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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, October 17, 2017 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: Item A, Minutes of the Preceding Meeting. The September 12, 2017 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 the minutes? Very good. This group is so far ahead of themselves, they know what to say before I even ask. All in favor of accepting the minutes please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Woessner: All opposed? Okay, the motion carries. The minutes of the September 12 meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Woessner: Item B, Communications to the Senate. The Senate Curriculum Report of October 3, 2017 is posted on the University Faculty Senate website.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Woessner: Item C, Report of Senate Council. Minutes of the October 3, 2017, Senate Council meeting can be found at the end of your Agenda. Included in the minutes are topics that were discussed in the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President on October 3.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Woessner: Item D, Announcements by the Chair. Due to the limited bandwidth in the auditorium I ask that attendees limit their use of smartphones and tablets so that all critical functions of MediaSite and Poll Everywhere have sufficient wireless bandwidth to work properly. Please do not use video streaming during the meeting because of the large amount of bandwidth it requires. Thank you for your cooperation.

All Senators using MediaSite, please use the “Ask a Question” box to send a message that you have successfully connected to the live feed so that we can add your name to the attendance sheet. And as a reminder to Senators joining today by MediaSite, we are using the voting system polleverywhere.com/facultysenate. Instructions for using the voting system are posted on the Senate website, so please log on to polleverywhere.com/facultysenate now.

I'm happy to report that all faculty have been given access to the Penn State University Faculty Senate archives. This rich historical resource contains thousands of searchable PDF files with records of the Senate dating back to its founding. More than an intellectual curiosity, the database contains vital information on the Senate committees which can be used to understand the origin of Senate policies.
dating back decades. When researching the rules on governance structure of the Senate Executive, I had
the opportunity to read the transcript of a floor debate that took place in this room 46 years ago. The
arguments over the proper balance of faculty administrative power are timeless. Nothing ever changes.
These records are a reminder that even the routine work of the Senate, including the words we speak
today, will become part of that record. And, now that you have access to the database, I encourage you all
to explore the Senate's rich history.

As part of its commitment to promoting high ethical standards and accountability, Penn State has
commissioned a follow up to the 2013 Penn State Values and Culture Survey. Conducted by a non-profit
ethics and research center, the survey will focus on Penn State's workplace culture, providing potentially
valuable information about the University's strengths and weaknesses. In order for the survey to be
effective, the University needs a diverse cross-section of employees to share their perspectives and
experience. And sometimes faculty and staff are reluctant to take part in such surveys because, by their
very nature, these questions about workplace experiences can be sensitive. But in an effort to protect
employees and assure them that the results will be kept anonymous, Penn State has contracted with an
outside firm. And to be certain that the identities of the participants are protected, Penn State will not
receive the data from the individual survey responses. The Ethics Research Center (ERC) will only
provide summaries of the overall findings, thus protecting the identity of those who take part in the
survey. So, I encourage you to take the survey and please encourage your constituents to take part in this
important study. It only takes a few minutes and taking the survey is the easiest way to make a real
difference on behalf of the Penn State community. To take part in the study, look for an email from the
Ethics Research Center and follow the link that says take the survey. I thank you in advance for
considering taking part in this important study.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

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

Eric Barron, President: I'm glad I walked in when I did. That would have been not so good. Okay, so I
thought first of all, we'd just have a little bit of discussion about the budget in Harrisburg, and I will stop
and make sure I take questions and hear your thoughts. Obviously, you know one interpretation of this is
here we go again. It's an off-election year and therefore, we will tussle with the budget. Another
interpretation is, which I think a lot of us feel, is this is rather different because we have individuals who
are stating publicly that they don't think the state related should be funded by the state of Pennsylvania.
That puts us in a very different kind of position; although, we believe rather strongly that the majority
feel strongly about the role of Penn State, Pitt, Temple, and Lincoln, and in particular, the very large
volume of in-state students that we serve. So for quite a bit of time, the revenue to support the budget that
was passed had Penn State fully appropriated, flat- but fully appropriated, and the argument was over the
revenue that was required to support that budget and that's where things began to break down. And we
didn't really even come before the House for a considerable period of time. It was quite a challenge to sit
there and wait and wonder what was going to happen. Then, and the Senate having passed both our
appropriation and the budget and the appropriation for the budget. So a little disconcerting. And then
finally two revenue packages went forward that would have supported the state relateds and they both
failed. As you know, we need a two-thirds vote as non-preferred appropriation because we're state
related. So, again that's a bit tricky and the gap appears to be about $100 million of arguing how that
particular $100 million is going to be captured.
So the governor is taking one stance. The Senate and governor's office tend to see a compromise, and the
House has been a bit of a struggle. And either we'll find some solution to that particular part of it or we
could continue to struggle. However, we're kind of hoping that Representative Reed who, as the Majority
Leader, believes that one avenue might be to support what they have and figure out the other $100
million later so that people can go about their business and so still get our full appropriation. So we're
waiting to see. Periodically we hear a framework has been found. And then as we saw with the two
House votes that it didn't work out that way. And then they had a cooling off period. And they're back
working and we will see how that comes out.

So what is Penn State doing? Well we've had a strategy basically of wanting to work hard to get this
done, to notify people that we had an issue, and to activate our grassroots network. And we know
thousands of letters went into the legislature encouraging them, to joint statements by the chancellor and
myself. It happened at the Pitt-Penn State football game, off the field; we're both committed to educating
students in Pennsylvania. This led to a deeper discussion about what the implications are of not having
the state budget. Because really there are only two things-- you can cut out programs and people, or you
can raise tuition. And right now the funding from the state subsidizes in-state tuition and we add to it a
considerable subsidy of our own. So this is a conversation that's been going on back and forth. It has now
become a more public conversation. And I guess I'm really pleased to see that both Pitt and Temple put
out Op Eds, or discussion pieces, which pointed out that their total subsidy, when you consider the state
appropriation and what they add to it, is close to $11,000 to $12,000 per in-state student. That's a
whopping big number. We're $5,000-ish from the state and then we more than double it ourselves in
terms of our own contributions. So this could have a rather profound impact. Pitt and Temple both put
out Op Eds that said there would be little choice but to dramatically raise tuition. Pitt also mentioned the
closing of a campus. We have been more public about the notion that this would require some action on
the tuition side of the equation for Penn State. And so we're preparing for that.

We have a deadline before we will take action on this for parents for the spring. And, we very much hope
that we will not have to take any action whatsoever. There is no number that is sitting there. But you can
imagine that if you were not to have support at all and this became a permanent thing, frankly, many
people believe that if it's gone, it will be very hard to get it back. So if you're looking at that as you know
something on the order of $5,200, we would never want to do that to our students at once. But
financially we couldn't hold on without working on that number in an expeditious fashion. But we have
not picked a number to pick. We have not picked a number; we're still debating what it would take. And
part of that is based on the fact that we have lots of negotiations going on. We still believe that they will
come through for us. But it's also true that we have to be very serious about saying that we have little
choice but to take rather significant action—we just don't want to do that. We would be the first Land
Grant in the history of the United States to be defunded. That's just not a good thing.

So at any rate, I am cautious. Occasionally I add the word optimistic to the end of it. But you know we
need to see what happens. And I will tell you that if you have written letters, and many, many people
have, that this is a good thing. They are starting to censor a lot of people out there that just don't want this
to happen. So why don't I just stop there, just to make sure that we get any answers, any questions about
the budget so I can make you feel comfortable, if that's possible.

Chair Woessner: Questions for President Barron? Wait for the microphone if you could so that keep
people online can hear. Thank you.
Matthew Wilson, Penn State Harrisburg: Wilson, Harrisburg. In the worst case scenario, would we be thinking about closing campuses, too?

President Barron: Okay, so I have no interest in closing a campus. I think they have tremendous value for the institution. There is no stone that will go unturned. We believe we've been busily doing that but we will amp up our efforts to make sure that we understand budgets and consequences. But I believe the campuses are one of the great strengths of the University. It would have to take pretty dire circumstances for me to be thinking about that.

Carolyn Mehan, Penn State Altoona: Carolyn Mehan, Penn State Altoona. My question is, does this have implications because we are a Land Grant? Does it affect federal funds too if the state chooses not to fund? Do we give back federal money also?

President Barron: Yes, there's an amplification of state funds in areas like agriculture. And so it is something that also doesn't make sense not to support them because of that.

Chair Woessner: Other questions? Thank you, President Barron.

President Barron: Sure.

[APPLAUSE]

President Barron: Do you care if I just find out if there are any other questions on any other topic? Yeah.

Galen Grimes, Penn State Greater Allegheny: In light of the-- oh, pardon me. Grimes, Greater Allegheny. In light of the proposals coming before the Senate this afternoon on the smoking policy, two questions came up in the Faculty Benefits Committee meeting this morning that the committee wanted to ask you. The first was, does Penn State own any tobacco-related stocks in its investment portfolio?

President Barron: Okay, so I don't know the answer to that question. Actually, I think I could probably figure it out with some effort. So basically we are heavily diversified and we have a policy, which is a Board policy, that the only criteria for investment for the University is to maximize the income for the operation of the University. And so they do not want to cross a line to have a social decision on what we invest in or not. And it would take considerable effort to try to unwind stocks in the portfolio to do it. I've asked the question before for other topics and they'll go, “Okay, well we'll work to figure this out. Well, we think there's 3.2 percent or we think there's 1.1 percent that's invested in that area but it's not a simple thing to answer or to unwind and you would have to change Board policy”.

Galen Grimes: Okay. The second question was some of the department's colleagues and everything are recruited very heavily by the tobacco companies. Would this policy have any effect on that level of recruitment?

President Barron: You mean for our students to go work for?

Galen Grimes: Right.
President Barron: No. This is a health choice. This is the fact that this choice costs all of us a lot of money in terms of what the cost of our benefits are and it's a simple fact that even secondhand smoke is harmful for individuals. And so this landscape has changed a lot as we've gotten more and more science behind it. And so I think people choose to do what they want to do. This is in the best interest of the health of our employees and for the cost that each employee has to pay. And basically that is the answer.

Chair Woessner: Great. Other questions? Senator Jolly.

Rosemary Jolly, College of the Liberal Arts: Rosemary Jolly, Liberal Arts. I just want to say that I'm not-- I understand that it's pushing water uphill to try and change Board policy, but there are two things involved. One is that where the big tobacco companies are looking to sell right now is the continent of Africa. You know, so I just want to point out that there's a reputational risk in suggesting that there's one health policy for us but we can make money off the backs of others who don't have as many luxuries and choices in life.

President Barron: Yeah.

Rosemary Jolly: I'm just pointing out that it's not just a neutral policy, it is a policy which can, at points, engage reputational risk.

President Barron: Yes and I understand that. So part of this discussion is, once you start down a path of investing based on a number of things, where will there not be pressure to not invest in a particular area for a particular purpose. And I think that's probably the reason, although this is not a Board policy that I adopted or proposed, I think that part of the reason is because you could see the path going down multiple different companies and reasoning. And so they made it simple. The objective is, and you know certainly you are right, but the objective is to maximize the investments of the University to fulfill our mission. So in that case- it is what it is.

Chair Woessner: Immediate Past Chair Strauss.

James Strauss, Immediate Past Chair: Strauss, College of Science. President Barron, as you probably know, I serve as an officer on the Audit and Risk Committee for the Board of Trustees. Very interesting committee. At our last meeting we had a very informative discussion about security and I came away very impressed with what we have in line but I also understand that this is kind of privileged information. Given the events of Las Vegas, very tragic, I just wonder if you might outline what you can discuss about some of the security measures we have in place in terms of maybe just offices, personnel, without giving everything away, I guess.

President Barron: Yeah, so obviously you do want to be very careful in this space. So what can I say easily? One, we take it very seriously. Two, the risks evolve and we try to evolve with it. If you are a determined individual to do harm, it's probably extremely difficult to stop that individual. But you can certainly make your space and University as protected as you can. We're probably living in a world where architects will start to include such things in their design and obviously we have a physical plant that stretches over many, many decades. And so there are buildings where you haven't thought about this at all.

We are trying to ramp up our awareness. So we do a lot of tabletop exercises for the University. We put together a team and a lot of planning for different venues and events where we think that might be
important. But we've added to it. So we are now participating in national tabletop exercises on different topics, under the guidance of Homeland Security. And we are doing quite a bit of consulting, too, so that our audit and risk group have a full sense of what the emerging issues are. Not just what's happening today, but what are the emerging issues that are happening on campuses. Certainly the free speech element is one of those areas where it is very clear that universities are being used. Have outside groups from that are there to create tensions and even violence. And so we're seeing this emerge in different ways and we're seeing different ways in which threat factors are performing and so we will do these audits and we will gather as much understanding.

We'll look on our campus from a different light. Is there the potential for that harm to occur? How can we minimize the potential that that might occur? And it's basically, I think, new territory for a lot of campuses to be looking at your streets and buildings and thinking through what that actually means, and whether or not we can manage it or how we can manage the best we possibly can. So I think the most important point is that we take this very seriously but it's a huge problem if someone decides that they're willing to give up their own life in order to harm others. It's a huge problem to try to deal with.

Chair Woessner: Other questions? Very good.

President Barron: Alright. Thank you.

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

Chair Woessner: Item F, Comments by the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University. Provost Jones will now make comments and stand for questions.

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for missing the last meeting. I was on travel. And so I'd just like to take a few minutes this afternoon to really give you some updates fairly quickly, particularly focused in the personnel area because there have been a lot of changes since the beginning of the year. I've tried to update you certainly through the spring but it's actually quite useful, I think, to hear about all of these together and to remind you about some of them.

At the last meeting in my absence, I know that Kathy Bieschke, as the new Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, spoke. So she needs no introduction, nor does her office because she described her vision for that. But Kathy of course, is one of our new and very important appointments. We have a number of new deans: Engineering, Justin Schwartz; Schreyer Honors College, Peggy Johnson; an internal appointment, Hari Osofsky, is the new dean of Penn State Law here at University Park; and, Lee Kump is the new dean of the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences.

We are currently doing a search for Paula Milone-Nuzzo's replacement for dean of the College of Nursing. That search is in progress and hopefully we'll reach a conclusion by the end of the calendar year. We did bring on board over the summer Paul Shrivastava; some of you may have met him. He is the University's new Chief Sustainability Officer and Director of the Sustainability Institute. So his primary appointment was to be the new director of the Sustainability Institute but we also made him Chief Sustainability Officer. And his job, part of his job, is to hold our institutional feet to the fire; to ensure that everything that we do as an institution has sustainability in mind. So I think it's an important and exciting new appointment for the University.
We have a new University Budget Officer, Mary Lou Ortiz, who joined us from Rutgers October 1. So she is brand new. We're very excited to have Mary Lou here. You'll have an opportunity to meet her at a future meeting. She's traveling, I believe, today. We announced a short time ago a new Associate Vice President for Affirmative Action, Suzanne Adair. Many of you know Suzanne. She's been here at the University for many, many years in various capacities, most recently in the graduate school. This is the replacement for Ken Lehrman's position. Ken served as Vice Provost for Affirmative Action. And you notice that I said that this is an Associate Vice President for Affirmative Action. That title change is to reflect a couple of things. Primarily, to address some confusion that reigned about the scope of the Affirmative Action Office. It is University wide. The Vice Provost title tended to convey to some people that it was more focused on the academic side of the house, but it actually is very broad so we wanted to avoid that confusion. In addition, we are going to be housing our Title IX Office firmly under the Associate Vice President for Affirmative Action. So that responsibility will reside with that office as well. That is going to be a responsibility that is distributed across multiple units in the institution but the leadership will be provided by Suzanne.

This is kind of old news, but it wasn't that long ago that our new Vice President for IT and CIO, Michael Kubit arrived, and our new Chief Information Security Officer, Don Welch; you've heard from them. They've been here less than a year. Both are doing, I think, extraordinary jobs in their new roles. I think as I looked up I did see Bill Sitzabee sitting back there. Bill, raise your hand. Bill is our new Associate Vice President for Facilities, Management, and Planning. That means that he is the new Ford Stryker, just to simplify it. Bill, it's great to have you here. Bill joined us from Cornell University. That's a lot of people, which is partly why I wanted to go through the list. That is a lot of change in the leadership of the University. I think we have been extraordinarily fortunate to make some tremendous hires over the past year or so. We have a few more to go. But this is a lot of change and I hope you all will have opportunities to interact with all of these folks.

Some quick updates on the more functional side. LionPATH. The focus on LionPATH at this point is really continuing to improve the functionality and the usability of the system. We did make the change at the beginning of the summer to the user interface for our students. That's been very well received. And just to answer the question in advance, there is consideration being given to how and when we will deploy a new interface for faculty and staff. We are still working on that and it involves evaluating the new tools that are provided by the impending upgrade to the core software behind LionPATH. One of the things that was troubling me was I kept hearing horror stories of LionPATH creating extraordinary burdens for people. Very time intensive processes that didn't used to be time intensive before. So, I charged a group to come up with a Top 10 list of such issues. They did that. They came up with a very robust list. Not surprisingly, many of the issues were not just LionPATH, they were how LionPATH interacts with other University systems and we are rolling up our sleeves now to go down that list basically one by one and focus on making the changes necessary to make these processes more seamless.

Canvas is alive; Angel is in heaven where it probably belongs at this point. But that was a terrific transition, I think, and most of the reports I'm getting is the transition went well and the new functionality is being strongly appreciated. We launched the HR shared services office in the summer of July of 2017 and the WorkLion go-live date is December 10. Everybody's paychecks in January will, if get a monthly check, your January paycheck will be issued from WorkLion. There was a delay, we reported before. The original plan was to go live with WorkLion in the summer. We delayed that to December. We are on a good vector to make that happen. And I think the delay, even though it was a little frustrating for many of us, was a prudent action to take. Right now HR is struggling a little bit because they are living two systems. They're keeping the old system alive but are also in the process of transitioning to the shared
services operation. So it's a little bit of a stressful six months. But once we get to WorkLion go live I think things will smooth out a little bit.

And then finally, the business information system. We are actually in the final stages of negotiating the vendor for that system and the implementation of that will begin very shortly. It's too early to really talk about that or even reveal who will be the vendor, but it's very close. So stay tuned on that one. At the next meeting I believe I will be doing a full report to this group on strategic plan implementation, so I'll defer talking about that at this meeting. But we have a lot to report and I'm looking forward to that opportunity. I will echo the chair in putting in a plug for participation in the Values and Culture Survey. It is very important that people participate, so I encourage all of you to encourage your colleagues to participate. The more engagement we have in that, the better.

And then finally I'll just mention, some of you may have seen this already, we do have a new website for policies. The old Guru site is no more and probably was due to be sun-setted. So there is a new website. The transition, I think, has gone pretty smoothly. The feedback we're getting is very positive. So I encourage you to take a look at that. It's a much more contemporary look and feel compared to Guru, which takes me back to the old Gopher days.

One of the things that has also happened, just so everybody is aware, is we did effect a transition, we've talked about it before, in the policy identification. We pulled a bunch of the HR policies that related really purely to academic, the academic enterprise, and made them AC policies. So for example HR 23 is now AC 23; HR 70, should you ever need it, is now AC 70. And what's important is the policy steward for the academic policies is now my office, basically. So Kathy and I, together, really function as the policy steward for all those economic policies, which is really where the home for those should be. So I just wanted to let you know that's been done and encourage you to take a look at the new website. So I'll stop there and I'm happy to take any questions if there are any.

Chair Woessner: Thank you are there any questions for Provost Jones? Senator Wilson.

Matthew Wilson, Penn State Harrisburg: I'm going to take off my faculty hat and put on my parent hat. My daughter is a student here. And that every semester when we go to pay her bill we end up pulling our hair out. And that--

Provost Jones: Me more than you--

Matthew Wilson: Yeah, well-- and that I know the system already. And that I'm wondering to the degree to which we're getting parents really angry at us who don't know the system. You know, I just think that if we're talking about doing a better interface, that we need to do it for parents who pay the bills, too.

Provost Jones: Yeah. Well, we're certainly looking to be as efficient as possible in terms of how we take your money; that is for sure.

[LAUGHTER]

And I have to say I have two daughters here, so I do the same thing. I think that interface could be improved. It is one of the things that we're looking at. Some of the clunkiness is actually related to process issues. So we actually need to step back just a little bit and look at some of the processes that are associated now with LionPATH but it's the whole the broader context. So these are things that we're
looking at. Now that we're sort of fully into implementation, this is an opportunity for us to take that step back and say, “Okay, how can we make these adjustments to improve things and make things flow much more simply for users?” So it's a very good point, Matthew. Thank you and I will pass that on to the team. And I know I've had my frustrations from time to time also.

**Chair Woessner:** Other questions. Very good. Oh was there-- Oh I see it.

**Sharon Holt, Penn State Abington:** Thank you. Sharon Holt, Abington. Provost Jones, would you care to tell us what the URL for this famous new website is?

**Provost Jones:** Yeah I would.

[LAUGHTER]

It is policy.psu.edu. Thank you.

**Chair Woessner:** Other questions. Okay, thank you very much.

**Provost Jones:** Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

**FORENSIC BUSINESS**

**Chair Woessner:** Item G, Forensic Business, there is none.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**Chair Woessner:** Item H, Unfinished Legislative Business. We will use clickers for voting today. The system provides a precise count of each vote taken and it allows for confidential voting and gives immediate results. Senators should have received their clicker before entering the auditorium. And raise your hand if you need a clicker or if during voting you find your clicker doesn't work. We have one Unfinished Business item from the Committee on Committees and Rules. The title is “Revisions of the Bylaws, Article III, Election to the Senate Section 7” that were introduced in September. It is a proposed change to the Bylaws and it appears as Appendix B. Committee Chair Kent Vrana will respond to questions.

**Kent Vrana, College of Medicine:** By way of introduction, this is what we believe is a simple change and we ask you to support it with your vote. As you'll see in Appendix B, what happened is that we had a situation where a Senator was unable to begin their term. The language said ‘unable to complete’. And so there was a question, “If they hadn't started, how could they complete?” And so we changed the language very simply to say, “If a Faculty Senator is unable to fulfill the duties of their elected term”, then we trigger the alternate process. Questions?

**Chair Woessner:** Okay. Are we ready to vote? Is there any further discussion? Okay. We have-- where are we here? Okay. So the report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. If we're ready to vote, Senators joined by MediaSite can cast their votes at polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.
I love the votes that come in at the last minute. Apparently it's a hard decision to make. We'll wait for polleverywhere.com.

**Anna Butler, Faculty Senate Staff:** On Polleverywhere I have nine Accept.

**Chair Woessner:** Motion carries. Thank you.

**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 pencil and paper. We have two Legislative Reports today. The first is from Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid. The title is “Update Senate Policies to Replace/Remove eLion/ISIS-Revision to Senate Policy 48-30 Corrected Grades”, which appears as Appendix C. Committee Chair Mary Beth Williams will respond to questions.

**Mary Beth Williams, Eberly College of Science:** Thank you. This is a simple editorial change to remove eLion from the one policy, in Senate policy where it exists.

**Chair Woessner:** This is a big symbolic moment.

**Mary Beth Williams:** I know it is. We're killing eLion.

[LAUGHTER]

Shall we try?

**Chair Woessner:** For those who are online, it says if we vote against this, does eLion come back? We'll get back to you on that one. Are there any questions? Okay. The report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Are we ready to vote? Senators joining by MediaSite, you may cast your vote at polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

We're waiting for polleverywhere.com.

**Anna Butler:** On Polleverywhere I have 14 Accept.

**Chair Woessner:** Did we lose the vote? Oh there we go. Motion carries. Thank you very much. I was going to say, more than four people voted, I saw it. Okay, 137--

**Paula Brown, Faculty Senate Staff:** [INAUDIBLE]

**Chair Woessner:** Voted C, Okay. E, thank you. The second report is from the Committee on Committee and Rules and is titled “Revisions to the Bylaws, Article I, Officers, Section 1.” It appears as Appendix D. Because this is a revision to the Senate Bylaws, both a discussion and the vote will be held at the December meeting.
Chair Woessner: Item J, Advisory/Consultative Reports. We have three Advisory/Consultative reports to consider today. The first report submitted by Faculty Benefits is titled, “The Pennsylvania State University Smoke Free/Tobacco Free Task Force Report and Implementation Plan”, and appears as Appendix E. In the Agenda, Committee Chair Galen Grimes and the task force members, Linda LaSalle, Director of Health Promotion and Wellness and University Health Services; Alex Shockley UPUA Vice President; and Renee Borromeo, Chair of JCIB; are here to present the report and to stand for questions.

Alex Shockley, Vice President, University Park Undergraduate Association: Good afternoon, everyone. My name's Alex Shockley, I'm vice president of UPUA. So basically we're just going to kind of walk through the recommendations, just to give a brief summary so everyone is on the same page. And then I'd be happy to answer any questions that the task force did have. So the task force concluded this past summer in August. We presented the recommendations with our chair who was Paula, the dean of Nursing, presented it to President Barron, and now are kind of receiving some follow up thoughts and feedback.

So the first recommendation is kind of the overall explanation. So the task force recommends that Penn State University will be both smoke free and tobacco free. Smoking and tobacco will be prohibited on all campuses and all PSU owned or leased properties, facilities, and vehicles. This policy applies to anyone who is on PSU property for any reason. This will include any and all products that use tobacco or nicotine, and any product that produces some form of smoke. And then just kind of jumping to Recommendation 3 really fast, which is the timeline to follow up. The task force recommended that the University begin communication on the policy in the fall of 2017, so that's where we're at right now with recommendations, with a soft launch and no enforcement in the spring of 2018. This soft launch would increase awareness and understanding of the new policy. Over the summer of 2018, the policy would go into full effect and roll right into the fall of 2018 for all Penn State students, faculty and staff, and community members.

Linda LaSalle, Director of Health, Promotion and Wellness, and University Health Services: The second recommendation in the task force is that the University create an office for a smoke free/tobacco free Penn State. The office would be responsible for implementing, coordinating, and assessing the initiative. This includes supporting the campuses in the implementation of the policy and also helping campuses provide resources to any individuals who want to quit tobacco products.

Renee Borromeo, Penn State Mont Alto: The next recommendation is that the task force would recommend that Penn State support those faculty, staff, and students who wish to stop using tobacco or nicotine products with free smoking and tobacco cessation programs. This recommendation supports an educational approach of enforcement that has proven successful at other universities.

Alex Shockley: Recommendation Number 5 regards enforcement. So the task force recommends that enforcement of this policy should be through the mechanism of peer support and encouragement, and only when necessary, supervisory oversight. Violations of this policy should be handled through the existing channels of policy implementation in the University but rarely does the task force expect for this to occur.
Linda LaSalle: In the final two recommendations, the task force recommends that the University roll out a comprehensive communication plan. Effectively communicating the new policy to the wide range of community members will be an integral part of its success. The task force recommends that each campus adapt the plan to meet the needs of their local community, both within and external to the campus.

Renee Borromeo: I'll just conclude with the Faculty Benefits Committee recommendations that are found in the report. The first recommendation from the Faculty Benefits Committee is that recognizing the link between health hazards and the use of tobacco and smoking products, for both the smoker and those exposed to secondhand smoke, and the environmental impact of smoking, it is recommended that Penn State University be smoke free and tobacco free in its entirety. The second one. The Senate recommends that the administration move to incrementally adopt a smoke free/tobacco free policy and all recommendations as outlined in the aforementioned report by the Smoke Free/Tobacco Free Task Force for all Penn State, all twenty-four Penn State campuses. Any questions or discussion?

Ira Saltz, Penn State Shenango: Saltz, Shenango. I know I asked this question this morning in committee but I guess I just wanted to open it up to hear other people's thoughts on this. Overwhelmingly, Shenango faculty that are communicating with me, expressed support of this. You know the only concern that was raised is that we're a tiny campus. It's very easy for somebody who wants to smoke to just walk out of the building and cross the street, which is no longer campus property, and smoke. And perhaps just then drop their cigarette butts there and that just may infringe upon our neighbors. You know, that they may become upset. And we're not talking about businesses, these are a lot of residential homes and all of that. So I guess we're just looking maybe for some guidance on what to do to hopefully mitigate this concern.

Linda LaSalle: One of the things that we identified in the report is we ask each campus to consider developing and adopt the Block Program, where members of the campus community actually volunteer to clean up specific neighborhoods that are close to campus and actually dispose of tobacco related litter that's a result of people going off campus to smoke.

Matthew Wilson: Matthew Wilson, Harrisburg. We have a tobacco-free policy at Penn State Harrisburg. And often, I don't know whether you see this Matthew, I go to the library and there's a student smoking in front of the no smoking sign. And how do we ensure enforcement when the students are already blatantly violating the policy? I feel uncomfortable as a faculty member saying to a student, “Hey you know, you're not supposed to be smoking here.” Is that my job? Whose job is enforcement in this case?

Alex Shockley: It's a great question. We get that one a lot. So in the recommendation we really frame the light around this in moving towards a policy that is pure encouragement, and kind of doing positive reinforcement. So Linda and I actually attended a conference this past week down in Atlanta, Georgia for the American Cancer Society, part of the grant that the government obtained to move towards working towards a policy like this. And the University of Kentucky, which is probably known as the best university in the country that has a tobacco free policy, presented and she talked a lot about this. They actually employ an Ambassador Program at their campus, which we provided in the recommendation, as well. With that Ambassador Program it can be any student, faculty, or staff member that would like to be a part of it. They receive training and identify ways to go out into the community to talk to these students so they receive information. In no regard do these ambassadors necessarily enforce. So they don't police, they won't get in an argument with you about putting it out. They ask very nicely. They say, hey I respect you as an individual; just letting you know we are tobacco-free University; here are the resources that we provide for you. Please contact us at this number. In the six years that they've been doing this now there's
only been one incident that was a negative experience. So that's kind of the light we had framed it in for this policy.

Chair Woessner: Other questions.

Richard Singer, Penn State Altoona: Rich Singer, Altoona. In full disclosure, I am an ex-smoker. It's been 27 years. I do not support smoking of any kind. However, the report that I read that was in the Senate document said that 9 percent of our student body says they are smokers. That's a large number, although it seems to be a small percentage. So we are going to affect thousands of students. The second number that I saw in that report was that 45 percent, give or take, people approve of this, which to me means that 50 percent do not approve of a full ban of smoking on all of our campuses. At this point in time, as far as I know, smoking is not illegal. And so I believe there's room here for a compromise solution. For instance, right now at the Altoona campus, we've added some smoking huts around the periphery of the campus. And it's got proper places where you can butt out your cigarettes and so there's no litter from smoking there. And so I personally do not believe that we should take away people's rights to do something that is legal. And so I believe we ought to look for a better solution than the one that's on the table right now.

Chair Woessner: Other questions or comments.

Renee Borromeo: I'll just respond to that quickly. The task force did hear and consider arguments much like that. We just kept coming back to the health and safety and well-being of the majority and of all of the students, faculty, staff, and visitors at Penn State. And we just kind of kept coming back to that as our central issue and feeling like second-hand smoke, the exposure, is what we've focused on.

Richard Singer: I don't disagree with most of the recommendations here. The one that I disagree with is taking a legal action and taking somebody's rights away. We could just as easily take away their rights to eat potato chips, and we could take away their right to drink Pepsi-- although Pepsi seems to bribe us pretty well to keep it on the campus-- and alcohol, we could ban alcohol on the campus and all of its facilities, as well. But we don't choose to do that for some reason and this seems to have an emotional appeal because-- and by the way anybody that smokes knows that it's not good for them. So I mean there's not an educational issue here. And I agree that we should provide help for anybody that wishes to have help to quit smoking. I got it when it was my turn. And so the only part I disagree with is just banning it blatantly from all campus facilities.

Chair Woessner: Thank you. Other questions or comments. Over here.

Paul Thompson, Penn State Harrisburg: Yes, Paul Thompson from Penn State Harrisburg. I was president of the Senate when we instituted our no smoking rules down there, and 15 percent of our student body are international, they have a slightly different cultural approach to this, just like this gentleman said over here about the legality of it. So I think if we do do that, we need to communicate to them even before they arrive in this country, very carefully, perhaps even in their own language, that we have this particular policy because when we tried to enforce it locally they just did not understand the cultural differences.

Alex Shockley: If I can speak to that. So as a student representative on the task force it was important to me to speak to my fellow students of the international community. We did have roundtable discussions with the International Student Council and the Chinese Student Scholars Association, which represents a
large population of students on a specific tier at University Park. Basically from the conversation we got there, and in full honesty, they said we recognize that it's an honor to be here and to study at Penn State, and to come to the U.S. for that, and we respect the rules and the policies of the University. The only thing we ask is that this is communicated effectively to us so we know how to communicate it to our peers. So part of the recommendations, the last one, is communication, ensuring that all the student groups and working with specifically the Chinese Student Scholars Association because they actually have pre-orientation in China before they even come to New Student Orientation or International Student Orientation. So working with them to make sure they have those means.

And, to quickly touch on your point as well sir, I recognize that it's not against the law to smoke. In no means with these recommendations are we saying you can or cannot smoke. We're just kind of saying Penn State recognizes the health and well-being of all students, faculty, staff members, our visitors, and community members. We ask that we share this policy and really act in a positive light to encourage that healthy wellbeing. I've talked to employees in the HUB about this. They're excited that it could potentially come because it's actually going to give them the leg up to hopefully become smoke free or tobacco free. So I think there's a lot of positive imaging around it that we can reflect to encourage others to follow this.

Chair Woessner: Senator Pauley.

Laura Pauley, College of Engineering: Pauley, Engineering. Does this also include dormitories and graduate housing which are more likely independent private townhouses?

Linda LaSalle: The policy that the task force recommended includes all University owned, operated and leased property, including residence hall areas.

Chair Woessner: Senator Azemi?

Asad Azemi, Penn State Brandywine: Azemi, Brandywine. --just a technical issue you have in the enforcement. It looks like you only have faculty, staff, or students there. How about visitors?

Renee Borromeo: Visitors are included. Well, I guess enforcement for visitors would really be a reminder that Penn State is smoke free and tobacco free. Supervisory, like what we're alluding to there was supervisory intervention wouldn't happen to visitors. I'm on the right one.

Senator: Okay, so I mean you're saying supervisory would not happen to them?

Galen Grimes: Yeah I'd just like to point out that, some years ago, Penn State instituted a no smoking policy at Beaver Stadium, which has over 100,000 visitors every Saturday, except for the ground level, and as far as I know, there's not been any problems there with the smoking policy.

Chair Woessner: Senator Jolly.

Rosemary Jolly: Senator Jolly, Liberal Arts. I just want to ask how this fits into a general framework of harm reduction. I don't understand the tobacco exceptionalism piece. We have a society that's in the middle of other forms of substance abuse than just tobacco. So I just need to understand a little bit better why tobacco has been selected. I think that there are other forms of substance abuse where you could do
an integrated substance abuse planning which would be the best public health route, rather than going a tobacco exceptionalism route. So I'm just a little concerned about that.

**Linda LaSalle:** The task force was charged with specifically looking at barriers and making recommendations to address those barriers related to the University creating or having in place a tobacco-free, smoke-free policy. The Office of Health Promotion and Wellness does quite a bit of work on campus related to substance abuse, particularly in the area of alcohol and marijuana, which are the two primary drugs of choice by college students.

**Chair Woessner:** Are there any other questions? Oh, we have a MediaSite question?

**Anna Butler:** This question is from Rob Shannon from Agricultural Sciences. Will this policy also pertain to areas around Beaver Stadium on game days?

**Renee Borromeo:** Yes.

**Chair Woessner:** Immediate Past Chair Strauss.

**James Strauss, Immediate Past Chair, Eberly College of Science:** Strauss, College of Science. Follow up to that, what is the implementation strategy for the largest public interface that we have on our property, which are Penn State tailgates?

**Alex Shockley:** Throwing me on that one. So this is an extensive conversation that we had with athletics, including Sandy Barbour, when we were kind of going around throughout the task force. We looked to our peer institutions, as well. So what we had laid out in the communications plan and a little bit more detailed is that prior to arrival for any tailgate event, or really any visiting experience at Penn State, would be the policy that's communicated. Same to any other policy that we have here at the University, making sure that individuals visiting are aware of what we expect. And full honesty, game day is definitely difficult because of the large number of students in a compacted area. So I think it would be, again, the pure encouragement aspect, expecting individuals to follow it in regards to their good health. And that's what we really encourage. So we see this policy. There's a tobacco-free or smoke-free policy at almost 1,800 universities across the nation. Of these 1,800, 1,500 have specifically tobacco-free, and then within the Big 10 alone there are ten universities that do a tobacco or smoke-free policy. We would be number 11. So we see it at our peer institutions. It would be a framework over time that we would have to work on and develop.

**Chair Woessner:** I see one more question.

**Steinn Sigurdsson, Eberly College of Science:** Steinn Sigurdsson, College of Science. Penn State has an addiction and smoking laboratory at University Park where people are paid to come and smoke cigarettes. Is that covered by this policy? And if not, is an exemption being granted, and once you grant the exemption, are other exemptions possible?

**Linda LaSalle:** Yes, absolutely. The task force considered that in the draft of the policy and there would be an exemption for research purposes.

**Steinn Sigurdsson:** Is that a specific exemption or does that open the door for other people to request exemptions?
Linda LaSalle: Religious, as well. The policy actually hasn't been officially drafted yet but the group that's involved in doing that will take that into consideration. And there will probably be an approach that allows people to apply or to request an exemption.

Chair Woessner: I think that's all-- I see one more question, yes.

Sharon Holt, Penn State Abington: Thank you. Sharon Holt, Abington. I like that you're allowing campuses to adapt the policy to their particular needs and communities. But the roll out is pretty fast and I'm wondering when the campuses are going to get hold of these policies so that they can have a reasonable time to create those adaptations.

Alex Shockley: So speaking to the time line, again this is in the recommendation phase, so this still has to be approved by the president and our administrators. The way we have framed it though is from January until midsummer, basically, would be the idea of building the understanding and kind of the outlook this is going to take on the University and all the campuses. So hopefully there would be an announcement of approval or non-approval in the coming months. With the recommendations of the task force, next semester would be where potentially someone would be hired or appointed to a director to consider this. The communication with the campuses would be involved so they have the entire next semester, so about six months. And then starting in the fall of next year would really be our hard launch, Penn State is a tobacco-free University. It's the expectation of everyone on our campus starting in the fall to abide by this policy. So I think a rollout of six months is what we've seen from a lot of the other campuses and schools. They did have a time frame to adjust and really increase awareness at first and then had the opportunity to enact it. So I think that would be the expectation for campuses.

Chair Woessner: Are we ready to vote? Okay. This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs 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.

We will wait for the results from MediaSite.

Anna Butler: On Polleverywhere I have 15 Accept and 4 Reject.

Chair Woessner: Motion carries. Thank you Galen, Linda, Alex, and Renee. The second report submitted by Student Life is titled, “Endorsement of a Deferred Rush for Fraternities and Sororities” and it appears as Appendix F in the Agenda. Committee Chair Kevin Harwell will respond to questions.

Kevin Harwell, University Libraries: Thank you. Good afternoon. The Student Life Committee's charge this year included an item relating to the University administration's new measures for reforming the culture of fraternity and sorority life. Specifically, we looked at the administration's delay of recruitment for new Greek Organization members, or Rush, for one semester. This report recommends that the Senate endorse this delay. Data from the Office of Student Affairs suggests that delaying Rush may be beneficial to academic performance for many students, as briefly summarized in our report. We also heard additional perspective from student members of the committee and from Vice President Damon Sims. We considered pushing for a delay of Rush until a student acquired additional semester hours, and may reconsider this idea after more data becomes available. However, with the information we have gathered to date, the committee is recommending an endorsement of the administration's current measure.
Chair Woessner: Are there questions or comments? Are we ready to vote? This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Senators joined by MediaSite, you may cast your votes at polleverywhere.com. Press A to accept the motion, press B to reject the motion.

We'll wait for the results at polleverywhere.com.

Anna Butler: On Polleverywhere I have 16 Accept.

Chair Woessner: Motion carries. Thank you, Kevin. The final report submitted by University Planning has been withdrawn from the Agenda at the request of the committee chair to allow time for a consultation with additional stakeholders. Committee Chair Laura Pauley will make a few comments about the report.

Laura Pauley: Okay. The recommendation to dissolve the Facilities Planning Advisory Board first came about for discussion at University Planning, when in September of 2016 our representative to FPAB came back and said the whole committee asked me why do we have this committee, and it doesn't do anything, and it's not useful. And it's all because Faculty Senate in 1989 recommended that this be formed. It may have been important then, but it's not important now. So with that feedback from our representative, University Planning discussed this, and we brought forward the recommendation that you see in the Senate Agenda. Considering that meeting and the feedback of all the members of FPAB to be consultation with many different colleges because the Facilities Planning Advisory Board includes representatives from the College of Arts and Architecture, College of Engineering, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, College of the Liberal Arts, College of Arts and Architecture, as well as staff members of OPP and representatives of Faculty Senate. We also consulted with Ford Stryker and with Bill Sitzabee to get advice on the effectiveness of this committee as well.

After we presented, posted our recommendation to the Senate Agenda, we heard from several different units that there was concern for this. We had comments at our meeting this morning of concern, as well. So University Planning decided to withdraw this recommendation at this point and it's going to be a main focus of our December meeting of University Planning. I'd invite anybody who does have concerns to please contact me so that you can be part of our discussions in December.

Chair Woessner: Thank you very much.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Chair Woessner: Item K, Informational Reports. We’ve moved to the informational business segment to today's Agenda and I would like to remind our presenters to adhere to the time allocation by Senate Council for the presentation and discussion. I will inform each presenter when they have five minutes left. There will be four Informational Reports today. The first Information Report for today is from Faculty Benefits and is titled, “2018 Medical and Prescription Drug Plan”. It appears as Appendix H. Greg Stoner, Senior Director of Compensation Benefits, will present the report. Twenty minutes has been allocated for the presentation and discussion.

Greg Stoner, Senior Director of Compensation and Benefits: Afternoon, everyone. Thank you Chair Woessner, and thanks to Chair Galen Grimes from the Faculty Benefits Committee requesting that I speak to you today. The informational report I think you all have and probably have had a chance to review. The purpose of my discussion today isn't to dive deeply into plan designing, cost sharing for
2018. We did that at the April Faculty Senate meeting. Rather, I just want to highlight a couple things and then leave enough time to hopefully answer any questions you may have.

As many of you know, and probably a lot of you have done, we've had on campus meetings across the entire commonwealth the last couple of months. Here at University Park I believe there are three meetings scheduled, the 24th of October, two in November, and then for all of you who haven't had a chance to attend any of those meetings, we actually have three webinars in November. So there are plenty of opportunities to learn details about the 2018 benefits, the vendor changes of which there are many, as well as get your specific questions answered.

So just as a quick reminder, we do have four vendor changes all effective January 1, 2018. All of these contracts are three years long. And it really is healthy for any employer, certainly the size of Penn State, to go through the exercise of testing the market. The 10-year relationship with Highmark ends this year. We are changing our medical TPA vendor to Aetna and our prescription drug vendor to CVS Caremark. For those of you who have health spending accounts, you already know that we transitioned those accounts to HealthEquity. That was actually forced upon us unbeknownst to us until probably about two months ago when Bank of America announced that they were getting out of the employer-sponsored health savings account business effective November 1. So we didn't want to have to go through two transitions; obviously it would have been very clunky. So HealthEquity stepped up and said, “we can help you do that now.” The Flexible Spending Account and Dependent Care Accounts will be effective with HealthEquity the first of next year. And then we also have vendor changes for life and disability benefits we are moving to Unum.

We also wanted to disclose-- and again this is not new information. In fact, I know the president presented this to the Board of Trustees. But I just wanted to break down some of the savings to the University as well as to employees. During the life of the contract with Aetna we anticipate $35 million in savings, $5 million to employees. For CVS Caremark, this is the prescription drug, we are anticipating about $29 million of savings there. And then for the HealthEquity there are savings to any of us who are in the Health Savings Accounts. Those monthly fees, which I know are an irritant or have been an irritant, they are $3 a month today, they are $1.75 a month under the HealthEquity contract. It’s a 42 percent reduction and then Penn State will also see their costs for administering the flexible spending accounts drop a little bit.

On the Unum change for life and disability, the life insurance- there is savings there as well. And, for the first time, Penn State is offering short term disability benefits to faculty and staff. So certainly those staff, especially who have limited amounts of sick time accumulated, this is a nice benefit with the opportunity to purchase either 14 or 30 day elimination period. Meaning, until that benefit starts that will be the lapse time of 14 or 30 days. And then lastly, for those of you who may know retirees, friends, family members who are in the Freedom Blue plan with Highmark, that is not changing. That plan will still remain in effect but Highmark came through with a very favorable renewal for that plan.

This chart just summarizes everything I spoke to, both on a one-year and a three-year basis, illustrating the savings to employees as well as the University. And then I wanted to touch briefly on Benefits-Open Enrollment. Again, if you have attended or plan on attending any of these meetings, this is a snapshot of the online e-magazine that you will see on openenrollment.psu.edu. I don't know why I looked at that website; I know it by heart. That is where we have all the information you need for 2018. Very detailed, plan grids, premium costs, all the information that you would expect to see. The e-magazine is a very
This is the landing page of the open enrollment site. You see there's a listing of all the carriers. We've actually now added phone numbers as well. So again across the top you see the availability of drop down menus where you can drill into details around each of the plans, each of the options. We have a tremendous number of frequently asked questions, thanks to all of you for continuing to provide those to us. This site is updated a few times a week. Mainly with the FAQ's but again as we get new information we're putting it all out here on the website. So I would encourage you between now and November 1, when open enrollment begins, to take advantage of the limited time I'm sure you have to just take a peek at some of the features of the website. But certainly when open enrollment begins, this is your one stop shop for everything.

Again I've reviewed this in April, so I don't want to go through this in detail. But just to point out again the plan design changes for next year are very limited. They're circled in red here, the PPO plan, the deductibles are changing, and the PPO Savings with the HSA, those seed monies are changing as well. This slide shows the deductible changes for the PPO plan. This slide shows the seed amounts that Penn State's putting in. For both of these, the deductibles and the seed amounts are based on your salary as of this month. The premium contributions are also based on your salary. You see for the PPO plan that the salary contributions are declining a little bit. And they are increasing a little bit for the PPO Savings Plan. You may say, why is that? Why are we seeing that shift? The point here being one of the guiding principles, which you're all familiar with, we review them here and they were voted upon and approved March of 2016. There is that guiding principle of sharing in the cost, total cost of our health care plan, 75 percent- University, 25 percent- employees. That includes your premium contributions and your out-of-pocket expenses. By plan design we've actually established that cost sharing for each plan. So that's why you saw a little bit of tweaking there with the premiums.

A couple of other important things. The tobacco surcharge. As you recall, there was an attestation online through ESSIC asking if you or a spouse utilize tobacco. It was a very ineffective means to collect that information. And I think it also aligns with, if there is a serious consideration of moving to a tobacco free campus, we certainly want to provide opportunities to help employees who want to quit, to do so. So that surcharge is going away. There will not be any attestation for next year. But a good question we've got, and I think there was maybe some linkages being made between the tobacco surcharge and the spousal surcharge, that spousal surcharge remains in effect. That's the $100 per month charge that, if your spouse has access to his/her own health care coverage through their employer but you want them to be covered under your plan here at Penn State, that's permissible but you will pay an additional $100 per month.

Lastly, and this is also another change, if you and your spouse elect to be covered under this same contract, meaning as husband and wife or husband or excuse me as spousal coverage, or if you like family coverage, the premium contributions will be based on the higher paid spouse. There are some exceptions there due to collective bargaining agreements. So it may be worth it to you, if you and a spouse are both electing coverage, you may want to sit down and see what makes the most sense for you. Do you want to stay under one contract? Do you want to enroll individually? Where should the children be put? So there may be some analysis you want to do there. But that summarizes at a high level all the changes again. All the various ways we're communicating it, please use the website. We constantly update that with new information. That is all I have.
Chair Woessner: Thank you. Are there questions for Greg? And please stand and wait for the microphone and give your name before asking questions. Senator Jolly.

Rosemary Jolly: Rosemary Jolly, Liberal Arts. I just wanted to ask whether the website makes provision for the fact that generics may be cheaper than whatever the-- there's been a lot of this in the news-- that whatever we may be being asked to pay for in prescription drugs, and I understand that unless we ask the pharmacist specifically about substitutions, for some bizarre reason the U.S. does not permit them to volunteer that information. That would be very helpful information to faculty, to know that there is potentially a cheaper option than going through these plans in certain specific instances. Is that available on the website or could it be made available?

Greg Stoner: I would suggest, first and foremost, have the conversation with your physician. If in fact he or she feels that there's a clinically effective generic substitute, have them prescribe that to you. We just put out this week the listing of a formulary which shows all the drugs that are covered under CVS Caremark. You may want to take a look at that to see if in fact your brand name drug is listed on there with a generic substitution. In addition, we'll be going live probably in the next two weeks with a website where you can actually enter the drug name on the website and get additional information there. But again I would always start with your physician to see what options may be available to you.

Chair Woessner: Questions.

Johanna Wagner, College of the Liberal Arts: Hi. Wagner from Liberal Arts. I just was wondering if information about specific procedures will be available on that website as well. Because if we're making decisions about January and we have care that we need to think about that will cross December through January, is that information currently available or where can we find that?

Greg Stoner: If you have specific questions about care certainly in 2018, I would suggest call Aetna directly and just explain your situation and get that type of information. That level of detail isn't on the website because it really is dependent upon the individual situation. But that's why the Aetna member services team is there to walk you through any procedural types of things, questions you may have on medical coverage itself, timing, and those types of things.

Chair Woessner: Other questions. I think I see one more in the back.

Michael Krajsa, Penn State Lehigh Valley: Krajsa, Lehigh Valley. Since we've been used to with our current plan for over ten years, is the University considering having some sort of a medical advocate ombudsperson that we can come to in this transition in case we're not happy with something or we see some things that aren't being done correctly?

Greg Stoner: Well the one thing I would keep in mind is that, whether it's Highmark or Aetna or United, medical policies are very similar in terms of what's covered and what isn't covered. There may be some variances on the prescription drug side, meaning the formularies may be different, and those types of things. The first step to it is to always deal with the carrier. There are appeals processes if a claim is denied or if there is confusion about it. Certainly Penn State, as the plan sponsor, owns the relationship with the vendors. So if there are questions that simply aren't being answered at the vendor level, you can direct those back to Human Resources. Is there a dedicated resource sitting within Human Resources? No. But again, we're responsible for that vendor relationship. And you know I personally would want to know if in fact our vendors are falling short on our expectations. And we also have performance
guarantees in place with all of the vendors to ensure that what they promised to deliver is actually happening.

**Michael Krajsa**: Do these new vendors report back to you on a weekly or monthly basis with some sort of metric that is saying this is how many times our door was knocked on for questions, and these are the range of these questions?

**Greg Stoner**: Well the vendors certainly produce statistical information about contacts and that sort of thing. But again, if there are patterns of things that are happening, they would certainly bring those to our attention. But again, we're all consumers of health care and I would encourage you if you don't feel you're getting the responses that you deserve, please direct them back to HR.

**Michael Krajsa**: Thank you.

**Greg Stoner**: You're welcome.

**Chair Woessner**: Thank you. I'm seeing no more questions. Thank you, Greg.

[APPLAUSE]

The second Information Report is from Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology titled, “Penn State University Press”, and appears as Appendix I. Committee Chair Roger Egolf and Patrick Alexander, the director of the Penn State Press will present the report and stand for questions. Ten minutes has been allocated.

**Roger Egolf, Penn State Lehigh Valley**: Thank you. The Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology Committee felt that it would be very useful for you all to hear about the good work that the Pennsylvania State University Press is doing so I'm pleased to be able to introduce to you the director of the Penn State Press, Patrick Alexander.

[APPLAUSE]

**Patrick Alexander, Director, Penn State Press**: Thanks very much, Roger, and I’m grateful for the opportunity to speak to the Senate. My thanks also to my boss, Dean Barbara Dewey, who helped facilitate the meeting with LIST. Penn State University Press was founded in 1956. It has been an active member of the Association of University Presses, which has just changed its name. It used to be Association of American University Presses, the other AAUP. And it reports to Barbara, as you can see at the top there. Annually, we publish around 65 to 75 peer reviewed monographs and books. We also have a series devoted to regional publications. We have about 60-- actually more than 60 now-- peer reviewed journals. Most of these are in the arts and humanities. We begin to get into the natural sciences a little bit. Penn State University Press is a little bit unusual to have such a publishing program in journals. We're probably in the Top 10 in terms of quantity of journals for our size. We're in a race against Duke and MIT in that regard.

Areas of specialization in the book program include history, communication, Latin American studies, Jewish studies, African-American history and culture, medieval and early modern studies, and we're particularly known for art and architectural history. Our press books are reviewed widely. They've been reviewed in the New York Times Book Review, the New Yorker, Los Angeles Times, the Washington
Post, and the New York Review of Books, as well as Science Magazine. Most recently, one of our books was featured in the Times Literary Supplement, and we're very, very proud of this of course, as you can see. This is from a series we do on the history of magic.

The first title, these are some of the books in our art and architecture list that Henry James is a co-publication, for example, with the Morgan Library. And it's also part of an exhibit that was at the Morgan and then will also be at the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum in Boston. If you haven't been there, it's a great, great museum. This is a series that we do in graphic medicine that involves a lot of Penn State faculty, both here and at Hershey. The first title was called, Graphic Medicine Manifesto. It was nominated in 2016 for a highly competitive Will Eisner Award. Our graphic medicine book on Down Syndrome, Hole in the Heart, was named a 2016 Reviewer's Choice title by Forward Reviews. And Slate named, Wood Hicks and Bark Peeleers one of the best historical coffee table books of 2016.

The University Editorial Committee, which peer reviews-- reviews the peer reviews, really, reports for all the books under the PSUP brand-- consist of faculty from the University, University Libraries, and from the Faculty Senate Committee on Research, and the Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology. This committee meets roughly five to seven times a year. The Keystone Book Imprint is an imprint that represents books that we do for the Commonwealth. As a state-related University we have a commitment to the citizens of Pennsylvania and the mid-Atlantic region. We do about four or five titles in this area. You may recognize, The Wild Mushrooms of Pennsylvania, which, this is a second edition. We just released, The Layer of the Line, which is an engineering history of Beaver Stadium. These projects are eyeing an audience of not just academics but really individuals who are interested in matters dealing with Penn State in and around the area, and even a book we just released about State College called, Among the Woo People.

The Press enjoys an international reputation for the high material and editorial quality of its more than 1,500 titles in print. Its publications are collected by research libraries and scholars around the world. And the Press has distribution partners in the United Kingdom, and the EU, and Japan, Australia, and New Zealand. And we continually strive to expand our impact both in terms of book distribution and journal publishing. We have editors, authors from around the world, from Germany; England; Japan; South Africa; India; Australia; Korea; Russia; Turkey; Brazil; China; and numerous other countries. We conduct our operation in an environmentally friendly and economically balanced, honest and we're trying to be respectful of others. The Press collaborates with a wide variety of institutions for co-publishing opportunities or distribution arrangements. We have partnered with the Morgan Library; The Frick Collection in New York; the National Gallery of Singapore; Princeton Index of Medieval Art; and the Wilsonian, which is at Florida International University. We work with the University of Michigan; New Jersey; Center University; Northern Illinois University; and Nanjing University Press. Currently we work with more than 20 scholarly societies; this is mainly in the area of journal publishing.

The Press attends the London Book Fair. We just got back from Frankfurt. I didn't go this year but two of my colleagues were there. And that's where we buy and sell rights. We do a lot of business to business relationships, try to increase distribution worldwide. And we are working with some colleagues from the Libraries who attend the Beijing Book Fair and the Guadalajara Book Fair to build inroads into those areas. The Press, as a division of the Libraries, also has a commitment to open access publishing. We currently publish two journals that are fully open access. And we have a platform for a monograph series, as well as 50 titles that come from the Library Special Collections that are open and free. An initiative to make the Penn State University Press titles available to the entire community of Penn State is under way with some of our backlists.
The Press is a not-for-profit organization and it must finish in the black each year. The University provides a budget allocation to us of roughly 10 to 11 percent of our operating expenses, which does not include the tremendous amount of indirect support we get, such as the building that we are in that we don't pay rent on. The revenue generated from selling books, rights, permissions, and journal subscriptions, including [INAUDIBLE], comes roughly around $3.5 million and that's how we pay that other 90 percent of our operating expenses. Salaries form about 44 percent of our operating costs. This is just a little breakdown. Like most places, salary is the highest area of your operating expense. For us, it's salaries, wages, and then journal manufacturing or digitization- however you want to look at it. The plan for the Press in the coming years calls for aggressive growth--

Chair Woessner: One more minute, just so you know.

Patrick Alexander: What's that?

Chair Woessner: One more minute.

Patrick Alexander: Perfect. We hope to grow the business to around $4.5 million. I will say that a recent development, which is not in the report, is thanks to the support of the University, the Press just acquired a commercial publisher, called Eisen Brown. It is an internationally respected publisher in the ancient Near East and Archeology. Thank you very much.

Chair Woessner: Very good, thank you very much.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Woessner: There is no time for questions so we will-- thank you very much. Our third Informational Report is from Senate Council titled, “2016-2017 University Faculty Ombudsperson Report”, and appears as Appendix J. University Faculty Ombudsperson Pam Hufnagel is here to discuss the report and stand for questions. Ten minutes been allocated.

Pam Hufnagel, University Faculty Ombudsperson: Thank you, Matthew. Good afternoon, everybody. In 1973 the Senate established a policy whereby every unit, that's campus and college, has an ombudsperson and an alternate. Most of the units currently do have people in those positions. In 1998, the position of the University Faculty Ombudsperson was established to coordinate their activities, make sure they're updated on policies, and so forth. These ombudspeople follow an organizational ombudsperson model, which means they don't advocate for either side. They serve impartially. It's an informal process. All conversations are confidential unless the visitor provides permission to the ombudsperson to discuss their issue with anybody else. And they're independent, so they won't get involved in any case in which they're a party.

The goal of the ombudspersons is to help people resolve their problems before they become serious disputes. To do this, they engage in activities such as helping visitors clarify the issues that they're facing, offering options, coaching them on ways they might communicate with the other individual that they're having a problem with, and in some cases mediating with them. Most of the cases that our ombudsperson faced this past year involved things like incivility and interpersonal conflict, climate, and conflicts with their supervisors. Many of these cases were resolved at the ombudsperson level, although in some instances, the ombudsperson didn't know what happened because the person came to them for information, got information, and then never came back. Sixteen cases were referred to other committees,
like Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, or Affirmative Action, or Human Resources. I forgot to mention that there were 88 cases reported to me that unit ombudspeople handled during the past academic year.

Some of the problems that we face with this process are that a lot of faculty, and even some administrators, don't know that there are unit ombudspeople available to them. So they wait until they have a really serious problem. And then they're talking to a friend of theirs and their friend mentions, oh you know you could go talk to the ombudsperson. But sometimes things have gotten really bad by that point and it's a little beyond the scope of the ombudsperson to help. Another problem we face is that there's sometimes a misunderstanding about what ombudspeople can do. Since we're impartial and informal, the way that our legislation is written is the ombudspeople do not conduct investigations. They can help clarify policies, they can look into policies, find out what policies are, help interpret them, but they're not going to get into the nitty gritty of investigating any particular case.

What I would like to do today is thank all the unit ombudspeople for their selfless service. They all serve as volunteers. Some of them are in the room with us today. And I encourage Senators to make sure that their colleagues, their faculty colleagues in their units know that they have ombudspeople available to them. In the very small number of units that don't yet have ombudspeople, I would encourage Senators to help their unit get busy and get a nice, good communicator in that role.

I said most of what I wanted to say in the written report so I just wanted to make this a brief presentation to allow someone like 10 minutes for questions that you may have.

Chair Woessner: Time for questions.

Pam Hufnagel: I'm ready.

Chair Woessner: Are there any questions?

Erica Smithwick, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Hi, Erica Smithwick, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences. First of all, thank you for the report. Unfortunately, the report highlights issues related to incivility and interpersonal conflict, which you reference, and the text reads, "Harassment, bullying, making threats, and spreading rumors, in addition to what we might think of as unfortunately the more normal issues of leadership issues, or promotion and tenure related issues." So it also appears a lot of these are related to issues with administrators or departmental unit leaders. From the data in the report we don't know if this is simply a fact of more people reporting these issues, if people are more comfortable reporting these issues, which might actually be a good thing, or if this is part of a larger trend of incivility in our institution. So our Senate Caucus received a letter from a faculty member in response to this report, which we had shared with them and I shared this letter in full with the Senate leadership, and also we discussed it at our College Caucus meeting.

And just to summarize, in this letter it suggested that we need to rediscover and embrace a culture of civility, respect, and compassion at all levels within the institution. And there was also an appeal that the Faculty Senate be the right place to push forward and upward into the administrative ranks, and likewise in former students about what defines civility. So first of all, I would like to thank the Senate Council for sponsoring the report and would advocate that we continue to sponsor this report so that we can uncover whether these are indeed trends moving forward, and whether there is actually data to support these kinds of assertions. And I also wonder whether there is a case for relevant committees, including the Council to
recommend action or actionable items in support of incivility or in support of civility at all levels within our institution. So thank you.

Pam Hufnagel: Thank you. I would like to say that you're part of the increased number that you saw in this report was a much better response rate to the-- we used to call it a survey that went out to the ombudspeople and the response rate was pretty mediocre. This year we had a much better response rate and I do need to thank Paula for her help on getting a much better response rate. We called it a report, too. That was Senate Council’s idea, to call it a report, a mandatory report. So we did get close to an 85% response rate. So that's partially why there was an increase. Most units had very few cases. Like the norm was between zero and three cases, but there were seven units, or seven ombuds, I should say, that reported more than three. So a very large number of cases came from a very small number of units that just had some particular problems. But I'm not going to name those units on the Senate floor.

Chair Woessner: Any other questions?

Carolyn Mehan, Penn State Altoona: Carolyn Mehan, Penn State Altoona. When you deal with ombudsperson issues, do they ever deal with issues outside of your unit? So for example, within a college perhaps with a complaint to higher level administration, for example. Would that be handled by the ombudsperson or is that a Faculty Rights and Responsibilities issue?

Pam Hufnagel: Well, it depends. There are some instances where a faculty member in one unit, unbeknownst to me, does contact an ombudsperson from another unit. Perhaps they feel more comfortable with them. There are cases where they approach me to deal with a case. I actually don't deal with very many cases per se. Most of my conversations are with unit ombudspersons who just want another idea about how they might handle a case they're dealing with. So we just put our heads together and try to think about what they might do. Those conversations, by the way, are confidential. They don't usually tell me who the person is; it's all sort of hypothetical, to keep that confidentiality as best we can.

The Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee has a limited range of issues that they deal with. I'm always embarrassed that I can't remember exactly what the issues are but it's-- I know there are people in the room who know what the issues are. Like Michael Bérubé would know what they are. Aren't you the Chair of that committee?

Michael Bérubé, College of the Liberal Arts: Do you mean things that go straight to FR&R?

Pam Hufnagel: The cases that, I mean it's like Promotion and Tenure denial, I know that they deal with that. And what are the other--

Chair Woessner: Violation of policy.

Pam Hufnagel: He's going to look it up. While he's looking I'll see if there's another question. And then we'll finish answering that one.

Chair Woessner: With time that remains. Yes.

James Jaap, Penn State Greater Allegheny: Jaap, Penn State Greater Allegheny. Pam, I was wondering, what type of training do these ombudspersons go through? And then, if there is a situation where the ombudsperson is involved in the incivility, who is a faculty member supposed to go to?
Pam Hufnagel: We have an annual meeting at the beginning of every fall semester. We call it orientation. There is a brief training on how to deal with cases. That's recorded; it's available to all ombuds all year long. There's also a lengthy handout that goes with that, with a lot more information and many resources cited. And we have occasional other meetings. In fact, we're trying to ramp that up a little bit. I recently sent out a message to all the ombudspeople about a free online course that they can take on negotiation and conflict resolution. I actually started taking it myself and it seems like it's going to be pretty good.

If the unit ombudsperson is involved in a conflict, each unit is supposed to have an alternate. So the alternate could be the person that's approached. And if that falls through then usually they get in touch with me. The way the policy is written, the Provost could actually appoint somebody else if he or she needs to. So, last resort sitting here.

Michael Bérubé: So Faculty Rights and Responsibilities covers academic freedom, professional ethics, and procedural fairness.

Pam Hufnagel: Okay. Yeah so, P&T, that is the procedural fairness part. Okay.

Chair Woessner: Very good. That is time, so thank you very much. The final report is from University Planning and appears as Appendix K. Committee Chair Laura Pauley will present the report and stand for questions. Ten minutes has been allotted for the discussion.

Laura Pauley: Okay and those 10 minutes are mainly for questions. You have the report in front of you so I don't need to repeat this. It was first prepared in April of 2015 and at that time one of the recommendations was to review this again every two years. So you're receiving this updated report. It lists the percentage of the research incentive funds received by the college that's then distributed to departments or distributed directly to faculty. And this report is prepared as informational so that you can see what your unit is doing and what other units are doing as well.

In addition, this year we added received input from units on how the resources were used that are retained by the dean. And then how faculty in the unit are informed of the availability of research incentive funds. So Steinn and I are here for any questions you might have.

Chair Woessner: Questions. Remember to rise and announce your name and your unit.

Jane Sutton, Penn State York: Jane Sutton, York. I don't see-- I see York, for example, and other campuses listed at the top. But down below, in terms of how they're distributed to faculty or by the unit, I don't see York or some other campuses listed.

Laura Pauley: Well, you'll notice that York, along with a couple other units or campuses, have the double star, the footnote indicating that the data shown is from 2015. Those units were contacted multiple times in various ways from various people with no response. So at that point we decided we should publish what we have.

Chair Woessner: Questions? Very good. Thank you very much.
NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Woessner: Item L, New Legislative Business, none.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Woessner: Item M, Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the University. Are there any additional comments for the good of the University? None.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Woessner: May I have a motion to adjourn? All in favor please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

All opposed. Motion carries.

The Senate is adjourned until December 5, 2017
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