning at Penn State, weblearning.psu.edu. And it's referenced in the report. And that is our canonical source for much of this information. So that is a good place to go if in the future you want to learn more; you want to point a colleague to this information.

Elizabeth Seymour: So we're ready to just take any questions. I realize it's late.

Chair Strauss: Seeing none, thank you very much.

Annie, you can stay up there, because I think you're next for the Officers Report, Fall Visits. So moving right along here, item seven, our next information report is from Senate Council. It appears as Appendix V. Senate Secretary Ann Taylor will respond to questions. Five minutes is allotted to the discussion. I will say that we have a much more detailed report than what we usually file, and I actually heard very good compliments about that. So any questions for Ann?

Ann Taylor: Yeah. No formal presentation. There is a couple of versions that you've got-- or a couple of pieces of information you have. We have an executive summary that gives some overarching themes we saw across the seven campuses that we visited. Plus brief summaries. Jim was very helpful in writing those, as was Madlyn Haynes in helping us get our information correctly presented.

And those summaries add up to maybe about four or five pages. But then if you want the nitty-gritty details, it's in our Senate Box space. And that does give you campus by campus bullet points of what we learned, and we'd be happy at any point to answer questions. But it was a fascinating tour in the fall. I know we learned a great deal, and we were able to share that with the Provost and with the Executive Chancellor.

Chair Strauss: OK. Roger, question?

Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: Egolf, Lehigh Valley. Are the senators from the campuses allowed to share the information from Box with the faculty on their campuses, if they had a visit?

Chair Strauss: It's a public report at this point.

Ann Taylor: Yeah. I mean, we put it in Box because-- we thought long and hard about this-- there was some viewpoint across our senators that we don't want to be too public in kind of airing dirty laundry, so

to speak. But it's honest information. And in the interest of transparency, I would think that would be absolutely fine. But it's just the reason we didn't put it on a public-facing website.

Roger Egolf: Yeah. That's fine. And I wouldn't do it if I didn't know it was OK. OK, thank you.

Ann Taylor: I think that's fine.

Chair Strauss: OK. Any other questions for Ann? OK. Thank you very much for a great report.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Strauss: Our next informational report is from University Planning. It appears as Appendix W. Committee Chair Laura Pauley will respond to questions. Five minutes is allotted for discussion. OK. So Laura has placed some experts on us. If you'd like to just give us a brief overview of what's going on with this.

Deborah Howard: We provided a summary report. So we have lots of bathrooms at University Park. And we saw this issue coming years ago to provide more restroom opportunities. So in 2006, we added a design standard to our design manual for Physical Plant, for new buildings, capital projects, major, to start adding more restroom opportunities.

And because of-- I mean, we've got lots of buildings-- 1,974-- and lots of bathrooms. Many of them are older buildings. So it's difficult to go in and add new restroom facilities, or there's code issues. So we started having a requirement when we did major renovations in capital projects.

But as for the needs of the community, we would get a request from a college or a department, usually through LGBTQA office, saying, we have a situation in the building. We need to provide more opportunities. It could take two or three years to be able to come up with a solution.

So we knew we had to get a little more in front of this. So in 2014, we hired a consultant that came on campus. And we looked at 100 buildings here at University Park. And when we talk about the all-gender restrooms, we focused on our major education and general buildings here at University Park, 100 buildings. So there's still the auxiliary, the housing. I mean, there's lots of restrooms out there.

And one of the things we noticed is-- and this has happened all through the industry. The signage is a big issue. We spent a long time talking about the signage. I mean, it's gone from unisex to gender inclusive to female stick figures to male stick figures, then in-between.

Unidentified Senator: No stick figures.

Deb Howard: Yeah. And so we settled on-- and this was working with our LGBT community, looking at different universities, seeing across the country what was being used. And we came up with the all-gender restroom sign. And we want to be consistent.

So we've done it in phases. We did the study in 2014. We have things that we can do quickly. And one of the things we wanted to do right away was to change out all the signs to be consistent. So this is the sign.

They're going up as we speak. So all those restrooms that had all the various signs, that's the first phase of things we're doing.

Another part of the phase is, we've got some restrooms that we can look and convert easily. It may be a male restroom today or a female, but the building had enough fixtures-- you know, we have an opportunity list that we can convert without a lot of expense. After that it starts going into phases where it's much more expensive.

So we had \$120,000 to go for the study, and we've got \$200,000 right now, like I said, to invest and do things quickly. And when you see the sign-- because we've already had confusion. And you can help. If there's an all-gender sign with this handicap symbol, it means it's handicapped accessible. It means anyone can go in and use the room and lock the door, single user. And wash your hands when you leave. And we should be good.

So it's a long-term venture. I mean, as an example, our LGBTQA office is in Boucke Building. There are no all-gender restrooms in Boucke Building. To convert one is \$60,000. So we've got near-term things that we're doing. We're at least trying to be consistent.

Now, our study was at University Park. But our plan is-- I mean, we're buying the signs for all the campuses, but also to use the model that we used to go through it as a model for our campuses. And we'll be working through those to allow more restroom opportunities at Penn State.

Chair Strauss: Thanks very much. Questions? Thank you very much for your interesting report.

[APPLAUSE]

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Strauss: Item L, New Legislative Business. Are there any new business items for consideration? I see none.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Strauss: Item M, comments and recommendations for the good of the University. Are there any additional comments for the good of the University? I see none.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Strauss: May I have a motion to adjourn? Thank you very much. Thank you very much for your attention, folks, and the hard work of all the committees and their leadership. Have a great afternoon. Senate is adjourned.

The following Senators were noted as having attended the March 14, 2017 Senate Meeting.

- Abdalla, Charles
- Adair, James
- Adewumi, Michael
- Ambler, Gilbert
- Ansari, Mohamad
- Aurand, Harold
- Aynardi, Martha
- Azemi, Asad
- Barlow, Jesse
- Barney, Paul
- Barron, Eric
- Bartell, Paul
- Basso, Susan McGarry
- Baumer, Eric
- Bechtel-Wherry, Lori
- Bérubé, Michael
- Bishop-Pierce, Renee
- Blakney, Terry
- Blockett, Kimberly
- Boehmer, John
- Borromeo, Renee
- Bowen, Blannie
- Boyle, James
- Bridges, K. Robert
- Brigger, Clark
- Brown, Claudia
- Brown, Raymonde
- Bruno, Michael
- Brunsdon, Victor
- Bryan, Julia
- Caldwell, Linda
- Casteel, Mark
- Chen, Wei-Fan
- Clark, Mary Beth
- Clements, Ann
- Connolly-Ahern, Colleen
- Conti, Delia

- Copeland, Ann
- Cusumano, Joseph
- Davis, Dwight
- Dendle, Peter
- Dietz, Amy
- DiStaso, Marcia
- Douds, Anne
- Duffey, Michele
- Duschl, Richard
- Eberle, Peter
- Eckhardt, Caroline
- Eggebeen, David
- Egolf, Roger
- Elias, Ryan
- Ellsworth, Maura
- Engel, Renata
- Farley, Timothy
- Finke, Erinn
- Friedenberg, Marc
- Furfaro, Joyce
- Geisinger, Samantha
- Geller, Andrew
- Giebink, Noel Christopher
- Goranson, Morgon
- Grimes, Galen
- Griswold, Anna
- Haigh, Michel
- Han, David
- Hanes, Madlyn
- Harrison, Terry
- Harwell, Kevin
- Hayford, Harold
- Healy, Michael
- High, Kane
- Hodgdon, Kathleen
- Hufnagel, Pamela
- Hughes, Janet

- Jaap, James
- Jablokow, Kathryn
- Jett, Dennis
- Jolly, Rosemary
- Jones, Nicholas
- Jones, Raymond
- Jurs, Peter
- Kalapos, Paul
- Kalavar, Jyotsna
- Keiler, Kenneth
- Kelly, Claire
- Kennedy-Phillips, Lance
- Kenyon, William
- King, Elizabeth
- Kitko, Lisa
- Koch, Patricia
- Krajsa, Michael
- Krasilnikov, Andrey
- Lang, Teresa
- Lasher, William
- Le, Binh
- Linehan, Peter
- Linn, Suzanna
- Litzky, Barrie
- Lobaugh, Michael
- Loeb, Robert
- Mahan, Carolyn
- Mangel, Lisa
- Marko, Frantisek
- Matsoukas, Themis
- Melton, Robert
- Messner, John
- Michels, Margaret
- Miles, James
- Miles, Mary
- Mookerjee, Rajen
- Myers, Jamie

- Nasereddin, Mahdi
- Nelson, Kimberlyn
- Nousek, John
- Ofosu, Willie
- Ozment, Judith
- Pangborn, Robert
- Patzkowsky, Mark
- Pauley, Laura
- Pearson, Nicholas
- Petrilla, Rosemarie
- Pierce, Mari Beth
- Plummer, Julia
- Poole, Thomas
- Posey, Lisa
- Prabhu, Vansh
- Preciado, Felisa
- Radhakrishna, Rama
- Radovic, Ljubisa
- Regan, John
- Reuning, Kevin
- Robertson, Gavin
- Robinett, Richard
- Ropson, Ira
- Rothrock, Ling
- Rowland, Nicholas
- Ruggiero, Francesca
- Saltz, Ira
- Samuel, George
- Scheel, Lydia
- Schmiedekamp, Ann
- Schulz, Andrew
- Scott, Geoffrey
- Seymour, Elizabeth
- Shannon, Robert
- Shapiro, Keith
- Sharma, Amit
- Shockley, Alex

- Shurgalla, Richard
- Sigurdsson, Steinn
- Silveyra, Patricia
- Singer, Richard
- Sinha, Alok
- Sliko, Jennifer
- Smith, David
- Smithwick, Erica
- Snyder, Stephen
- Song, Jim
- Stephens, Jonathan
- Strauss, James
- Straw, Michael
- Subramanian, Rajarajan
- Suliman, Samia
- Sutton, Jane
- Szczygiel, Bonj
- Taylor, Ann
- Teye, Emmanuel
- Troester, Rodney
- Truica, Cristina
- Vrana, Kent
- Wagner, Johanna
- Walker, Eric
- Wang, Ming
- Welsh, Nancy
- Wilburne, Jane
- Williams, Mary Beth
- Wilson, Matthew
- Woessner, Matthew
- Wolfe, Douglas
- Yun, Jong

Elected	148
Students	18
Ex Officio	4
Appointed	10
Total	180