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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, January 23, 2018 at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate building with Matthew Woessner, Chair, presiding.

Chair Woessner: Good afternoon, everyone. The Senate will come to order.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Woessner: Minutes of the Preceding Meeting. The December 5 Senate Record, providing a full transcript of the proceedings, was sent to the University archives and is posted on the Faculty Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions to be made to these minutes?

May I hear a motion to accept?

Unidentified Senator: I move.

Chair Woessner: A second?

Unidentified Senator: I move.

Chair Woessner: All in favor of accepting the minutes, please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Woessner: All opposed. The motion carries. The ayes have it. The minutes of the December 5 meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Woessner: The Senate Curriculum Report on January 9, 2018, is posted on the University Faculty Senate website.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Woessner: Item C, Report of Senate Council. Minutes of the January 9 Senate Council meeting can be found at the end of your agenda. Including are the minutes and topics that were discussed with the Faculty Advisory Committee to the president on June 9.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Woessner: Announcements by the Chair. As a reminder, due to the limited bandwidth in the auditorium, I ask that all attendees limit their smartphones and tablets so that we have the critical functions for Mediasite and Polleverywhere and sufficient bandwidth to run the meeting. Please do not use video streaming during the meeting because it uses large amounts of bandwidth and impedes our services.

The Senate officers have completed their visits to the Pennsylvania College of Technology Altoona and Fayette. There will be visits to Hazleton and Schuylkill tomorrow, Wilkes-Barre and Worthington on the
29th of January, Dickinson Law on February 6, Penn State Law and Earth and Mineral Sciences on February 15, the Graduate School on February 19, Engineering on February 28, Education on April 3, and DUS on April 16; finally, the College of Medicine, on April 18.

Senators in those units are reminded to encourage their colleagues and students to participate in these information-gathering sessions. The visits we've had so far have gone very well, and we really appreciate participation by faculty, students, staff, and the administration. All units were contacted by the Senate office regarding the election of Senators for next year. The names of the newly-elected Senators and alternates are due to the Senate office no later than January 31.

All senators using Mediasite, please use the ‘Ask a Question’ box to send a message, that you have successfully connected to the live feed, and so that you may have your name added to the attendance sheet. As a reminder to Senators joining us today via Mediasite, we are using the voting system at polleverywhere.com/facultysenate. Instructions for using this voting system are posted on this Senate website. Please log into polleverywhere.com/facultysenate now.

As many of you are aware, the President's Office transmitted a response to AC21 concerning the promotions-based, fixed-term contracts to the Senate. The letter will be posted on the Senate website later today. According briefly from the letter, a second paragraph states that, "We stand in strong support of the intent of this revision. Penn State is committed to strengthening stability for Penn State’s non-tenure-line faculty and believes that, upon promotion, each should be considered for a multi-year contract. As we have shared with the Senate leadership on several occasions, we cannot in good conscience, however, support the mandated length of the contracts specified in the Advisory and Consultative report. Given that the majority of non-tenure-line faculty are supported with temporary funding, and given that temporary funding does not allow for the provision of a contract longer than three years, it would be unconscionable to support a proposal that is, in essence, unable to be implemented. To do so would create expectations on the part of non-tenure-line faculty that cannot be fulfilled and put academic administrators in the position of being unable to implement this recommendation”.

The revised Section 5-- Section 6 was struck entirely-- now reads "Faculty members who are promoted shall be considered for a multi-year contract. If a multi-year contract is not granted, then factors that shape the decision shall be communicated to the fixed-term faculty member at a time when the new contract is offered."

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Woessner: Section E, Comments by the President of the University. President Barron will now make comments and stand for questions. President Barron.

Eric Barron, University President: Well, it's a good thing I wasn't any later than that.

Chair Woessner: Sorry.

Eric Barron: OK. Well, you know it's been a gloomy couple of days, so I thought I would just point out some good news in case you haven't been hearing it. So you know, for example, that the campaign that we are in for Greater Penn State for 21st Century Excellence, its first year was the third highest set of gifts in the history of Penn State, perhaps the only university in the Big Ten with an increase in the
number of alumni donors, and the growth was considerable. They've been madly counting at the end of the year, an exceptional December. But the first six months of the year, they haven't given me the exact number, but the first six months of the year is at a record pace, and we appear to be on target to have the highest fundraising totals in our history.

I want you know I just put a lot of pressure on the VP for Development by saying that six months into the year, but it's a good story. You also know-- and this is entirely to your credit-- that last year's research expenditures hit an all-time record. We are in six months of the year at a pace considerably above last year's all-time record for research funding.

Now it's always interesting when I go out and talk to alumni groups and I tell them how much money you've raised in research, they look at me like, well, is that a good number? And, so I have hit upon two things that, according to our public relations people, really does hit the mark. And that is that if we look at the number of disciplines that we have in the top ten of research funding in this country, we're in the top ten and 15.

There's no other university in the country that has as many research programs in the top ten as Penn State. We are tied with Johns Hopkins and the number of programs at 15, and I tell people this year we passed MIT, which now has less than we do. And I like to tell the alumni that I hear they're a pretty good university, but we have more disciplines in the top ten and research funding than MIT.

It is also very exciting to see that in the social sciences, we rank third in the nation in terms of funding. That's also quite a statement about the productivity of our faculty and something to be quite excited about. The quality of the applications, still ever higher, making it more competitive.

Entrepreneurship, we've just had-- and you probably saw in the paper-- the announcement that we have our first million-dollar gift to endow, one of our Launchboxes. We now have 17 across the State. We've got some others that we're working on, endowments, but that now puts $2 million dollars in the coffers to keep that going strong.

And I'm always interested in the fact that when the press is speaking, they will make a comment about the million dollars and our commitment to entrepreneurship and getting your ideas and student ideas out into the marketplace. But what I don't see and what I find even more exciting than the knowledge that it is endowed is that, if you think about it, we don't have two years yet where Launchboxes have been in action. And in the first full year, we only had five. So this is very early, but we've had more than 2,500 faculty, staff, and students engaged in Entrepreneurial University at Penn State. We have hundreds, literally hundreds of community entrepreneurs that have been supported and are participating in different ways. Eighty new products were developed during that time period that have been launched. Seventy-nine startups were launched in that short period of time, and more than 100 student internships were created in this process.

And this is a new thing that I hadn't anticipated at all, that many of these startup companies are hiring student interns to support them. And so they are, in a sense, training many more students than are welcomed into our Launchboxes.

So that, if you think about it, is an incredible history. And I've seen some advertisements like United Magazine where universities brag about 25 startups in the last five years. And I go, “wait a minute, 79 in
essentially a partial year”, that's quite an exciting beginning, and we're seeing those donations starting to come in to support those activities.

On the State government side, it is an election year. I can't tell you what the Governor and the legislature is going to do, but all prior history suggests that the budget will go through quickly because it's an election year and people go back to work in terms of running for office.

And so we are not anticipating all of the heartburn that we have had. We have a very short amount of time before the governor will propose his budget. I just think what we can expect is in the same mode of election year that this will be flat and to get something will certainly be exciting.

Last time I was here, I talked about the Feds and the tax code. And so the good news about that is that all the most onerous provisions were not voted through because of conference. So for example, the taxation that was going to occur on salaries for our physicians at Hershey did not get an exemption. This was something that we had requested. I suspect a lot of other people were hearing about that as well. The tuition benefit for our employees that was in the house did not go through. The taxation of tuition benefits for our graduate students did not go through.

So we are left with some uncertainty about the impact of higher standard deductions on giving and some impact that is on athletics. Very little interest in excluding athletics from the taxation that was there. So again, that's relatively good news, and the government is back in operation accepting proposals, so that's also good news.

But anyway, it is a cloudy day with a little bit of rain. There are a lot of good things going on, and I just want you to know I appreciate all of your efforts. I don't think we attract those students without you. We certainly don't have those research grants without you. The faculty and staff are very involved in the Launchboxes, and the ideas that we have for philanthropy are of great interest to our alumni, and the numbers of alumni are going up.

And I think I could sit there and say, “Look, this is a good time for the economy, and maybe this is the economy, but it didn't happen in any other Big Ten university”. And so the fact that we had a five percent increase in alumni donations and we have a lot of alumni who give—it is a big number-- this is quite a statement, I think, on how our alumni are feeling about Penn State these days.

Thank you and always happy to answer questions.

Chair Woessner: Questions for President Barron? Please wait for the microphone in order to stand and announce your unit. Immediate Past Chair Strauss.

James Strauss, University Park: Good afternoon, President Barron. So my question centers around the letter that was sent regarding the AC21 decision. And I want to try to take an optimistic spin on things and underline the sentence that says "in the response that, we," meaning the administration, "stands in strong support of the intent of the AC21 revisions." And I'd like to put this in the context that we know that fixed-term faculty are the majority of faculty, both at University Park and our Commonwealth Campuses. We also know that they are heavily involved in the instruction of our undergraduates for their education. And we know that tuition funds a big portion of the University in that context.
So my question is actually a simple one. How will the administration, moving forward, strongly support the intent of the AC21 Legislation with either future actions, policies, or incentives that will improve the likelihood of multi-year contracts for our fixed-term faculty -- and I'll underline-- especially at the Commonwealth Campuses. Thank you very much.

**Eric Barron:** Yes. So I think it is and I appreciate the fact that you said it the way you did because I do think we can put an optimistic spin on it. It is very hard when permanent funds and temporary funds have a time limit for the University and that appointment exceeds that. So that presents a challenge.

And you know what we don't want to do is we don't want to take on the part of that text which says, and explain to the individual why they're not getting that extended term. So if we're doing that over and over again because the definition and split between the allowable amount of time on non-permanent dollars, then I think we were doing a disservice to everyone.

So my thoughts are, one, we ought to be looking at the language here to be able to do this, and we need time and effort to go back and look at how it is we do that funding. Because you are right. We want to be able to look at an individual who's been promoted and is a highly valued employee and to be able to do that.

But to have it be, in a sense-- and I don't want this to sound like a little bit of whining, but to feel like you are in a box, that you're going to frequently tell people ‘no’ and the reason why is because of that definition. I don't think that serves any of us well. So I just think we need to do a little bit more work, and we might think of some language here that is appropriate to set us off on that track without having it turn out to be a problem where it starts to become routine, that this is our objective and we don't achieve it. So we have some work to do, and I invite you to think about other language too that we might go back and forth with to make this so, that it's easier for you to look at this optimistically because we are dedicated to the goal that is stated there.

**Nicholas Rowland, Altoona:** My name is Nicholas Rowland. I'm at Altoona. I'd like to go back to the comment that was just made a moment ago. Thanks, Jim, for bringing us on this course. This letter doesn't look like a lot of the letters I'm used to seeing from your office. Typically, they either accept the requested recommendations and they move towards implementation. Other times, this, of course, infrequent, but they ultimately reject what it as we go forward.

And still other times-- this, I think was before your time here at Penn State-- occasionally the president would revise a document and then accept it as revised. When I read this letter, I don't see any of those. In fact, I think, with the language like ‘we suggest’ and that ‘we suggest modified recommendations’ and the ‘thank you for the opportunity to review this item’, this doesn't seem like it is resolved.

So if I'm understanding you right, are you saying-- this bears on what we're going to do in here with this and where we're going to go in the future-- are you saying that this is an open dialogue, or are you requesting that we accept this language? I'm just not sure how to interpret it, so any clarity there would help.

**Eric Barron:** OK. I actually wouldn't interpret it differently than any time in the past. And we certainly can have dialogue on the language.
Nicholas Rowland: Is that an invitation for dialogue in the future, or are we-- I'm just--

Eric Barron: I believe that I invited you for dialogue--

Nicholas Rowland: Thank you for inviting me, sir.

Eric Barron: --on this topic. Yes, I did.

Nicholas Rowland: I will come over.

Chair Woessner: Other questions?

Carolyn Mahan, Altoona: Thank you. My name is Carolyn Mahan, and I just wanted to comment and I'm very happy that you said you're open to dialogue on language. I'm from Penn State, Altoona. I'm a professor of biology there. And I just want you to know that this report stems out of a history of trends that we're seeing at Penn State where we're relying more and more on our fixed-term faculty. And we used to run a report-- I don't know if you remember this-- that looked at the ratio of fixed term to tenure track faculty.

And I believe in 2012, we hit that over 50 percent mark. So over 50 percent, as Jim alluded to, of our faculty are fixed term. And in terms of credit hours, the majority of the contacts our students get are with fixed-term faculty. So as that trend continued, we thought as a Senate is we could offer our fixed-term faculty some career advancement, some security.

We are maybe seeing the career advancement with the promotions, and this was an attempt to deal with the security issue of the faculty. And I guess, part of me, I can understand striking Point 6 where you mentioned the five years. But Point 5, you strike the word three from multi-year contracts, even though previously you indicate that we can use temporary funds for three years.

So my question is, can we-- I guess maybe [INAUDIBLE] is that we stick with the multi-year contracts. Because as this reads, people on three-year multi-year contracts, they get reduced to two-year contracts. So as long as that language could stay-- or I guess my question is why would you strike this three-year? I understand the five-year.

Eric Barron: I think it's the notion of the tiers. And so if you have the notion of tiers and you have it for one and then you're not contemplating what you're doing for the highest tier. So that's just a statement of the arithmetic, not a statement of the intent.

So you have one tier that's a promotion, and it's three, and the next tier, we're going to do the best we can. So that's all it is. It is our intent in the way it was written to work on the issue of job security. But we, obviously, have rules about temporary funding and how far we can use them into the future that we have to think about. And I don't want anybody to think about what the level of risk is for an individual, but there are many, many people that worried we weren't going to get our State appropriation at all last year. What was the University going to do?

And so I think you will always discover that administrators start to shy away for anything that looks like a commitment level that they start to worry about. So I do think we can work this out, but we don't want
to be in a position where we've created an expectation and we're not sure we can fulfill it at the level that it's been presented. That's really what it is.

Do not strike it as motive. Strike it as something we have to work through.

Chair Woessner: There is a Mediasite question.

Anna Butler, University Faculty Senate Staff Assistant: This question is from Daniel Perkins from Agricultural Sciences. "I think it is unreasonable for grant-funded position be anything beyond the requirements of the funding period. Could you comment?"

Eric Barron: Well, that is a challenge if you are literally raising your money that way. And the grant is a one-year grant or a two-year grant or a three-year grant. But I do think-- and probably someone in the room will stress about this-- I do think that if you've been working here for 25 years and you've been promoted and you have had a fantastic career and opportunity and pulling in grants and contracts and you've been pulling your way, I think it would be a tragedy in the ups and downs of federal or State funding to not have some opportunity for commitment from the University even though it's on a grant, it was a one-year grant.

Alok Sinha, College of Engineering: Yeah. I'm Alok Sinha from College of Engineering. It was very good news that our research funding has increased so much. However, when we look at the academic ranking in that terms, it does not translate that well. So what is it that we are not doing or what should we do to make our academic ranking also go higher and higher?

Eric Barron: Ranking is an interesting topic, and I tell people that when it compliments us, I talk about it. And when it doesn't, I talk about what the failures are of the ranking system. I think that's normal for my profession. But here is the simple fact of the matter; this is an institution that could decide on what rank to have. We could decide. We could have a lot more elite University, not take students that aren't expected to graduate even though we graduate them, and envying elite have more dollars per student, and we would soar in the rankings. So if I am UCLA, great university, I have more State support- that helps a lot. But in fact, the competition within California and with the California State system that is very strong, UCLA basically has students in the top ten percent of their class.

And the simple fact of the matter is something like US News and World Reports expects that student to graduate, and they do graduate. So that attraction to UCLA, which is basically because it's a limited commodity, has all of those student metrics for entrance and then success as higher than at Penn State.

Frankly, I'm not willing to give up our mission that we have a whole group of students not expected to graduate that might be in the top 25 percent in their class, not the top ten percent of the class, come into our institution, do incredibly well, and are hired by companies because they like the fact that they're bright and hardworking. That work ethic is a key part of it.

So in this particular case, unless everybody tells me different, I am not willing to change the admissions and characteristics of our students to get a better ranking. I like our mission that we educate students of Pennsylvania and this nation and, increasingly, the world. So this really is the difference.
Florida State is going way up in the rankings. I told my board there you don't have enough faculty members. You hire more faculty members, the student ratios will change, and this was their weakest point. And visually they go up because the State gave them the money to hire more faculty members. In our particular case, it's really the fact that our arms are like this for students and very successful.

I don't know whether you paid attention to the US News and World Report rankings but they predict our graduation rate based on the demographics of our students and the expectation, whether they would graduate or not our graduation rate exceeds their prediction by 21 percentage points. That's higher than any other university in the top 100. This, in my mind, is that particular statistic should have a much heavier rating than how many of your students come in the door in the top ten percent of their class. It should have a much-- but it isn't. And so we're 14th among publics. This is a heady place to be, but we could easily be top ten if we changed our attitude about who we were going to educate. I don't want to do it. [APPLAUSE]. Thanks.

Chair Woessner: So we're pretty limited in our time span, so I want to move toward our next question, if it's OK. Wait till the microphone.

Maureen Jones, University Park: I'm going back to Nicholas' comment about opening up a dialogue. Can I ask if we're willing to go one step further in a multi-year contract discussion and follow on the Board and the University's elite telling us that we need to be innovative. So can we open up a dialogue that piggybacks that is innovative in how we support those fixed-term faculty?

I realize we have a current structure for our budget model and for how we use funds, but can I ask that you contemplate looking at other ways to do this, other things that aren't currently in play and that we put our heads together and think about a way to advance the current policy to something even better eventually.

Eric Barron: I'm game to go through ideas.

Maureen Jones: All right, Nicholas. It's all you.

Chair Woessner: Other questions? Yes.

Bonj Szczygiel, Arts and Architecture: Szczygiel from Arts and Architecture. Good afternoon. Glad you're here. Thank you for continuing the dialogue. I think it's obviously very valuable. I've got a question that's a little somewhat tangential and a bit retro. In the fall of ’16, we did a fairly unique experiment in voluntary retirement offers going out to faculty, and that resulted at least in-- I don't know the overall number of faculty who took you up on that offer University-wide. I know that at U-Park, it's somewhere around 140 or so faculty members, maybe. But I'm curious whether the administration has followed through or done an assessment on this unique event that took place and to specifically see how many new faculty hires there have been and who are they. In other words, as a result of this, have our fixed-term numbers changed dramatically as a result?

Eric Barron: So I do not know the answer to this specific question. So the provost says that it is too early to tell because there is still a lot of hiring that's going on although it seemed to me 200 new the last time I remember. And we'll look at that.
**Rosemary Jolly, Liberal Arts:** Rosemary Jolly, Liberal Arts. It seems to me that any discussion that subtends the question of AC21, we would need to have some very clear understandings of how the University determines and what the University determines to be fixed and non-fixed budgets. Because I'm a relative newcomer here at 2013 only. But I sense that this is because we are not, as a Senate, clear enough on understanding what is fixed and what is non-fixed.

So if you look at it from an outsider's perspective, we are between six percent and eight percent supported by the State. Is it lower than that even, Michael? I happened to be tenured faculty, but when we translate that into where are our fixed-term faculty going and when we talk about hires, are they fixed term, are they not fixed term, how do we support people we've already hired, I'm not trying to say that they are, in fact, not saying that there's any deliberate misleading. I'm just saying that the face subtends on the transparency of these categories. Because as you pointed out, if we are going to introduce a sense of problem solving and innovative thinking around this, we have to know what we're innovatively trying to change in the first instance. Thank you.

**Eric Barron:** Yeah. It's a very good comment. And actually, in my mind, that definition is under a little bit of flux. We have been, in my mind, a risk-adverse University. I think that's because we see some of the challenges in arguing for a budget for which we're not at 1998 levels. If we were at 1998 levels of funding or if you imagine what just an inflationary budget would be like since 1998, this University would have received $1.6 billion dollars more from the State of Pennsylvania. It's a big number.

So there is that factor. And in that restricted-- in that risky environment, my view, the way we have operated is a delta on our budget. A delta on our budget, what do we need in order to provide a raise? What do we need to pay the eight percent, 12 percent increase in health insurance? And then what can we save and therefore set tuition based on those attributes?

And so each year, we've looked for $20 million-$30 million dollars in savings literally to offset a raise pool, primarily and some of these other components from that. And for that reason, colleges-- up until two years ago; because when I was a Dean here, that's what we were doing-- we have recycled over and over again.

And one of the things that occurs with recycling, if every time you turn around you know and you're thinking about your budget and you know I'm going to take one percent to two percent of it, you start to become risk adverse and you start to say, instead of hiring a tenure-track person, I'm going to hire a fixed-term person. Because I won't crater my budget if the president says, well, I need three percent or you take a $50 million dollars hit as occurred in the State appropriation.

This combined with the fact that we've seen faculty themselves have an interest in exceptional teachers as opposed to say, a senior faculty member deciding to take on a Gen Ed class, and we've seen the power of having an individual who has the opportunity to really focus on research and aid the whole enterprise. There has also been what I would say a natural tendency for faculty to also promote the idea within departments of faculty that I would call our expert-in-mission as opposed to prep.

I think these two things combined have created over 15-20 years, a remarkable change in the characteristics of the faculty. Now, fortunately, this has been a place that hasn't done this on temporary faculty. We have very few credit hours that are in that way that we have had this focus on full-time faculty.
So we are slowly coming to grips ourselves with what should our tolerance be in terms of risk aversion to a budget. How much can we put in a permanent category? So there is a little bit of pressure now, I would say, for us to start to redefine this. So what we're talking about here is in the midst of us wrestling with this idea, the Board is looking at bringing in an external consultant to see if they can provide advice on the budgeting that would allow some savings in dollars. I don't know what will come of it, and they are, of course, as we all are, not interested in having tuition go up too high while we have physical plant issues at the same time.

I think it's even part of this reaction that you see is that we ourselves are looking at this. Unfortunately, it is not like here's the definition because we've been trying to tug the University into more dollars in the permanent category. Now, of course, what this starts to also mean is that no matter what, we'll need to fill the number of students that we-- the seats we have-- because that's what's driving the University.

And so there is a lot of discussion too about your degree. How far will you go in order to balance your budget versus this risk aversion? It is not a simple topic, and I really appreciate the fact, Rosie, you asked the question. Because I should have also, in my answer to the very first question, talked about that this is a challenge for us in how we're running the University in terms of our level of risk aversion or not. So thank you for that question.

Chair Woessner: Another question.

**John Liechty, Smeal College:** John Liechty from Smeal and Eberly, jointly. I'd like to follow up on the comment or question from a colleague from Engineering. I applaud the emphasis that we have on undergraduate education and helping people get the best of what they can in their life. But I think his point may have been more towards if we have research funding coming in, what about our scholarly academic rankings and our scholarly impact, which is another aspect of the academic endeavor that we have.

And I would like to maybe see if you could comment also a little bit on the idea of retention of faculty. I've seen a number of anecdotal instances throughout the University over the last couple of years of where very good faculty have either been forced to go look for other positions or have been approached for other positions in order to get their wages anywhere near what the market is, with a lot of issues around salary aversions of things of that nature.

**Eric Barron:** There are avenues by which that research productivity stands out loud and clear. So our AAU rank is very much dependent on that research productivity. And quite frankly, when I'm sitting with those 61 other universities, this is exactly the company that we should be in.

The notion that we're now in a position where no other university in the country has more funded research fields in the top ten than Penn State, I think that is a signal that many, many people will notice. Now, in terms of recruiting students and things like that, that may or may not be of interest to them. But I think at that level, we have a lot to be proud of in the rankings. Maybe there are some that I'm missing that don't value it as much. It would be nice to have a performance-funding metric that included that because it leads right to the innovation arguments that are there. I see your part two. For as long as I have really paid attention, good people get offers. Sometimes there are other reasons why you want to move to a different place. Every time I've looked at where our faculty are recruited to, we are in very good
company. They're not being recruited really to the lesser universities unless there's a great package that is coming along with it or for some other reason.

And this, unfortunately, is a fact of life. And I've never seen any place where it isn't a fact of life. And so we do our best we can to be competitive, but we also have a budget constraint in that level too, so that becomes a challenge many times. We do our best. It's a great place to work and to live. It's a hard question to answer, but we're constantly looking at it, who's going after our faculty? When do we lose them? Oh, well, we lost them to this university and this university. We didn't lose them to these universities. Or this person went to Western, Southern, Eastern Kentucky State College, and we go, “what were they thinking?” But we work hard to keep good people, but we're not perfect, and it's a very competitive world out there.

Chair Woessner: On more question. Yes.

Mary Vollero, DuBois: Hi. Thanks, President Barron and everybody. I'm Mary Vollero, Penn State, DuBois. And I want to thank you all for your efforts for non-tenured line faculty this past year and for this discussion. As an FT for 15 years on a one-year contract, I really appreciate the changes that have been made.

I was promoted five years ago, and I have a terminal degree, so I'm enjoying my new title. And I'm really enjoying the fact that maybe in the future I could have a multi-year contract. I don't want to sound even a little bit ungrateful because I love my job and I just really appreciate that this conversation is happening. But what seems unconscionable and it's not just at Penn State, but nationally, like the elephant in the room, is the inequity that we can have so many non-tenured working as hard or working alongside tenured, but not even enjoying a fraction of the job security.

I know every summer, I wait for that contract in the mail, and I'm not the only one. And this year I'm really going to be on pins and needles, maybe, but I just hope that it would not be asking too much for a three-year contract. It seems like that would be a reasonable thing to consider, and I'm really hopeful. So thank you for this opportunity. [APPLAUSE]

Eric Barron: I don't disagree with you in any way. I really don't.

Chair Woessner: Thank you, President Barron.

Eric Barron: Sure thing.

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

Chair Woessner: Item F, Comments by the Executive Vice President and Provost. I am pleased to recognize Provost Jones to make comments and stand for questions.

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost the University: Thank you, Chair. I do feel it incumbent upon me to address you all in person. I think some, if not many, if not all of you, are aware of that recently I was announced as a finalist for the presidency of the University of Utah. I was not successful in that position, but I felt that I should address that with you specifically and face to face. It did represent for me and for us a unique professional and personal opportunity.
But as I said, I was not selected, and I want to stand here before you and assure you that my commitment to Penn State is not diminished in any way. And in fact, I would just like to add-- and this echoes some of the comments that the president made-- that I was actually reminded in that process just what an extraordinary institution Penn State is because a lot of the conversations I had were talking about the things that we are doing as a University.

So I came back from that process, I think, even more energized about the focus of this institution and the commitment, as the president said, to things like providing access to students, regardless of financial ability, and so on. So I just want to assure you that I am back and I am back with bells on. So do not for a moment think, again, that my commitment is diminished in any way, but thank you for letting me say that.

With your permission, I'd just like to ask Kathy Bieschke to do an introduction, if that's OK.

**Chair Woessner:** Sure.

**Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs:** I spoke with you in the fall about hiring an additional person for my office, an Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, and that person is in the room today attending her first Faculty Senate meeting. So I'd like to introduce in the back here on the left. This is a Tineke Battle.

I'm happy every day that she's here. She's been here since the 15th. She comes to us from Georgia State University. She has about a 15-year history in human resources, and her last position was Director of Talent Management there. So welcome her if you get the chance.

**Nicholas Jones:** Thanks, Kathy. I just want to touch on a few issues, and I know that time is of the essence, so I'll move quickly. First is about information security. So, stolen passwords through phishing emails are still the most popular attacks on Penn State. On average, over 300 accounts are compromised every month, and we are taking a number of steps to reduce these attacks, and one is to stop malicious emails from getting to people.

So in December, we moved the slider a little bit in terms of more aggressively rejecting emails that we felt contained malicious content. So during the month of December, we blocked an average of 40,000 such emails per day. That is out of an average of about 1.3 million daily messages coming from outside of Penn State. That's a big number.

So on an average day, we're blocking only about three-percent of the incoming messages. When we block an email, we send a message back to the sender saying that we've rejected this email because it appears malicious, and if we are mistaken, please resend it to a particular address and we will be certain that it gets to the intended recipient.

Through the month of December with 40,000 emails a day being rejected, we received a total of zero requests. So I think it is working. That would probably suggest we could slide a little bit more to the right. We got to dwell at that point for a moment, but be assured that if any of you have concerns that you're not getting email, please let us know because we will be most happy to get in there and make some adjustments and some tweaks if we're creating problems. But in 2018, given the risk to the University, we feel that we need to take a slightly more aggressive approach to this challenge.
We're doing something else that you all should be aware of and will be aware of before we do it. And that is in an effort to help educate the community, we are getting into the phishing business. We actually will be sending out fake phishing messages to the University community.

We will tell you when that is happening, and we'll advertise it broadly, and we will send out messages. If you click on one of these fake phishing messages, we will tell you that it was fake and suggest strongly that you partake in some training about how to recognize phishing messages. It is important, and it's actually important not only for Penn State in your professional lives, but also personally. Because, as I think many of you are aware of, some of these phishing messages are pretty darn sophisticated, and that's not a risk that you want to take.

There is a slight addition to this story and that is if you successfully phished by us, some weeks later, we will phish you again to see whether you have improved in your ability to recognize phishing messages. And if we phish you successfully a second time, you will probably get a more personalized response.

But I'm presenting this somewhat in jest, but this is really important. It is a big risk to the University, and 300 compromised accounts a month, ten a day, that is a lot, and it creates great vulnerability for the University. So we're trying to take an active approach to this as well as trying to reject as many of these messages as possible, and we hope that you'll all be supportive of these efforts.

A quick update on searches. Dean of the College of Nursing; we have completed the interviews for that search, and we are now reviewing the feedback that we've received from people who participated and should have a decision on that search very soon. The director of the Millennium Scholars Program; the committee was charged back in November, and preliminary interviews for that search will be held in the second week of February.

Dean of the College of the Liberal Arts; the committee was charged on December 20, 2017. The position was posted at the beginning of January, and we are starting to receive interest in that position. In addition, we did three town halls for College of the Liberal Arts faculty and staff to explain the search process and gather feedback.

And then finally, Dean of the College of Health and Human Development, the committee was charged on January the 10th. We are using a search firm in that particular effort, and they will actually be here later this week meeting with key stakeholders to help advise us on moving forward. So that's where we are with all of our searches.

If I might before I make my next round of comments, I just want to comment briefly on a couple of the questions that were posed to Eric and just provide a little bit of complimentary perspective. On AC21, we will be communicating very clearly to budget executives across the University, i.e., deans and chancellors. Our expectations in their embracing the spirit and the intent of AC21, they will know that it is our expectation that this be implemented in the manner that is intended. So that is one tangible way we will be ensuring-- I think that was to Jim's question-- that the message will get out that we are taking this very seriously.

Second, the faculty salary issue-- and I'm mentioning this because this is actually so new, I haven't even shared it with Eric yet. First I would say we are attracting great faculty at all levels as well. So,
sometimes as Eric indicated, we lose faculty to other institutions. We're also very successful in recruiting great faculty at all ranks to Penn State. So that's a great positive.

However, we are trying to shift from what I would describe that we've used in the past as a more ad hoc approach to faculty salary management to a more strategic one. In order to do that, we need to provide the deans and chancellors with tools that can help them be more strategic in their management of faculty salaries. We shouldn't have to be waiting for faculty to get an offer from outside the University before we address a perceived inequity.

And so we're hoping with our improved tools which we simply haven't had until recently that we will be able to help the deans and chancellors be a little bit more strategic in their approach, so stay tuned for that.

Strategic Plan-- we are getting close to the close date for Cycle 2 of the Request for Proposal process. We funded a dozen proposals in the first round, invested just a little above $2 million dollars in one-time funds in those initiatives. We're pretty excited about the interest that we're seeing in Round 2, and when Round 2 concludes, there will be a third round of proposals sort that we will fund towards the end of the academic year. So please participate. Many of you are already, I know, but we're pretty excited about the efforts that are being funded right now.

This spring, we are having a series of forums here at University Park that follow up on the forums that we had last year at campus locations. The first one was last Wednesday, January 17. We have one scheduled on transforming education, Wednesday, February 21 in Foster Auditorium, and on the Strategic Planning website, you can see when the other ones are scheduled and what the focus will be.

I know you're going to hear later about LionPATH, so let me just mention briefly then. WorkLion, we are live with WorkLion. We've actually done a couple of the biweekly pays through WorkLion already. The big date that is ahead of us is January 31 when we do the first monthly payroll, which probably affects most of you in this room.

We are very optimistic based on what we've observed with the biweeklies that we're in pretty good shape and things will go smoothly. When I say things will go smoothly, that does not mean that things will be perfect because this is big and complicated, and there are opportunities for errors to show up in the process. But I can assure you that the team is ready. They are practiced, and if any of you have any concerns in that first payroll, please let us know immediately. There is a hotline support available, both online and by phone, and we stand ready to help with any concerns that you may have.

We do realize that some of you may be, on January 31, looking at your pay stub for the first time ever. However, for those who are wanting to understand how the new format compares with the old format, we've actually, on the website, put up on the portal a comparison so you can see how the two translate.

And of course, as we roll from the last tax year into a new tax year, there will be many changes that are completely independent of WorkLion and our new payroll system, so just be aware of that. But in order to facilitate that, we've put that example.

I think in view of time, I'll stop there, and I'm happy to take any questions if there are some.
Chair Woessner: Are there any questions for Provost Jones?

Ira Ropson, Medicine: This is actually a question that extends from previous remarks. I'm curious, and I don't know if the data is available or if you can make it available, if there are any numbers on the way that the proportion of individual campus budgets have changed from permanent funding to temporary funding over the past 15 years. In other words, we don't know these kinds of numbers has faculty, and our instincts is to say that if somebody has been teaching a job for five to seven years, come on already.

But if the budgetary situation is such that the only growth has been in temporary funds that may need to be cut the next year, it becomes a far more detailed kind of problem that I'm not sure how to deal with that.

Nicholas Jones: So let me respond in two ways. First, I'm not sure if the precise information you're looking for is on the Budget Office website, but on the Budget Office website, there is a large amount of information that gives you more details and probably you would ever want about the institution's budgetary commitments over time. And it's a great place to go to get a lot of questions answered, so I would suggest that first and foremost you take a look there.

But I think as a result of that question, some of the questions the president got and some discussions that we have had with the Senate Council and others, I think we need to look for opportunities where we can do a better job, the administration, in ensuring that the faculty and the Senate, in particular, are fully aware of how we budget this University and how we break it down into all manner of detail.

It's a little bit hard because it's big and complicated to do that in a 25-minute briefing, but we can certainly look for other mechanisms, I think, to ensure that you have all of the information that you need to inform you on questions like that and for us to stand and be willing to explain why things are the way they are. There's usually a reason. It's not always a great one. Sometimes it's imposed upon us; sometimes it is a decision that is being made internally. But there is always a reason why things are the way they are. And I think for us to be able to share that with you in an even more transparent way than we are now, we value the opportunity to do that.

Chair Woessner: Other questions?

John Liechty: I appreciate your comments on the retention issue. I have one anecdote I thought maybe I'd just share and then ask a clarifying question about your strategy. The anecdote is a faculty in my department approached the retention issue with senior management, the administrators. And well, the response given to that faculty was to go out and do benchmarking themselves.

So they did. There's a number of public universities that have got comparable level institutions to that department benchmarked and crossed all the different ranks and found that their salary, which was a full professor rank of research active was in the 30th- percentile, that neighborhood of assistant professors and lower as you go up the ranking.

And so that person has been here a long time. Salary inversion happens, and I applaud the effort to have better tools at the hands of the administrators to be strategic. But I think one of the points in the discussion they had was that the tools themselves would honestly solve the problem. I'm wondering if the strategic tools are going to be met with strategic resources also.
Nicholas Jones: Yeah, that's a great question. A strategic tool is indeed only useful if you can back it up with some action. I would love to be able to just say, yes, of course, but it's complicated. There are lots of pulls on our resources. What I hope the tools will be able to do is enable our deans and chancellors and others around the University to make much more informed decisions about salary allocations.

Honestly, when we make these tools available, I do not anticipate that in one year, we're going to address all of the issues and inequities and challenges that we have. But I would like to think that over a multi-year, maybe a five-year period, by looking at these data in a more strategic way, we're able to put faculty members on paths so that their salaries end up where they need to be. And we think the tool will be useful in that regard.

There are always decisions that have to be made and trade-offs about should additional permanent funds, resources be invested in area ‘X’ or area ‘Y’ or area ‘Z’, and those decisions are the responsibility of the budget executive. But we hope with this tool they will be able to, in a more enlightened manner, inform those decisions and identify where the real needs are.

Chair Woessner: Thank you, Provost Jones.

Nicholas Jones: Thank you.

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Woessner: There is no Forensic Business.

UNFINISHED LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Woessner: Item H, Unfinished Legislative Business. For those attending in person, we will use clickers for voting today. Senators should receive a clicker before entering the auditorium. Raise your hand if you need a clicker. Those attending by Mediasite should use polleverywhere.com/facultysenate.

We have two unfinished business items. The first item is a Committee on Committees and Rules revision to Bylaws Article II, Membership, Section 5(c) that was introduced at the December meeting. It is a proposed change to the Bylaws and found in Appendix B.

The Committee Chair, Ken Vrana, will respond to questions. Is there any discussion on the report?

Kent Vrana, College of Medicine: Thank you, Matthew. Just by preamble, this is a change to the Bylaws that arose because we have two representatives of undergraduate associations and none from the Graduate and Professional Student Association. We are rectifying that with a simple change to the Bylaws in Appendix B.

Chair Woessner: Any question for discussion? Are we ready to vote? The Senators joining my Mediasite, you may cast your votes at polleverywhere.com. To accept, press A. To reject the motion, press B. We'll wait for Poll Everywhere.

Anna Butler: Poll Everywhere, I have 13 accept.
Paula Brown, University Faculty Senate Staff Assistant: In house, we have 128 accept, four rejects.

Chair Woessner: And for answering D or E, for the record.

Paula Brown: Yes.

Chair Woessner: Thank you. Motion carries.

The second unfinished business item is also from the Committee on Committees and Rules, Revisions to the Constitution Article I, Function, Section 1, was introduced at the December meeting. It is proposed to change the Constitution found in Appendix C. Committee chair, Kent Vrana, will respond to questions. Are there any questions on this report?

Kent Vrana: Simple change to correct a vestigial phrase that said that the Senate has responsibility or purview over resident instruction. That has now been stricken, and we use this opportunity to add a single word that we also have the purview over professional graduate and undergraduate education.

Chair Woessner: Are you ready to vote? Senate joining by Mediasite, you can cast your votes at pollwherever.com. To accept, press A. To reject, press B. We will wait for the results of the Poll Everywhere.

Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 15 accepts.

Paula Brown: In house, 131 accepts, two rejects, and three uncounted votes.

Chair Woessner: Motion carries. Thank you very much.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Woessner: Item I, Legislative Reports. Please be reminded, that parliamentary procedure requires that all motions be submitted to the chair in writing. If needed, the Senate staff can provide you with paper and pencil. We have two Legislative Reports today.

The first, Committee on Committees and Rules, revisions to Bylaws Article IV, Section 6, and appears in Appendix D. Because these revisions are to the Senate Bylaws, it will be discussed at the April meeting. If there are questions for clarification, Kent Vrana is available to answer those questions. Questions or clari-- OK.

The final legislative report is for Curricular Affairs titled "Guidelines for Academic Programs," information appearing in the University Bulletin. It appears as Appendix E. Committee Chair, Michele Duffey, will present the report and respond to questions.

Michele Duffey, Health and Human Development: Thank you. This one is relatively simple. The "Guidelines for the University Bulletin" were created in 1980 and had not been updated. So we clean them up a little bit so that as we are moving to the new digital bulletin, it would be much more flexible going forward.
Chair Woessner: Other questions or comments? Are we already to vote? This report is brought to the floor by committee and need no second. Senators joining by Mediasite, you can cast your vote at polleverywhere. Press A to accept the motion, and press B to reject. We'll wait for the results for Poll Everywhere.

Anna Butler: From Poll Everywhere, I have 12 accepts and one reject.

Paula Brown: In house, we have 132 accepts, five rejects, and two uncounted.

Chair Woessner: Motion carries. Thank you.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Chair Woessner: Item J, Advisory and Consultative Reports. There is one Advisory and Consultative Report on today's agenda, by Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity, titled "Proposed Changes to Penn State Policy SY 45, Use of Unmanned Aircraft" and is found in Appendix F. Andy Schultz, Committee Chair, will introduce the report.

Andrew Schulz, Arts and Architecture: Sure. Thanks, Matthew. So this pertains pretty exclusively to the use of drones, which as you may know have become very potent tools in a variety of research domains. It also applies to model aircraft that might be used in the context of student clubs or other organizations. And, just to frame this very briefly for you, as you know, if you looked at the redline document, this amounts to essentially a new policy.

The existing policy had basically put in place a blanket prohibition on the use of unmanned aircraft, and this new policy or the revised policy creates a set of guidelines outlining the specific circumstances under which drones or other unmanned aircraft can be used. The committee found that the needs of research and other activities were well balanced with concerns about safety and FAA Regulations. So we thought this is an excellent revision, and we thank the Office of Research Protections for allowing us to comment on it.

Chair Woessner: Are there questions or discussion? I thought this would be controversial. Very good. Are we ready to vote? Oh, there is a question.

Michael Krajsa, Lehigh Valley: I'm just curious over the last three years how much activity, how many more faculty, students, and staff are using drones in their research and for other things and do you have any projections?

Andrew Schulz: Basically, I haven't been able to under the existing policies. So zero.

Michael Krajsa: So are we to track the metrics on this going forward?

Andrew Schulz: I would assume we can do that, and I would assume that that will happen. One of the things that policy outlines is, basically, manager of this activity. And I would fully expect that tracking this kind of activity would fall under the responsibilities of that position.

Michael Krajsa: Thank you.
Andrew Schulz: Yeah, sure. Anything else?

Chair Woessner: Other questions. OK, are we ready to vote now? Very good. This report is brought to the floor by committee need no second. Senators joined by Mediasite, you can cast your votes at polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B. And we will wait for Poll Anywhere.

Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 16 accepts and two rejects.

Paula Brown: And it is 124 accepts, eight rejects, two uncounted.

Chair Woessner: The motion carries. Thank you.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Chair Woessner: Item K. Three of the Informational Reports in today's agenda were approved to be web-only reports so they will not be presented and discussed at our meeting. From Committee of Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid, the Annual Report on Reserve Spaces Programs; from the Elections Commission, the University Faculty Census Report 2018-2019; and from the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education, the Summary of Petitions by College, Campus, and Units 2016 to 2017. They're available in the agenda on the Faculty Senate website. Questions may be emailed to the Faculty Senate office or the committee chairs. They appear in Appendix G, I, and K.

ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID
Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program, Appendix G

ELECTIONS COMMISSION
University Faculty Census Report 2018-2019, Appendix I

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
Summary of Petitions by College, Campus, and Unit 2016-2017, Appendix K

The first report is from Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid titled "Update to LionPATH Implementation." It appears in Appendix H.

Stephanie Szakal and Harold Hayford, will stand for the presentation. Twenty-five minutes are allocated for presentation. I think we divided that in ten minutes for presentation, 15 minutes for questions and discussion. Thank you.

Stephanie Szakal, LionPATH: Thank you. Thank you for the invitation to come and address you. I am not here alone from LionPATH. And in fact, there are a variety of members, both from our Governance Committee and our Executive Committee. They suggested that they be asked to waive or stand. So if you would indicate that you are part of this, thank you. There are many.
We will follow the general approach that the report took, and I also should note that chairperson for that committee, David Smith, sends his apologies for not being able to be here. He had a conference today. So we will proceed then to the material.

So first of all, it's very important to note that LionPATH is not simply software. It is a combination of all the people who implement the processes associated with that software, the processes themselves, policy, and our response and interpretations of those policies as well as the technology. So, I think this is true for all of these large ERP implementations and certainly is an issue that we all have to understand very thoroughly.

As part of our vision and the purchase of this software, we have in our charter-- and it was part of our mandate-- to try to utilize that software to minimize customization and to use the purchased product as best we could. In some cases, adjust those practices, especially those that don't differentiate Penn State, but are really commodities, as the software was intended to do that.

And so it's a constant balance. We're constantly trying to figure out how the software works; how can we make it work properly for Penn State, and where in those cases, we do need to adjust, how can we minimize that adjustment and what can we do there.

So in addition, I should note that we have, both the concept of customization, which is to change the software, and we have done very little change. We have done a lot of the extension, and that is both through LionPATH itself and through all of the associated systems. So for example, Starfish is one of the systems that was purchased because LionPATH did not address all of the needs that we wanted to address for advertising.

And with that in mind, this is the ecosystem we live in. Now we think of ourselves, of course, as a center of the universe, but we recognize very clearly that we are not. And all of these systems are critical to supporting all the different kinds of student activities and administrative processes that are essential to charting our students' course and enabling them to be successful.

So you'll see the different colors. The blue tend to represent the universal systems that everybody in a very large population is part of. So we have Canvas, of course, and iTwo and the central person registry and all of those kinds of things that we have in our environment. The brown represents some very specialized support software that you don't necessarily see as its own. The green is mostly special populations, or the orange is rather. And the green is yet another subset dedicated to very large populations.

With all of these we have multiple interfaces. So we were asked to comment on how we interface. At the present, I believe we have 87 outbound interfaces. Most of these represent complex interactions; two-way interactions we get and send information back and forth, and it is challenging in that LionPATH like its cohorts, like WorkLion and SIMBA in the future, represent a different paradigm than ISIS did.

So some of the challenges in making these links are in explaining how the data, how the concepts have varied from what we had in the past and to some extent how they do or don't match the receiving system and those kinds of issues come up on pretty much a daily basis. So all of these are very much part of supporting that large population, and I will note how very large it is.
So we have 175,000 students who have been provisioned for LionPATH over its life. In addition, we have about 57,000 people who are paying for those students. The authorized payer is the term we use in LionPATH.

Then we have people who can see grades or financial aid. By the students' request, they have authorized delegates; 47,000 of those. Most of these tend to be parents, almost 11,000 faculty, and about 8,200 staff. So we've got a very broad set of populations that we serve, and we try to understand their behavior and how we can best support them.

We also have, just so you understand the magnitude of the challenge, the 2016-17 numbers. We processed over 108,000 applications, which led to about 28 percent of those people matriculating. It's a whole lot. In addition, we had 108,000 students register for over a million course offerings during that first year.

So while the first year was admittedly bumpy, there was a lot of activity happening. So what you saw was the percentage that had problems and struggled. We collected $1.8 billion dollars in tuition and dispersed $1.2 billion dollars in financial aid. So it's big numbers we support and lots of different activities.

A big week for us is, of course, the first week of class. We had on January the 8th, we had almost a million page views. So people were hitting our system hard. As far as I know, it went pretty well. We didn't have any performance problems. They found that they needed.

The various offices that support, frontline support for students, were all battered, I'm sure, with requests and all of that, but that's what the traffic looked like. And so we continue to support all of them and takes a whole lot of people. It isn't just the system. It's everything else that goes behind that.

We are governed by a large group of people who attempt to represent everything that we do in the way of student service. You can see the listing of the different kinds of folks that are represented here, and when we need to, we go out and we go beyond and we have advisory committees and so forth. This group is not only charged with helping us figure out what we should be doing-- what's new, what's coming-- they also provide guidance and direction in terms of making sure we stay with our mission as well as bringing us on board and keeping us aware of the strategic vision of the University--strategic projects.

It's a big challenge because there's a lot going on, and there are lots of different groups represented, and we are trying to be responsive. So, not only do our representatives drive initiatives, we also have to meet other initiatives. So we are equally impacted as we had impacted other groups. Now WorkLion and in the future SIMBA will force changes from LionPATH. So we're responding to them as well as initiating change, and it's hard in both directions.

As far as those requests that are steering and the governance group are looked at, they can come from anybody. They can come from any place in the University. I believe you have to have a web access ID to submit a request, but that's pretty much it. And so we are constantly battered with requests. Some of them large and very carefully articulated, others very broad and not necessarily even ours. We try to help direct people back to that ecosystem because one of our challenges is to find which is the software that does the right job for this.
Many times our software functions overlap. And, so we could do this in LionPATH, we could do it in Starfish, we could do it in another system, and we have to help make that judgment call. And that's where the Governance Committee spends a lot of time trying to figure out where do we answer these questions, which system is best set up to be able to help support this function.

So we monitor those requests as they come in. We prioritize them. It's a constant ongoing battle to try to figure out exactly how much time it's going to take, what part of our resources do we need to dedicate to any given request and then getting back to people after they submit something to ensure that they understand why we are asking for more information, why we're directing them to somebody else, or why we're just, in some cases, refusing or embracing what they want and then giving them a timeline.

So our current focus is on-- I have moved ahead. So last summer, at the provost's behest, we looked at the top ten most painful processes that we have facing LionPATH. The various functional units went out from our Governance Committee and solicited input. So a lot of colleges, campuses, other units provided input to let us know where the pain points were.

And from that very large list-- and sometimes we didn't always understand and had to follow up and all of that-- we distilled it down to ten. As you can see, these running down here. I think you should resonate with most of them. You've probably heard about a lot of them, maybe not all of them.

A few of them are back office processes that are essential to our mission. We organize those. Each one of those has a lead, and this is from the whole of the governance committee. This isn't just the LionPATH, this technical support group, but rather the whole. And they could touch people, processes, the software itself, in some cases, policy.

I think a very good example of one of those that touches all those places has been transfer credit. We've spent a lot of time looking at the transfer credit process here. It isn't from LionPATH. It is a committee that embraces all the folks who are involved in various aspects of that, and they have come back to us. And we have 20 different serious development efforts that we will be systematically working through, including public facing and presenting transfer credit to the applicants and prospects that we have in our environment.

So it's that kind of thing. Some of them are mostly technical, but very few of these are technical issues. Most of these involve a lot of discussion about what our vision is. So it's not the LionPATH software that's necessarily changing, it's the process and the people that are doing these things.

Longer term, another thing you should be aware of is we are doing an upgrade, and don't fear. It's not as radical, revolutionary as the implementation was. In fact, most of you should barely notice what we are hoping to achieve, and we'll roll out with the upgrade or sometime shortly thereafter is an improvement for the look and feel of the software.

And we might be the worst of these. The provost exhorted us to and was the driver of making a better-looking interface for students because it's really the user experience. It's not merely cosmetic, and we got that message, and we are looking at that increasingly in the future. And it's also on the vendor's path, so that enables us to do a lot more. It gives us flexibility without customization to be able to give a better user experience.
Some of those top ten also have touch points about the user experience. So I think that's a major driving point, and as we look forward to an upgrade, that should be minimally disruptive. It will slow us down a little bit in terms of the amount of extensions and customizations and work we can do. But long term, it should enable us to present a better-looking pace of our systems and aim at that more intuitive, natural-feeling software than we currently have.

So with that, I'll take any questions.

**Chair Woessner**: We have ten minutes for questions.

**Kevin McDade, Shenango**: Yeah. I just had a question, the prerequisite checking.

**Chair Woessner**: Your name and unit.

**Kevin McDade**: Oh, sorry. Kevin McDade, Penn State, Shenango. The prerequisite checking. Is there a timeline as far as when that's implemented, and have other institutions that have implemented systems like LionPATH, do they have any advice as far as some of the problems that we've seen?

**Stephanie Szakal**: And I will refer that back to the registrar because we do have it implemented already for select departments. And Bob, would you want to--

**Robert Kubat, University Registrar**: Yes. We're working with colleges who have been working with IST, over with Nursing, and there be other colleges. I know Smeal has asked to be included, the Commonwealth Campuses. So we'll be working with these colleges as they indicate their interest in moving forward.

Some of the processes will involve the colleges to ensure that their courses have the right prerequisites attached to the courses. So that could involve some curriculum changes, making sure that they are talking with their departments and the faculty of how they want to implement it so that it could include, for example, if there is an exception that wants to be made, how is that process going to occur.

This will happen over the next several semesters as we roll out. We've been working with Mary Beth in College of Science. So yes, we are moving forward with it. It will be done over the next several semesters. Does that help?

**Chair Woessner**: Other questions? There's a microphone right behind you.

**Jake Springer, College of Education**: Jake, student for College of Education, Jake Springer. So one thing we're talking about in ARSSA is opportunity for students to help the University in a sense where if the UPUA, the student government, could get students to find a way or an interest into working with LionPATH, is there any way that they could join the Governance Committee and help them in any sort of a sense. Like, obviously, there would be extreme safeguards, or they wouldn't work with student information or anything like that, but even just working with the interface or something quick that could help out the process and speed things up. Is there any way that students can help out with this?

**Stephanie Szakal**: I think the best place, actually, one of the things we're doing now as we look forward to this upgrade, is thinking about how we can take advantage of the new technology that's coming and
what that means for the look and feel; including, for example, we have both a mobile app and a semi-adaptive framework that we have implemented in the new student UI.

I think helping us once we figure out what's possible, sort of how to think about that would be a helpful way. And I believe the Governance Committee has talked about the student advisory group, which would be, I think, helpful, especially when as we look at the changes we can make. That would be a very helpful point because we do need that kind of input, and it's harder than you think to organize and structure. So that would be very useful. So thank you, and we will follow up with that.

Chair Woessner: Are there other questions? Let me come down here.

Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: Egolf, Lehigh Valley. I hope I didn't miss you saying this, but I didn't hear you say anything about with the new interface in 9.2-- if that's going to go to faculty also or if it's going to remain just student?

Stephanie Szakal: You did not miss me saying that. That is something as part of an upgrade and so our upgrade time frame is to roll it out for July 2019. And that's where we really look at faculty and staff because the technology will enable us, for example, to have the adaptive framework so you could have this stuff on your phone. It does enable us to make the pages look better.

So unfortunately, it's more on that time frame, but it is something we're definitely aware of and considering looking at.

Stein Sigurdsson, College of Science: Sigurdsson, College of Science. On the faculty and staff interface, it is absolutely the worst interface I've seen in 20 years.

Stephanie Szakal: I'm sorry.

Stein Sigurdsson: It is the worst interface I have seen in 20 years. It is appalling. It is a waste of faculty time, and there is absolutely no reason why an enterprise of this scale cannot be fixed that promptly. The font size is too small. The layout is appalling. The directions and the text are cryptic and incomprehensible, even to people who actually wanted to bother reading instructions.

And really, it is inconceivable to me that it takes 18 months to fix this. I don't understand why it cannot be fixed in a few days with a single programmer and a few lines of code. And I have some considerable experience managing large databases with large access by many people.

Stephanie Szakal: I appreciate your comment. I see the pain. Honestly, I was exposed to PeopleSoft professionally 15 years ago and thought it was ugly then, and it hasn't changed a whole lot. The vendor is very aware. And all I can say is we--

Stein Sigurdsson: No, we are a customer. We are paying them a lot of money. This needs to be fixed as a matter of extreme urgency. And as one of the representatives of this body, I'm trying to communicate that. This is really cannot go on. We cannot spend this sort of money on something that's that dysfunctional.
Stephanie Szakal: And this is a broader issue that we can-- I mean, I have the governance committee here, and I think we can look at that and respond. I can't respond here today because we have, frankly, a lot of things on our plates that we have to balance with that. And I appreciate the time commitment that it takes to use it.

Stein Sigurdsson: OK. I assume that it's possible to multitask on this and make progress on multiple fronts at the same time?

Stephanie Szakal: I'm sorry?

Stein Sigurdsson: I assume it is possible to multitask on software upgrade and proceed on multiple fronts at same time?

Stephanie Szakal: We will respond to you. So thank you.

Chair Woessner: We have just a few minutes left. In the back.

Cynthia Young, Liberal Arts: You said at the beginning of your presentation that one of your vision was to pick something that didn't require you to do that much customization. I thought that's what you said. That you were trying to do minimal customization. Is that correct? And if so, are you having trouble hearing me?

Stephanie Szakal: Yeah.

Cynthia Young: Okay. So at the beginning of your presentation, I thought what you were saying in terms of your vision for the rollout was that you wanted to pick something that required minimum customization.

Stephanie Szakal: Right.

Cynthia Young: And that seemed counterintuitive to me. Usually you want something that can do the flexibility to customize for a particular situation. So I'm just curious why was that part of the criteria?

Stephanie Szakal: Well, you want to purchase something that is as close to providing the functionality that you can. Because quite honestly, when you do the customization, there is a huge investment, and it isn't just the development. We tend to think of this as software. Oh, it's the development effort. Anyone here who has participated in structuring the processes know that there's an enormous investment in just collecting the requirements and figuring out what you want and getting that buy-in before you make any changes. And then as soon as you've made changes, you realize what you did wrong.

Then, there is the problem of every time-- so quarterly, we apply updates to the software. Those are essential for certain functions. For example, financial aid does not function without its quarterly updates because its compliance, and it is driven by recognizing that the federal requirements there.

And so every time you apply those updates, you have to look at all your customizations. Any place they change the software takes testing time and in some cases tweaks and adjustments. So that's why you try very hard to-- you want configuration. So there are other two.
Customization has changed. And increasingly, you see all the big vendors providing more opportunities for changes without changing the base software, and so that's what we always try to do. So it's a difficult message because it is nuanced in that sense.

Chair Woessner: We're out of time. So I think we have an urgent-- OK, let's take one more. Certainly this is an urgent matter.

Carla Pratt, Dickinson Law: Carla Pratt, Dickinson Law. Number two on your pain list was degree audits, and we haven't been programmed for our degree audit, so we're going to be doing it manually, I presume, for this graduation cycle. Is that what you're anticipating, or do you anticipate that degree audits will be in place in time for the May graduation this year?

Stephanie Szakal: So the degree audit issues are numerous, and a lot of them are around presentation. Some of them actually pertain to the transfer credit, were related to some of the issues with transfer credit, so they were intertwined issues. We are in the process of gearing up for the Law, and if anybody from the registrar's office wants to add anything on that point-- but there were numerous issues. It wasn't that they didn't work so much as I think they were not pretty not intelligible.

Carla Pratt: It doesn't work for Law.

Stephanie Szakal: It doesn't work for law. Then we probably need to have a separate conversation because it takes a lot of configuration and manipulation. So it may be that we haven't worked through all the issues yet. And if that's not the case, then we look at what other options there are.

Chair Woessner: Again, sense of the clock. I know this is a really important matter, so if somebody else really has something they can ask, otherwise we can talk perhaps afterwards. Thank you very much.

The final Information Report is from Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology titled "PSU Libraries Collection Budget Report, 2017" and appears in Appendix J. Julia Proctor, Collection Services and Strategies Librarian will present a report. Twenty minutes has been allocated for presentation, ten minutes for the presentation, and ten minutes for questions.

Roger Egolf: Yeah, I'd like to introduce Julia Proctor, who is the collection services and strategies librarian here at Penn State. And I want to make sure that you look at the full report in the agenda because there's a lot in there, far more than can be presented in this amount of time, a lot of interesting information.

It really shows some of the critical issues coming up that have already happened and are coming up in the cost of books and journals versus the amount of money available to buy them. So with that, I introduce Julia.

Julia Proctor, Collection Services and Strategic Librarian: So this is the third Annual Collection Budget Report for the Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology. The previous two are part of the Senate Informational Reports. These reports aim to provide information about the organizational structures, supporting library collections, as well as the intricacies of the library's collection budget and issues in the scholarly publishing landscape that affect how we build and maintain our collections.
We started writing these reports to bring transparency to how we spend collections money. And each annual report has a specific topic that it focuses on, and this year's report focused on inflation. So this report is organized by the who, what, where, and when of collections at Penn State Libraries.

The ‘who’ section describes the faculty and staff of the library that are involved in procuring collections materials and managing collections budgets. The ‘what’ section describes our funding sources and the types of material that we purchase. The ‘where’ section explains the relationships between University Libraries, Hershey Medical Library, Penn State Law, and Dickinson Law. And, the ‘when’ section gives an overview of our fiscal calendar.

There's a ‘Challenges’ section, which discusses the issue of inflation in depth and how that affects our collections. There's also an ‘Opportunity’ section that goes over some of the new projects and collections-related initiatives as well as some major collections purchases. And the report ends with information regarding the Harrell Health Sciences Library. So for the purposes of today, I just wanted to focus on the Opportunities and the Challenges sections of the report.

In the past year we've had the opportunity to launch internal projects such as updating guidelines for sending items to our annexes and gathering use data on our electronic journals for our annual review of journal subscriptions. We've also engaged in things like that textbook and educational resources endowment fund, which is a fund that has been created to support the purchase of textbooks for course reserve materials.

This fund aims to mitigate expenses that too often prevents students from purchasing course materials or sometimes even enrolling in classes. The fund was made possible by generous donations and contributions, and University Libraries have been able to acquire a wide variety of textbooks and educational resources that are available for all Penn State users to take advantage of.

We also have collections-related opportunities through our participation in the Big Ten Libraries Collection Initiatives. For example, years ago we carved out money from our budget to deposit with the Big Ten every year so that we would be able to take advantage of some of the consortia purchases that they negotiate on behalf of members. Publishers and vendors create proposals for the Big Ten with custom offers and discounts. This year we were able to purchase the raw XML data behind the Web of Science index, which is of use to big data users. We know that some researchers on campus were buying pieces of this on their own, and now it will be available to all users at Penn State.

The Big Ten is currently working together to try to figure out how to make this data available, and we're hoping to have more information on that soon. Through the Big Ten, we were also able to support Reveal Digital, which is an organization that employs a library crowd-funding model to digitize collections and make them openly accessible.

So finally, I want to talk about the Challenges section of the report, which focuses on inflation as I mentioned earlier. Like many research libraries, we have our fair share of challenges with regard to building and maintaining our collections in the face of rising costs. The cost of scholarly journals has been rising at a rate that many libraries struggle with.

The report provides details on this, but the gist is that overall cost increases for scholarly journals have been holding steady at around five percent to six percent per year. We have this information from the
Annual Periodicals Price Survey that's published in Library Journal. In 2017, that survey reported that out of 500 libraries surveyed in North America, only 11 percent had budget increases of five percent or more, while 64 percent had budgets that remained the same or had increases of less than five percent.

So there's a table in the report that shows we've been working with the same base budget since the 2014-2015 fiscal year. The table also shows non-recurring money collections as received from the library's own operations budget as well as University administration.

Since the report was written, it was completed in the fall. We've received additional support from University administration, and those funds will be immensely helpful to us in managing inflation this year.

So another part of the report that I want to highlight is that the rising costs of scholarly journals are only part of a larger picture. Everything goes up in cost over time. And publishers and vendors offer subscription models, sometimes multi-year deals that limit our ability to cancel things, and some publishers are beginning to increase their output aggressively.

For example, Springer and Nature merged in 2015 to create Springer Nature, and they produce a significant amount of content that is desirable to universities. In 2017, Springer Nature launched five new journals and is launching more in 2018. Now on the surface, it may not seem like adding new content would be problematic and it's expected to an extent. However, one of our librarians received a request from a faculty member who wanted the library to subscribe to one of the new titles. So we contacted the vendor and asked for a quote. The quote we received was around $12,000 dollars for an annual subscription to one title. And just to give you a sense of how that measures up to other costs, there's a table in the report that lists the average price per title for scholarly journals, and the highest average price is around $4,700 dollars for titles in Chemistry.

So reputable publishers produce really valuable content that they know will be in demand, but when prices are so high, libraries have trouble keeping up. The Big Ten wrote a letter to Springer Nature indicating that Big Ten libraries were going to stand firm by not subscribing to that title, or to those new titles, so that they weren't rewarding aggressive growth in this publishing model, and the majority of Big Ten libraries have maintained that position.

So, that just gives you a sense of the kinds of things that are happening with regard to the scholarly publishing landscape. And I think I'll end there and leave time for questions. There's a great deal of information in the report, and we really hope that it's helpful and that it demystifies some of the things that happen behind the scenes at the library.

Chair Woessner: Thank you. Are there any questions? Very good. Thank you very much. Thank you, Julia. Is there any New Legislative Business or any business of any kind?

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Woessner: Item L, Is there any New Legislative Business or any business of any kind? None.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY
Chair Woessner: Comments or Recommendations for the Good of the Order? OK.

ADJOURNMENT

Unidentified Senator: Can I motion?

Chair Woessner: Sure.

Unidentified Senator: Motion to adjourn.

Chair Woessner: All in favor, please say, aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Woessner: Motion carries. The Senate is adjourned until March 13, 2018
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>