The University Faculty Senate

AGENDA

Tuesday, October 23, 2018 – 1:30 p.m.

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

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

A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Minutes of the September 18, 2018 Meeting in The Senate Record 52:1

B. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report of October 9, 2018 Appendix A

C. REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL - Meeting of October 9, 2018

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

E. COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

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

SPECIAL INFORMATIONAL REPORT

University Planning
Strategic Planning Implementation Update Appendix B

G. FORENSIC BUSINESS

None
H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

I. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid

Updating Language on Conditionally Enrolled Students – Changes to Senate Policies 02-50 Degree Seeking Provisional Student; 05-82 Minimum Entrance Requirements for Admission to Associate Degree Programs; 67-10 Division I – Athletic Competition (University Park); and 67-30 Division III and PSUAC – Athletic Competition (non-University Park) Appendix C

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules

Revisions to Standing Rules; Article IV – Amendments Appendix D

Revisions to Standing Rules: Article III – Other Functions of the Senate Appendix E

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

Revisions to Bylaws; Article VII – Delegation of Authority, Section 1 Appendix G

J. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Proposed Revisions to Penn State Policy HR68, Postdoctoral Appointments - REPORT WITHDRAWN Appendix H

Revision of RA03 “Eligibility to Serve as Principal Investigator (PI)” Appendix I

K. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

External Matters Subcommittee of Senate Council

Examples of Permissible and Prohibited Political Campaign Activity Appendix J

[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

Annual Report for 2017-2018 Appendix K
[5 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology
Pattee Library Renovations and Courtyard Infill Project
Appendix L
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

L. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, December 4, 2018, 1:30 p.m., Room 112 Kern Graduate Building.

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

DATE: October 10, 2018

TO: Michael Bérubé, Chair, University Faculty Senate

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

The Senate Curriculum Report dated October 9, 2018 has been circulated throughout the University. Objections to any of the items in the report must be submitted to Kadi Corter, Curriculum Coordinator, 101 Kern Graduate Building, 814-863-0996, kkw2@psu.edu, on or before November 8, 2018.

The Senate Curriculum Report is available on the web and may be found at: http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/senate-curriculum-reports/
SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING

Strategic Planning Implementation Update

(Informational)

Dr. Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost of the University, will present an update on the Strategic Plan Implementation.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING - 2018-2019
- O.Richard Bundy III
- Kevin Cockroft
- James Fairbank
- David Gray
- Lisa Grigley
- Nicholas Jones
- John Liechty
- David Lieb
- Frantisek Marko, Vice-Chair
- Kathleen Mulder
- Daniel Newhart
- Mary Lou Ortiz
- Padma Patil
- Laura Pauley, Chair
- Rajaram Ramesh
- Gavin Robertson
- Steinn Sigurðsson
- William Sitzabee
- Charles Specht
- Gary Thomas
- Kent Vrana
- Mary Vollero
- Ming Wang
- Robert Zambanini
Overview: Strategic Planning at Penn State

- Five-year strategic planning cycle
- Three primary components
  - Integrated Planning
  - Unit-Level Planning
  - University-Level Planning
- University-wide plan (“Our Commitment to Impact”) published in February 2016 (strategicplan.psu.edu)
- Plans in 48 academic and administrative units drove development of the University’s plan for 2016-2020
How University Fundraising Campaign Supports Strategic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign Imperatives</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Doors</td>
<td>Create Transformative Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transforming Education</td>
<td>• Transforming Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhancing Access</td>
<td>• Advancing the Arts and Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Driving Digital Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Global Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Diverse World</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campaign Success So Far

A GREATER PENN STATE
Time Elapsed: 45% as of September 30, 2018

Open Doors – Goal: $500M
Current Progress: $255.1M (52%)

Create Transformative Experiences – Goal: $225M
Current Progress: $109.8M (49%)

Impact the World – Goal: $475M
Current Progress: $343.9M (72%)

TOTAL FUNDRAISING PROGRESS – Goal: $1.6B
Current Progress: $819.0M (51%)
Plan Committee Participation

192 unique members focused on plan implementation

- 40 members of the University faculty (including 6 Faculty Senators)
- 35 executives (provost, deans, vice presidents, vice provosts)
- 36 administrators
- 28 academic administrators (associate deans, department heads)
- 40 staff members
- 11 students
- 1 member of the Board of Trustees
- 1 Humphrey Fellow

Plan Thematic Priorities

- Advancing the Arts and Humanities
- Driving Digital Innovation
- Enhancing Health
- Stewarding Our Planet’s Resources
- Transforming Education
New Consortium to Combat Opioid Crisis

The Penn State Consortium to Combat Substance Abuse (CCSA)

- Housed in Penn State’s Social Science Research Institute
- Will develop and implement programs, policies and practices to prevent and treat addiction and mitigate impacts
- Draws on University-wide expertise
- Hiring 12 new tenure-track faculty members over 4 years to support this signature initiative

One Penn State 2025

Vision and Guiding Principles

- **Vision**: An ambitious rethinking of approaches to how we structure learning and operate to support student success
- **Guiding Principles**
  - As an institution, be more integrated, flexible, and responsive
  - Seamless online access to curricula, with processes at all campuses
  - Function 24/7/365
  - Serve needs of people where they are
  - Strengthen pre-existing commitments
  - Be more diverse and inclusive
More Signature Initiatives
Examples of High-Impact Endeavors

• Driving Digital Innovation
  o University-wide launches of Office 365 and Adobe Creative Cloud
  o “Reimagining IT”

• Stewarding Our Planet’s Resources
  o “The Energy University” – Penn State leader in energy security, independence efforts

• Advancing the Arts and Humanities
  o Plans for Cultural District and Arboretum in University Park

Strategic Plan RFP Process

• Official request for proposal process open to current faculty, staff and students
• 22 initiatives approved for funding from 139 submissions in first two cycles
• Cycle 1: 64 proposals; 12 funded
• Cycle 2: 75 proposals; 10 funded
• Cycle 3: 58 proposals; currently in review process
RFP Process – Funded Initiatives

Advancing the Arts and Humanities
- The Public Humanities Initiative
- Exhibition and Catalogue: Back and Forth
- FaceAge @ Penn State
- Campus Arts Initiative

Driving Digital Innovation
- The Digital Collaboratory for Precision Health Research
- Immersive Technologies: Establishing New Paradigms for Environmental Decision Support
- Experiential Digital Global Engagement (EDGE) at the Commonwealth Campuses

Enhancing Health
- Integrated Data Systems Solutions for Health Equity
- Enhancing Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Cancer Research Activity Across PSU Campuses
- On Campus Ambulatory Intensive Care (AIC) to Improve Health and Wellness of Penn State Employees and Adult Beneficiaries with Chronic Illnesses
- Lion Pulse: Networking Employee and Student Wellness Initiatives

Stewarding Our Planet’s Resources
- Energy University Partnership to Support the Commonwealth’s Oil and Gas Strategy
- Ecology and Design
- United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE): Global Consortium for High-Performance Buildings
- Energy 2100: Ensuring a carbon-neutral, global energy economy
- Pennsylvania in Balance: Harnessing Stewardship for Clean Water through Innovative Communication, Engagement, Marketing and Sense of Place

Transforming Education
- Growing Food, Leaders and Community: Expanding Sustainable Food Systems Learning Across Commonwealth Campuses
- Penn State Lehigh Valley LaunchBox and Retail Services and Sales Industry Collaborative to Support Employment Pathways
- Using Research-based Pedagogies to Enhance Cognitive and Affective Outcomes of General Education
- Transforming Education through Immersive Technologies
- Individualized Pathways and Resources to Adaptive Control Theory-Inspired Scientific Education (iPRACTISE)
RFP Process – Funded Initiatives

Organizational Processes
• Working to develop an inventory of existing services/talent for process improvement
• Will be conducting a pilot project using known expertise to guide an improvement process

Constituent Outreach and Engagement
• Primary goal is to explore further opportunities to more effectively translate Penn State’s accomplishments to the constituencies we have committed to serve

Infrastructure and Support
• Primary goal is to prioritize investment in our people, and to invest in physical resources creatively and systematically

Unit-Level Progress
• University units are four years into their five-year strategic plans (2014-2015 to 2018-2019)
• Second year of unit progress reports have been submitted
• Unit Planning Advisory Group created
Moving Forward / Next Steps

- Academic Leadership Council (ALC) met August 13
- Timeframe realization – unit plans and institutional plan
- Pause – allow for assessment of unit level and institutional level strategic plan progress
- Essential continued conversations and engagement with University Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees
- Momentum identified, continue movement, allow space for guided evolution of the planning process

Plan Implementation Timeline

- RFP Cycle 3
  - Steering Committee reviews completed September 27
  - Executive Committee recommendations sent to Oversight Committee October 19
  - Oversight Committee meeting to be held November 16 for proposal recommendations
  - Funding decisions announcement slated for mid-December
- RFP Cycle 4
  - Proposals due January 31, 2019
  - Committees offering to review short concept papers in advance of proposal submissions
  - Steering Committee reviews completed by February 22, 2019
- Ongoing
  - Development and implementation of additional signature initiatives across thematic areas
  - Development of Institutional Strategic Plan evaluation framework
  - Unit Plan Feedback distributed to Budget Executives
Thank You – Questions or Comments?

provost.psu.edu
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID

Updating Language on Conditionally Enrolled Students – Changes to Senate Policies 02-50
Degree Seeking Provisional Student; 05-82 Minimum Entrance Requirements for Admission to Associate Degree Programs; 67-10 Division I – Athletic Competition (University Park); and 67-30 Division III and PSUAC – Athletic Competition (non-University Park)

(Legislative)

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

This report addresses a missing policy revision and three revised policy revisions for Appendix E from the December 5, 2017 Agenda: Updating Language on Conditionally Enrolled Students – Changes to Senate Policies 02-50; 02-80; 05-80; 05-81; 10-00; 12-00; 12-30; 12-70; 32-30; 32-40; 54-40; and 67-10.

From a federal student aid perspective, the terms ‘conditional’ and ‘provisional’ can be, and often are, synonymous. Schools can admit students conditionally/provisionally, for example, until they provide further documentation, such as academic transcripts or test scores, or demonstrate an ability to succeed in the program by receiving acceptable grades in program coursework. Often, schools limit these students’ enrollment in terms of number of courses or enrollment status until they meet the necessary conditions. Students admitted as conditional/provisional are regular students (i.e. eligible for federal student aid) only if the school officially accepts them into an eligible degree program. If the student is merely allowed to take some courses before being officially admitted to the program, he is not considered a “regular student” and is not eligible for federal student aid funds until he is officially admitted.

Previously, Penn State would admit some students in provisional status if they lacked certain required criteria. Senate policy was updated in 2014 to align with Admission practice – that is to accurately reflect these students as “degree-seeking provisional students” from the point of admission. However, because they were not admitted to a college or degree program, provisional students were not regular, degree-seeking candidates.

Admissions practices have now been updated to provisionally admit students as degree seeking students in the Division of Undergraduate Studies with Conditions. This subtle change satisfies the requirements for federal aid eligibility, and also provides structure and support to students by enrolling them in an academic unit with academic advisers.

From the federal student aid perspective, it is important to consistently and accurately represent these students in policy as officially accepted, matriculated, and degree-seeking (i.e. regular students). Updates to the language in Senate policies to reflect these changes are recommended.
Recommendation

Revise the language in the below Senate policies to remove “provisional” and replace/update to “conditionally enrolled in DUS” or “degree seeking in DUS with conditions”.

Please note that the following contains bold text for additions and strikeouts indicating deleted text. Deleted text is notated with [Delete] [End Delete]. Added text is notated with [Add] [End Add].

In the following title of the policy 02-50, the word “Provisional” remained even though the text of the policy was revised correctly. The title of the policy should have been revised as follows.

- [Add] 05-82 Minimum Entrance Requirements for Admission to Associate Degree Programs [Add]
- 67-10 Division I – Athletic Competition (University Park)
- [Add] 67-30 Division III and PSUAC – Athletic Competition (non-University Park) [End Add]

Revision for Policy 67-10 appeared in the December 2017 Agenda as follows:

67-10 Division I – Athletic Competition (University Park)

C. Enrollment Status

1. Courses offered through World Campus may not be used to establish the minimum requirements for full-time status.
2. Degree-seeking [Delete] provisional [End Delete] [Add] in DUS with conditions [End Add], non-degree regular and non-degree conditional students are not eligible to practice or compete.

1. NCAA Division III

g. Degree-seeking [Delete] provisional [End Delete] [Add] in DUS with conditions [End Add], non-degree regular and non-degree conditional students are not eligible to practice or compete.

Revision should have appeared as follows:

67-10 Division I – Athletic Competition (University Park) [Add] II. Eligibility of Athletes [End Add]

C. Enrollment Status

1. Courses offered through World Campus may not be used to establish the minimum requirements for full-time status.
2. Degree-seeking provisional in DUS with conditions, non-degree regular and non-degree conditional students are not eligible to practice or compete.

[Add] 67-30 Division III and PSUAC – Athletic Competition (non-University Park)

II. Eligibility of Athletes

C. Enrollment Status [End Add]

1. NCAA Division III

   g. Degree-seeking provisional in DUS with conditions, non-degree regular and non-degree conditional students are not eligible to practice or compete.

Policy 05-82 Minimum Entrance Requirements for Admission to Associate Degree Programs was accidentally omitted from the December 2017 report. Revisions should have appeared as follows:

05-82 Minimum Entrance Requirements for Admission to Associate Degree Programs

To be eligible for admission consideration to the University as an Associate degree candidate, either as a beginning student or as a student with advanced standing, an applicant must meet the following minimum requirements:

1. Penn State requires graduation from a recognized secondary high school program, home school program or equivalent (e.g. GED), as reported on the application for undergraduate admission, for admission to two-year degree programs.

A secondary school diploma issued by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, or appropriate authority in another state, may be accepted as equivalent to graduation from an accredited secondary school and as equivalent to the minimum secondary school units required for admission, as indicated under the Minimum Carnegie Units heading, with the exception of math and world language.

An adult learner, as defined by the University, may be considered for admission on an exception basis without a high school transcript by, at a minimum, self-certifying graduation. If an adult learner has completed 18 or more collegiate credits at an accredited university, successful collegiate level courses and secondary level Carnegie units as reported on the application will be considered for the admission decision. Adult learner applicants with 17 or fewer collegiate credits are strongly encouraged to provide a high school transcript for admission; however, if a high school transcript is not available, the applicant will be evaluated based on the available credentials and may be referred to degree-seeking conditionally enrolled in DUS [End Add] or other options.

2. Completion of the required units of preparatory work as indicated below under the heading Minimum Carnegie Units.

The University accepts the definition of a secondary school unit as established by the Carnegie Foundation. A unit represents a year of work in a subject in a preparatory school or secondary
school, provided that the work done in that subject is approximately one-fourth of the total amount of work regularly required in a year in the school.

The University reserves the right to deny admission to any applicant for admission for any reason the University determines to be material to the applicant’s qualifications to pursue higher education.

Both for admission to a college or school and for entrance to a major, a student must satisfy the requirements of the University, of the particular college or school, and of the major area. In special circumstances, the University may need to further restrict admissions to a college or school and entrance to majors because of space limitations.

**Minimum Carnegie Units**

**English**  
Four units, including one unit each in composition and literature, are required.

**World Language/Social Studies/Art/Humanities**  
Five units in any combination of world language, social studies, arts, and humanities are required. These units may include advanced placement courses in the arts.

**Science**  
Two units of science are required.

**Math**  
Two units of mathematics are required.  
Some specific programs may have additional entrance requirements.

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

- Clark Brigger
- Wei-fan Chen
- Tracy Fausnight
- Deirdre Folkers
- Katherine Garren
- Edward Glantz
- Mark Horn
- James Jaap
- Robert Kubat
- Melissa Kunes
- Allen Larson
- Timothy Lawlor, Vice Chair
- Keith Nelson
- Maura Shea
- Jake Springer
- Mary Beth Williams, Chair
- Richard Young
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Standing Rules; Article IV – Amendments

(Legislative)

Implementation: UPON APPROVAL BY THE SENATE

Rationale:

The Senate has approved reforms to the Senate Bylaws, Article X (editorial amendments of a non-substantive nature) the standing rules must be amended to reflect this change. To facilitate that process we therefore propose language for modifying the Standing Rules (Article IV) to harmonize them with approved changes to the Bylaws.

Recommendation:

That Article IV of the Standing Rules be and is hereby amended as follows:

Please note that the following contains bold text for additions.

Article IV Amendments

Amendments to the Standing Rules may be adopted at any meeting of the Senate by a majority vote of those senators present, provided that the amendments have been presented in writing in the agenda for that meeting.

In those cases where amendments are deemed to be editorial changes of a non-substantive nature (e.g., issues of nomenclature, committee names, or faculty titles), the Committee on Committees and Rules may submit them to Senate Council for approval by a two-thirds vote. If the vote fails, they will be returned to the Committee on Committees and Rules to be submitted via the regular legislative process. If the vote succeeds, the changes shall be published in a Communication to the Senate in the next Senate agenda. For five days following the Senate meeting, any faculty senator who feels that the changes require a more careful review may place their objections in writing to the Senate Chair to be returned to the Committee on Committees and Rules to be submitted via the regular legislative process. If there are no objections after five days the changes will go into effect.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

- Jonathan Abel
- Michael Bérubé
- Renee Borromeo
- Victor Brunsden, Vice-Chair
- Ann Clements
- Dennis Jett
- Beth King
- Binh Le
- Richard Robinett
- Nicholas Rowland
- Keith Shapiro, Chair
- Ann Taylor
- Rodney Troester
- Matthew Woessner
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Standing Rules: Article III – Other Functions of the Senate

(Legislative)

Implementation: UPON APPROVAL BY THE SENATE

Background:

In 2021, the Senate will mark its 100th anniversary. Established, in part, to cope with Pennsylvania State College’s growing size and complexity, the Board of Trustees established a representative Senate to oversee the curriculum, replacing the general assembly of all college faculty. From 1921 through 1966, the President of Penn State chaired the Senate, consisting primarily of administrators. The modern Senate, which includes predominately faculty, and elected Senate Officers, was established under the administration of President Eric Walker as part of a general reform of shared governance.

Despite its extensive digital archives, dating back to its founding, relatively little is known about the Senate’s history. As the Senate approaches its centennial year, the Senate appointed a special Centennial Committee to begin to document the Senate’s history, and make the information readily accessible to both the Senate and the University Community.

Rationale:

The process of uncovering and documenting Senate history is a slow and methodical process, requiring faculty support over a long period of time. To institutionalize this data-gathering process, the Senate would benefit from appointing a historian, and associate historians both to keep contemporary records on major Senate events, and to investigate the archives to learn about its past.

Among their duties, these individuals will work to create and update a web site devoted to the history of the Senate, prepare displays of historical information about the Senate, work with the university archivist and librarians, conduct oral histories of past Senate officers, and write papers about the history of the Senate. Over time, the Senate historians would build and maintain an ongoing historical record of the Senate. From the work of the historians, future senators will be able to read about the experiences of their predecessors, thus helping them contextualize contemporary controversies and policy questions.

The proposed revisions to the standing rules would establish a Senate Historian, appointed from among the elected Senators for a three-year term. The Chair may appoint associate historians,
potentially including non-senatorial faculty or graduate students, to assist the Historian in preparing informational reports, and maintaining the Senate’s online resources.

**Recommendation:**

That Article III – Other Functions of the Senate is hereby amended as follows:

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

**Section 13:**

**Senate Historians:**

(a) The Chair of the Senate shall appoint, from elected Senators, a Senate Historian to serve for a three-year (renewable) term. The Chair may appoint Associate Historians to serve as a resource to the Senate Historian for a one-year (renewable) term.

(b) Duties:

(1) The Senate Historian and Associate Historians shall file an annual informational report with the Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology to include:

(i) A summary of the major issues, debates and legislative initiatives of the Senate in the preceding year.
(ii) A transcript of any remarks made to the full Senate by candidates seeking election as either a Senate officer, or as the Academic Member of the University Board of Trustees.
(iii) Brief biographical descriptions of the Senate officers, the Parliamentarian and the Academic Member of the University Board of Trustees.
(iv) Photographs of Senate proceedings from the prior year.

(2) The Senate Historian and Associate Historians shall, on an ongoing basis, create content for the Senate web page concerning the history of the University Faculty Senate.

Section 14

Senators representing the Senate on extra-senatorial committees, boards, and commissions shall report actions of these bodies to the Senate when requested by the Senate Council or the Chair.

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES**

- Jonathan Abel
Rationale:

During the 2015-2016 academic year, the University Faculty Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics conducted a review of Penn State governance of Intercollegiate Athletics at the university. This review broadly examined the university athletic governance responsibilities, individual body jurisdictions, and overall effectiveness of the collective university-level bodies engaged in this pursuit. The findings of this review culminated in a request for the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules to create a legislation report to modify the standing rules of the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. This report acknowledges the need for Penn State faculty to engage more fully in the fulfillment of their governance and oversight responsibilities.

The Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics identified challenges such as a lack of familiarity among faculty senators terminology, rules, and underlying issues in Intercollegiate Athletics; a lack of continuity in committee membership and leadership that limits the development of this faculty expertise necessary to fulfill the IAC’s governance responsibilities; and the unavailability of the IAC for consultation during the summer months, when many critical decisions are made by Intercollegiate Athletics that require oversight and response by the IAC.

Recognizing the necessity for adequate specialized knowledge, experience, and flexibility in IAC, CC&R recommends the following changes to the Standing Rules to accommodate those needs.

Recommendation:

That Article II, Section 6(h) of the Standing Rules be and is hereby amended as follows:

Please note that the following contains bold text for additions. Added text is notated with [Add] [End Add].

Article II

Section 6

(h) Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics
1. Membership:

(i) At least eight elected faculty senators [Add] with the following qualifications:

(a) Senator appointments on the committee will be a minimum of two years, unless impractical due to a need to balance committee membership or a senator being unable to fulfill the duties of their elected term, and

(b) the committee chair will be required to have at least one year of prior experience on the committee, and will be appointed to a two-year term, as applicable given the remaining length of the senator’s term. [End Add]

(ii) At least two of the eight elected faculty senators must be from a location other than University Park. One of these two elected faculty senators must be from a campus with a varsity athletic program participating in NCAA Division III or PSUAC and will also serve as the chair of the extra-senatorial Committee on Campus Athletics.

(iii) Two undergraduate student senators, one from University Park and one from a location other than University Park. The student from a location other than University Park will also serve on the extra-senatorial Committee on Campus Athletics.

(iv) The University Park, Division I, Faculty Athletics Representative to the National Collegiate Athletic Association

(v) Director of Intercollegiate Athletics at University Park*

(vi) Senior Women’s Administrator for Intercollegiate Athletics at University Park*

(vii) Two members of the University Faculty Senate selected by the President of the University.

2. Selection: By the Committee on Committees and Rules unless otherwise specified

3. Jurisdiction: The Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics is responsible to the Senate for all intercollegiate athletic programs at the University as they relate to the University’s academic and educational objectives. Intercollegiate athletics shall include all teams and individuals representing the University with significant off-University activity.

(a) Scope: Without limiting the jurisdiction of the Committee, it shall, specifically (1) consider policies on eligibility of students for intercollegiate athletics, (2) certify the academic eligibility of students for athletic grants-in-aid, (3) approve intercollegiate athletic schedules as they affect academic standards, (4) review and approve matters from the Committee on Campus Athletics as required, and (5) help promote a sound academic climate for the intercollegiate athletic programs at all University locations.

(b) Consultation: The Committee shall meet with responsible administrators and others concerning the intercollegiate athletic programs at University Park and other University locations
that offer intercollegiate competition. It shall make a particular effort to seek the views of students participating in these intercollegiate athletic programs.

(c) Advisory role: Subject to the Constitution and rules of the Senate, and in consultation with the Senate Chair, the committee may also serve as the representative of the Senate to advise the President of the University on the operation of the intercollegiate programs at University Park and other University locations that offer intercollegiate competition. Subject to the general authority of the President of the University, as delegated by the University Board of Trustees and to the delegated authority of the Senate under its constitution to manage its own governance where matters considered touch on Senate jurisdiction, it shall initiate new policies, or review existing policies, which govern these intercollegiate athletic programs. These policies shall guide the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics and administrators at other University locations that offer intercollegiate competition in administering their respective programs when approved in accordance with applicable rules. With appropriate consultation, it shall develop recommendations to the President of the University on matters affecting the Penn State University Athletic Conference (PSUAC), the Big Ten Conference, the NCAA, and other national athletic governance bodies in which the University holds membership and shall work closely with the faculty representatives in establishing the University’s formal vote to these organizations. Without otherwise limiting the Senate’s general forensic and related authority, and at the request of the President of the University to the Senate Chair, the committee may consider other issues affecting the various athletic programs under the President’s jurisdiction.

4. Mandated reports: The Committee shall report on its activities to the Senate at least annually. The Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics shall have the authority to approve its mandated Informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

[Add] 5. Meetings: At the discretion of the committee chair, committee meetings or votes – in person or remotely – may be announced over the summer as necessary to respond to time-sensitive Intercollegiate Athletics issues requiring the full attention of the committee. With the understanding that many senators are on nine-month appointments, participation in such meetings is voluntary and the chair shall use discretion to limit such meetings to those that require time sensitive decisions/input. [End Add]

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

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

- Jonathan Abel
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- Victor Brunsden, Vice Chair
- Ann Clements
- Dennis Jett
- Beth King
- Binh Le
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Bylaws; Article VII – Delegation of Authority, Section 1

(Legislative)

Implementation: UPON APPROVAL BY THE SENATE

Rationale:

The University Faculty Senate Constitution Article I, Section 1 establishes the Senate as the “sole legislative body representing the University faculty as a whole.” It further states that the Senate shall be “authoritative on all matters that pertain to the educational interests of the University (graduate and undergraduate resident instruction, research, and continuing education) and on all educational matters that concern the faculties of more than one college”

The University Senate Bylaws, Article VII, Section 1, grants the Senate the power to delegate its authority to “appropriate organized faculty bodies” subject to the approval of the University Senate Council.

“Authority for functions of the Senate as defined in Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution may be delegated in whole or in part to appropriately organized faculty bodies upon recommendation of the Senate Council and approval by the Senate in accordance with Article X, Section 1, of the Bylaws.” – University Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article VII, Section 1

University Faculty Senate Council considers approval of amendments to the Constitutions, Bylaws and Standing Rules of Units’ Faculty Governance Organizations. Guidelines for Faculty Governance Organizations are listed on the University Faculty Senate’s website.

The Senate Council has a duty to ensure that the core principles of faculty governance set forth in its Constitution bylaws and other core documents are reflected in the exercise of delegated authority by the units, but always with fidelity to the core principles and provisions of the Senate. To ensure that this flexibility is appropriately exercised with fidelity to its own rules, the bylaws should set forth the limits within which these faculty bodies may exercise discretion. By clearly laying out the Senate’s expectations in the bylaws, Senate Council is better able to conduct its oversight responsibilities in the creation and maintenance of shared governance institutions to whom the Senate delegates authority.

Recommendation:

That Article VII, Section 1 of the Bylaws be and is hereby amended as follows:
Article VII – Delegation of Authority

Section 1

Authority for functions of the Senate as defined in Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution may be delegated in whole or in part to appropriately organized faculty bodies upon recommendation of the Senate Council and approval by the Senate in accordance with Article X, Section 1, of the Bylaws. Such delegation shall be limited to those functions appropriate to the faculty body concerned, and such delegations shall be specified in succeeding sections of this Article and shall be established in accordance with Article X, Section 1, of the Bylaws as interpreted by Senate Council. Legislative actions and minutes of all bodies to which authority has been delegated under Article VII shall be forwarded to the Chair of the Senate. Where appropriate, actions will be transmitted to the President following established procedures. The Executive Director is charged with assuring that review and transmittal to the Chair is made.

All faculty governance organizations to which the Senate delegates its authority shall draft its governance documents consistent with the Requirements and Recommendations for Faculty Governance Organizations set forth by the Senate Council. Those Requirements and Recommendations shall be read consistently with, and incorporate, the following basic requirements:

(1) Unit governing documents may be known by whatever name is consistent with the traditions of the unit, and may be identified as constitutions, bylaws, standing rules and the like, as long as they are clearly identified as constituting the governing rules of the unit.

(2) The chair of the faculty governance organization shall be elected from the unit’s non-administrative faculty, either by the faculty of the unit or by the elected members of the faculty governance organization.

(3) The key functions of the leader of the unit’s faculty governance organization shall include, but are not limited to:
   • Presiding over meetings of the faculty governance organization
   • Setting the agenda for the meetings of the faculty governance organization
   • Overseeing the selection of committee members, their leadership, and their charges
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Proposed Revisions to Penn State Policy HR68, Postdoctoral Appointments

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

Introduction and Rationale
At the April 24, 2018 meeting of the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA), Pallavi Eswara (Director, Office of Postdoctoral Affairs) presented revisions to the policy regarding Postdoctoral Appointments. The Office of Postdoctoral Affairs has received many questions on leave, both paid and unpaid, and about ending appointments prematurely due to performance issues.

A task force looked into clarifying and standardizing procedures regarding postdoctoral appointments. After balancing postdocs’ desires with faculty resources, and benchmarking with the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA), they revised HR68 with clarifications and new sections. The clarifications include duration of leave, unpaid leave, responsibility for clearing appointment, and grievance procedures. The new sections include appointment length and structure, international appointments, holidays, paid leave and leaves of absence (unpaid), expectations of performance during postdoc training, and termination.

Questions about holidays are frequent, especially requirements to work on official university holidays, and the difference at the College of Medicine (Hershey), which does not have the winter break. RSCA asked for changes to note the variability in holidays/shutdown periods and a few other corrections. After consultation with the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs and with the Office of the Associate Dean for Research, College of Medicine, Ms. Eswara returned on September 18, 2018 to present the revised policy incorporating the requested changes.

At that meeting, further changes were requested. After consulting with the task force, the Vice President for Research, and General Counsel, some of the changes were incorporated. Others would require more substantial consultations, and could not be accommodated without further delaying the policy. After considering the time and effort that has already been expended to advance the revised policy this far, it was decided that the policy revisions should go forward.

Recommendation
After the September 18, 2018 meeting, the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity voted by email to endorse the proposed revisions to policy HR68 Postdoctoral Appointments, and to recommend that the Senate also offer its endorsement of the revised policy.
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**PURPOSE:**

To outline the terms and conditions of postdoctoral scholar and postdoctoral fellow appointments University's policy on postdoctoral appointments.

**DEFINITION OF POSTDOCTORAL APPOINTMENTS:**

Postdoctoral appointments shall:

1. be full-time, but temporary, one-year appointments which include four (4) weeks of paid leave; 48-week appointments; and

2. be granted to appointees who recently were awarded a Ph.D. or equivalent doctorate (e.g., Sc.D, M.D., D.D.S., J.D.) in an appropriate field in the last five (5) years; and provide the appointee with training under the supervision of a faculty member of a department; and

3. provide the appointee with training under the supervision of a senior scholar or a department; and
3. involve substantially full-time research or scholarship; and
4. function as preparatory time for careers within and outside academia; for a full-time academic and/or research career; and

5. provide the appointee with the opportunity freedom to meet the expectation of publishing the results of her or his research or scholarship during the period of the appointment; and

6. provide the appointee with technical training and opportunities for professional and career development.

DESIGNATED TITLES:

Designated titles for postdoctoral appointments at The Pennsylvania State University are Postdoctoral Fellow and Postdoctoral Scholar. The title of Postdoctoral Fellow will be used only in connection with appointments financed under a Postdoctoral Fellow Program of a granting agency outside the University. The title of Postdoctoral Scholar will be the usual designation for all other postdoctoral appointments.

LENGTH OF APPOINTMENT LENGTH AND STRUCTURE:

Normally, the initial appointment and renewals are not longer than a six-year period at Penn State, with exceptions granted to meet specific training needs of an individual and only after careful review by the college and appropriate central administrative officer.

Postdoctoral appointments are intended for individuals who have recently completed a Ph.D. or equivalent doctorate. Individuals who have completed their degree more than five years prior to the anticipated start date are ineligible for postdoctoral positions at Penn State but may be eligible for other posted positions (e.g., Research Faculty). Individuals with titles other than postdoctoral fellow or postdoctoral scholar are not covered under this policy.

Appointments are offered as one-year terms with the possibility for renewal. All renewals are contingent upon available funding, satisfactory performance on the part of the postdoctoral scholar/fellow and adherence to all University policies and professional standards of conduct. No individual shall be appointed to a postdoctoral scholar appointment for more than a total of five years. Template for Appointment letter is given in Appendix A.

If the appointment is not being renewed at the end of the appointment period for any reason, including lack of adequate funding, or the postdoctoral scholar/fellow has reached a maximum of five (5) years in the position, a minimum of 90-days’ notice in advance of the appointment end date must be given. Postdocs are expected to perform all duties as assigned at the time of appointment during the notice period.
RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLEARING APPOINTMENT:

All postdoctoral appointments will be approved by the appropriate dean. and The Office of Postdoctoral Affairs within the Office of the Vice President for Research will maintain a current inventory of all appointments.

Prior to extending an offer, the supervising faculty member or department shall demonstrate availability of sufficient funding to cover the twelve (12) month appointment.

INTERNATIONAL APPOINTMENTS

The University recognizes that there are a significant number of postdoctoral scholars and fellows who are foreign nationals. Supervising faculty members who extend offers to international postdoctoral scholars and fellows must adhere to all applicable federal guidelines and University policies regarding their postdoctoral appointments. Additionally, the length of appointment must correspond with the individual’s visa dates. Faculty and foreign national scholars/fellows should consult with International Scholar Advising, Directorate of International Student and Scholar Advising (JScholarAdv@psu.edu) to ensure compliance with visa requirements regarding offers, renewals, leaves of absence, and exits/terminations.

REMUNERATION

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows should be compensated an amount of no less than the minimum annual stipend. https://guru.psu.edu/resources/rates-and-schedules/stipends-for-graduate-assistants

SALARY:
Postdoctoral scholars and fellows should be paid at least the minimum annual salary as noted each July 1.

INSURANCE BENEFITS:

Postdoctoral Scholars and Fellows may enroll in an available University-sponsored health plan effective with the date of appointment. Those who enroll will contribute for an available University-sponsored health plan on the same basis and at the same rates as regular faculty and staff member contributions. Such contributions will be deducted monthly. In addition, Postdoctoral Scholars and Fellows may enroll in the University's dental and/or vision plan. Postdoctoral Scholars and Fellows may elect to participate in the Age-graded Life Insurance Plan and elect an amount of coverage equal to their annual stipend. Postdoctoral scholars are not eligible for the University’s mandatory retirement plan; however, they may elect to participate in a supplemental retirement plan through TIAA. See the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs website at http://www.research.psu.edu/offices/office-of-postdoctoral-affairs/postdoc-benefits for coverage details.
PAID LEAVE

As part of each one-year appointment, postdoctoral scholars/fellows are provided with four (4) weeks of paid leave to cover absences to include, but not be limited to, doctor’s appointments, personal illness, caring for an ill family member, funeral leave, vacation, and other similar situations. The timing and duration of leave must be agreed upon and approved in advance by the postdoc scholar/fellow and supervising faculty member. Unused leave cannot be rolled over from one appointment year to the next and used to extend appointment at the time of separation from the University. However, unused leave can be used during the last week of the appointment as long as it is approved. Unused paid leave shall not be paid out to the postdoctoral scholar or fellow at the time of separation. Such leave shall be tracked in the University’s designated time keeping system.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE:
When a postdoctoral scholar or fellow is unable to perform the duties of the position, the four weeks of leave provided by a 48-week appointment can be used to account for the absence. In addition, the department may be able to provide for some work to be done at home (e.g., data analysis), permitting the scholar or fellow to remain in pay status.

Leaves of absence without pay for a reasonable period of time beyond the four (4) weeks of paid leave will be considered by the University on a case-by-case basis. Departments may be able to provide for some work to be completed at home (e.g., data analysis), permitting the scholar or fellow to remain in pay status.

should be considered if they would not inhibit the applicable research project(s). Guidance for leaves of absence can be sought from the Office of Human Resources Work/Life Office (814-865-9346).

Before a leave of absence is discussed with a foreign national scholar or fellow, the supervisor needs to contact the International Scholars Office (814-865-0423) to insure consistency with federal regulations.

See also the new parent guideline at [http://forms.gradsch.psu.edu/current/newparentaccomodationguideline.pdf](http://forms.gradsch.psu.edu/current/newparentaccomodationguideline.pdf).

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows may be eligible for leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act. To the extent that a scholar or fellow is eligible for such leave, it shall run concurrently with paid and unpaid leave under this policy. Whenever a postdoctoral scholar or fellow would like to request a paid or unpaid leave of absence, the scholar or fellow shall contact the Office of Human Resources, Absence Management Office. The Absence Management Office personnel shall work with the supervising faculty member and the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs at postdocaffairs@psu.edu when vetting and approving such requests.
Before a leave of absence is discussed with an international scholar or fellow, the Office of Human Resources, Absence Management Office shall contact International Scholar Advising, Directorate of International Student and Scholar Advising (E-mail: jscholarAdv@psu.edu) to ensure consistency with federal regulations.

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows should refer to New Parent Accommodation guidelines (not an actual policy) given at https://www.research.psu.edu/opa/benefits, Postdoctoral scholars and fellows may be eligible for parental leave. Please contact the Absence Management Office to discuss the parameters for parental leave for postdoctoral scholars and fellows.

EXPECTATIONS OF PERFORMANCE

Every scholar and fellow is expected to exhibit and promote the highest ethical, moral, and professional standards as researchers, future faculty, professionals, and leaders in their respective fields. Research misconduct as per https://guru.psu.edu/gfug/appendices/app05-1617.html and https://www.research.psu.edu/researchmisconduct is regarded as a serious offense, raising grave doubt that the scholar or fellow is worthy of continued membership in the postdoctoral community at the University.

In addition to demonstrating satisfactory research progress, fulfillment of assigned duties, and adherence to all University policies, postdocs must maintain proper ethical, moral and professional standards. The primary duties of scholars and fellows are research and scholarship. However, scholars and fellows seeking additional experiences in other areas such as teaching or consulting should consult with their supervising faculty members prior to accepting any such additional duties. Supervising faculty have the discretion to approve or deny such requests based on the funding criteria, performance and individual circumstance.

It is strongly recommended and expected that all scholars and fellows be provided a written outline of the expectations of the supervising faculty member at the beginning of their appointment. To the extent possible this document should include a description of specific responsibilities. The document should be the first step in developing an Individualized Development Plan (IDP) for the scholar/fellow in order to guide their professional development during their time at the University (See Appendix B). IDP is extremely helpful in guiding postdoctoral and early career researchers and is required by a growing number of federal funding agencies.

Scholars/fellows should also receive an annual evaluation at the end of each appointment year (See Appendix C). This evaluation will include a written assessment of their performance, which is to be discussed by the scholar/fellow and the supervising faculty member.

Although it is expected that all scholars and fellows demonstrate satisfactory performance in their research, fulfill all responsibilities outlined by the faculty member, demonstrate professional and ethical standards of behavior, and adhere to all University policies, there
are occasions when improvement in one or more of these areas is needed. Failure to meet the expectations identified by the supervising faculty member may result in actions including the implementation of a Plan for Improvement (PFI) and/or sanctions, which may include termination of the appointment. If a supervising faculty member determines that the performance and/or behavior of a scholar or fellow is not meeting expectations, the faculty member should notify and consult with the college’s associate dean for research and unit Human Resources Strategic Partner or Consultant. The supervisor should then meet with the scholar or fellow to notify them that their performance and/or behavior is a concern, and develop a PFI (See Appendix D). Once a PFI has been implemented, it is the responsibility of the scholar or fellow to adhere to all parameters outlined in the plan and of the supervising faculty member to monitor and document the scholar or fellow’s progress accordingly. If the scholar or fellow has not demonstrated satisfactory improvement and not met expectations within the time allotted, the faculty member will provide a final written assessment of their performance, along with a termination letter, indicating the specific date that the appointment will end.

All Plans for Improvement must be reviewed and approved by the work unit Human Resources office prior to being implemented with the scholar or fellow. The Office of Human Resources will consult with other University offices as needed (e.g. Office of Postdoctoral Affairs, Affirmative Action Office, Employee Relations, Office of General Counsel) prior to giving approval to the faculty member to implement the PFI with the scholar or fellow.

TERMINATIONS

Postdoc appointments can be terminated prior to the completion of the contract term for the following reasons:

a. Voluntary resignation;
b. Unsatisfactory performance or behavior; research misconduct; or violation of University policy.

In the case of a voluntary resignation by the postdoctoral scholar/fellow, the University requests that the postdoctoral scholar/fellow provide a minimum of 30 days’ notice to the faculty supervisor and follow the appropriate exit procedures within the research group and department.

If the postdoctoral scholar/fellow is being terminated prior to the end of the appointment period due to unsatisfactory performance and/or an unsuccessful performance improvement plan, the postdoctoral scholar/fellow must be given a minimum advance notice. The number of days of notice will be decided on a case by case basis.

If the postdoctoral scholar/fellow is being terminated prior to the end of the appointment period due to unsatisfactory behavior, research misconduct, or violation of University policy, the number of days of notice will be determined on a case by case basis. In certain cases where the behavior is deemed egregious by the University, termination of the appointment may be effective immediately.
Decisions to terminate postdoctoral scholar/fellow appointments involuntarily for cause must be approved in advance by the college or work unit budget executive or designee. Under any termination of appointment, postdoc scholars/fellows must adhere to University policy HR102 Separation and Transfer Protocol regarding the submission of keys, research equipment and materials, research data and all other University property.

International postdoctoral scholars/fellows must contact the Directorate of International Student and Scholar Advising in the University Office of Global Programs to determine their visa status as a result of the termination.

APPOINTMENTS:

IBIS Forms "GFSA" for appointments, and "GRAD" for changes and reappointments, must be completed in accordance with the approval paths established by your Financial Officer. Postdoctoral Scholars and Fellows should receive an appointment letter outlining the details of their appointment.

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE:

Postdoctoral scholars/fellows or scholars should always attempt to resolve problems concerning their professional situation by discussing the matter with their supervisor. If there is a reason for the postdoctoral fellow or scholar to believe that this avenue is inappropriate, he or she may seek recourse through the department or division or program head, or from the associate or assistant dean of their college or division. The fellow or scholar may also seek advice from the college or division ombudsman, HR unit and the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs.

Occasionally, there are disagreements between postdoctoral fellows/scholars and their supervisors that cannot be resolved in the administrative structure of the department, division, program or college. Such problems may involve alleged violations of academic freedom, professional ethics, and procedural fairness and consistency. There may be disagreements concerning authorship credit or intellectual property ownership. If a resolution of such problems cannot be achieved at the department, division, or program level, the following procedures are to be followed. This procedure is not to be utilized for instances of unsatisfactory performance or behavior by the postdoctoral scholar or fellow. If for some reason the proper jurisdiction is not clear, then the Vice President for Research shall decide on the appropriate procedure.

- For disagreements that are unresolved at the department or program level, a grievance process will be initiated when the postdoctoral scholar or fellow files a written grievance with the dean of his or her college. The parties to the grievance process shall be the person(s) filing the grievance and the person(s) responsible for the act or omission that gave rise to the grievance.
- In response to the grievance, the College Dean appoints and convenes a Hearing Committee consisting of five members. From that time until the hearing ends, the College Dean refrains from involvement in the dispute. The Hearing Committee consists of two postdoctoral scholars or fellows, two faculty members, and an administrator who will
serve as chairperson. All members of the Hearing Committee will be from outside the academic department or unit in which either the postdoctoral scholar or faculty member who is involved in the grievance participates.

- Each party is allowed up to three disqualifications from this committee without cause. An indefinite number of disqualifications is allowed with cause, as determined by the College Dean. The College Dean makes additional appointments as necessary to fully staff the Hearing Committee.
- The Hearing Committee attempts to resolve the disagreement within 30 calendar days of receiving the complaint.
- The hearing is not public. During the hearing, either party may have present an adviser, who must be a postdoctoral scholar/fellow, faculty, or a staff member of the University. In light of the nature and spirit of the proceeding, representation by legal counsel is prohibited.
- The Hearing Committee may have present at the hearing such assistance as it deems necessary.
- The Hearing Committee is not bound by strict rules of evidence and may admit any relevant evidence.
- The hearing is audio recorded, and a recording of the hearing is kept though any appeal processes. The parties involved may request to listen to the tape and take written notes until it is destroyed, however, copies are not provided.
- The parties are afforded an opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary and other evidence. The department or program involved makes all reasonable efforts to cooperate with the committee in securing witnesses and making available documentary and other evidence.
- Each party has the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. Expenses incurred in obtaining a witness will be the responsibility of the party requesting the witness.
- The Hearing Committee’s findings are based solely on the hearing record. In cases where issues involve authorship, the Hearing Committee should adhere to the spirit of Policy RA+3 IP02.
- The Hearing Committee submits its findings and recommendations in writing to the College Dean and to the parties involved. Based solely on the record of the hearing, the College Dean may endorse all, part, or none of the Hearing Committee’s recommendations. In coming to a decision, the College Dean may consult with the Vice President for Research. A written notice of the decision of the College Dean is provided to the Hearing Committee and the parties involved within three weeks of receipt by the College Dean of the Hearing Committee’s recommendations. If the College Dean does not endorse all of the findings and adopt all the recommendations of the Hearing Committee, an explanation will be included in the written notice. The decision by the College Dean shall be final, but does not preclude existing independent avenues of appeal (e.g. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities). The record of this decision, along with supporting documents, shall be submitted to the Office of General Counsel and the Vice President for Research and kept by the Vice President for Research for not less than five years from the date of the resolution of the complaint.
- After the final decision, all efforts should be made to reconcile the situation within the research group. In the rare case where irreconcilable differences exist even after the resolution, and where the decision is made against the faculty member, it will be the
responsibility of the College Dean to find another similar position in the University for the postdoctoral fellow or scholar, and, if necessary, to provide bridge funding for this position for up to six months.

TAX-DEFERRED ANNUITIES:

Retirement savings options available to Postdoctoral Scholars and Fellows are limited to contributions to either a Traditional or Roth Individual Retirement Account (IRA). Traditional IRAs offer the opportunity to reduce federal taxable income, subject to IRS limitations, when federal income tax returns are filed. IRA enrollment and payments options are done on an individual basis and are unrelated to University benefit programs. Traditional and Roth IRAs are available from insurance companies and mutual fund companies as well as most banks.

POLICY EXCEPTIONS

This policy applies to all individuals designated as postdoctoral scholars and fellows. In extenuating circumstances, exceptions to this policy may be requested to meet specific training or personnel needs. All such requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Any request for an exception must be submitted by the principal investigator or supervising faculty member to the college/unit’s associate dean for research and unit human resources office for review and, if appropriate, forwarded to the director of the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs (OPA) for approval. The director of the OPA will consult with the Vice President for Research if necessary and notify the college’s associate dean for research and unit human resources office of the final decision. If the request is denied, there is no further level of appeal and the decision will stand.

FORMS

Appendix A - Appointment letter templates.
Appendix B - Individualized Development Plan (IDP)
Appendix C – Annual Evaluation Form
Appendix D – Plan for Improvement Sample
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PURPOSE

To outline the terms and conditions of postdoctoral scholar and postdoctoral fellow appointments.

DEFINITION OF POSTDOCTORAL APPOINTMENTS

Postdoctoral appointments shall:

1. be full-time, but temporary, one-year appointments which include four (4) weeks of paid leave;

2. be granted to appointees who were awarded a Ph.D. or equivalent doctorate (e.g., Sc.D., M.D., D.D.S., J.D.) in an appropriate field in the last five (5) years; and provide the appointee with training under the supervision of a faculty member of a department;

3. involve full-time research and/or scholarship;

4. function as a preparatory time for careers within and outside academia;

5. provide the appointee the opportunity to publish the results of her or his research or scholarship during the period of the appointment; and

6. provide the appointee with technical training and opportunities for professional and career development.

DESIGNATED TITLES

Designated titles for postdoctoral appointments at the University are postdoctoral fellow and postdoctoral scholar. The title of postdoctoral fellow will be used only in connection with
appointments financed under a postdoctoral fellow program of a granting agency outside the University. The title of postdoctoral scholar will be the usual designation for all other postdoctoral appointments.

APPOINTMENT LENGTH AND STRUCTURE

Postdoctoral appointments are intended for individuals who have recently completed a Ph.D. or equivalent doctorate. Individuals who have completed their degree more than five years prior to the anticipated start date are ineligible for postdoctoral positions at Penn State but may be eligible for other posted positions (e.g., Research Faculty). Individuals with titles other than postdoctoral fellow or postdoctoral scholar are not covered under this policy.

Appointments are offered as one-year terms with the possibility for renewal. All renewals are contingent upon available funding, satisfactory performance on the part of the postdoctoral scholar/fellow and adherence to all University policies and professional standards of conduct. No individual shall be appointed to a postdoctoral scholar appointment for more than a total of five years. Template for Appointment letter is given in Appendix A.

If the appointment is not being renewed at the end of the appointment period for any reason, including lack of adequate funding, or the postdoctoral scholar/fellow has reached a maximum of five (5) years in the position, a minimum of 90-days’ notice in advance of the appointment end date must be given. Postdocs are expected to perform all duties as assigned at the time of appointment during the notice period.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLEARING APPOINTMENT

All postdoctoral appointments will be approved by the appropriate dean. The Office of Postdoctoral Affairs within the Office of the Vice President for Research will maintain a current inventory of all appointments.

Prior to extending an offer, the supervising faculty member or department shall demonstrate availability of sufficient funding to cover the twelve (12) month appointment.

INTERNATIONAL APPOINTMENTS

The University recognizes that there are a significant number of postdoctoral scholars and fellows who are foreign nationals. Supervising faculty members who extend offers to international postdoctoral scholars and fellows must adhere to all applicable federal guidelines and University policies regarding their postdoctoral appointments. Additionally, the length of appointment must correspond with the individual’s visa dates. Faculty and foreign national scholars/fellows should consult with International Scholar Advising, Directorate of International Student and Scholar Advising (ScholarAdv@psu.edu) to ensure compliance with visa requirements regarding offers, renewals, leaves of absence, and exits/terminations.
REMUNERATION

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows should be compensated an amount of no less than the minimum annual stipend. [https://guru.psu.edu/resources/rates-and-schedules/stipends-for-graduate-assistants](https://guru.psu.edu/resources/rates-and-schedules/stipends-for-graduate-assistants)

INSURANCE/ BENEFITS

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows may enroll in an available University-sponsored health plan effective with the date of appointment. In addition, postdoctoral scholars and fellows may enroll in the University's dental and/or vision plan. Postdoctoral scholars and fellows may also elect to participate in the Age-graded Life Insurance Plan and elect an amount of coverage equal to their annual stipend. Postdoctoral scholars are not eligible for the University’s mandatory retirement plan; however, they may elect to participate in a supplemental retirement plan through TIAA. See the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs website for coverage details.

HOLIDAYS

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows are generally eligible to follow the holiday schedules established for their respective campuses. Postdoctoral scholars and fellows will not be expected to perform any duties of the position on official University holidays, including the shutdown period during the December/January holidays at campuses that are closed during that time. If it is absolutely necessary for the postdoctoral scholar or fellow to perform their duties on a University holiday, then compensatory time off equivalent to the number of hours worked on the holiday will be provided by the unit. Holiday compensatory time off is subject to the approval of the supervising faculty, shall be used prior to other leave, and shall not be paid out at the time of separation.

PAID LEAVE

As part of each one-year appointment, postdoctoral scholars/fellows are provided with four (4) weeks of paid leave to cover absences to include, but not be limited to, doctor’s appointments, personal illness, caring for an ill family member, funeral leave, vacation, and other similar situations. The timing and duration of leave must be agreed upon and approved in advance by the postdoc scholar/fellow and supervising faculty member. Unused leave cannot be rolled over from one appointment year to the next and used to extend appointment at the time of separation from the University. However, unused leave can be used during the last week of the appointment as long as it is approved. Unused paid leave shall not be paid out to the postdoctoral scholar or fellow at the time of separation. Such leave shall be tracked in the University’s designated time keeping system.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Leaves of absence without pay for a reasonable period of time beyond the four (4) weeks of paid leave will be considered by the University on a case-by-case basis. Departments may be able to
provide for some work to be completed at home (e.g., data analysis), permitting the scholar or fellow to remain in pay status.

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows may be eligible for leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act. To the extent that a scholar or fellow is eligible for such leave, it shall run concurrently with paid and unpaid leave under this policy. Whenever a postdoctoral scholar or fellow would like to request a paid or unpaid leave of absence, the scholar or fellow shall contact the Office of Human Resources, Absence Management Office. The Absence Management Office personnel shall work with the supervising faculty member and the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs at postdocaffairs@psu.edu when vetting and approving such requests.

Before a leave of absence is discussed with an international scholar or fellow, the Office of Human Resources, Absence Management Office shall contact International Scholar Advising, Directorate of International Student and Scholar Advising (E-mail: JscholarAdv@psu.edu) to ensure consistency with federal regulations.

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows should refer to New Parent Accommodation guidelines (not an actual policy) given at https://www.research.psu.edu/opa/benefits Postdoctoral scholars and fellows may be eligible for parental leave. Please contact the Absence Management Office to discuss the parameters for parental leave for postdoctoral scholars and fellows.

**EXPECTATIONS OF PERFORMANCE**

Every scholar and fellow is expected to exhibit and promote the highest ethical, moral, and professional standards as researchers, future faculty, professionals, and leaders in their respective fields. Research misconduct as per https://guru.psu.edu/gfug/appendices/app05-1617.html and https://www.research.psu.edu/researchmisconduct is regarded as a serious offense, raising grave doubt that the scholar or fellow is worthy of continued membership in the postdoctoral community at the University.

In addition to demonstrating satisfactory research progress, fulfillment of assigned duties, and adherence to all University policies, postdocs must maintain proper ethical, moral and professional standards. The primary duties of scholars and fellows are research and scholarship. However, scholars and fellows seeking additional experiences in other areas such as teaching or consulting should consult with their supervising faculty members prior to accepting any such additional duties. Supervising faculty have the discretion to approve or deny such requests based on the funding criteria, performance and individual circumstance.

It is strongly recommended and expected that all scholars and fellows be provided a written outline of the expectations of the supervising faculty member at the beginning of their appointment. To the extent possible this document should include a description of specific responsibilities. The document should be the first step in developing an Individualized Development Plan (IDP) for the scholar/fellow in order to guide their professional development during their time at the University (See Appendix B). IDP is extremely helpful in guiding postdoctoral and early career researchers and is required by a growing number of federal funding agencies.
Scholars/fellows should also receive an annual evaluation at the end of each appointment year (See Appendix C). This evaluation will include a written assessment of their performance, which is to be discussed by the scholar/fellow and the supervising faculty member.

Although it is expected that all scholars and fellows demonstrate satisfactory performance in their research, fulfill all responsibilities outlined by the faculty member, demonstrate professional and ethical standards of behavior, and adhere to all University policies, there are occasions when improvement in one or more of these areas is needed. Failure to meet the expectations identified by the supervising faculty member may result in actions including the implementation of a Plan for Improvement (PFI) and/or sanctions, which may include termination of the appointment. If a supervising faculty member determines that the performance and/or behavior of a scholar or fellow is not meeting expectations, the faculty member should notify and consult with the college’s associate dean for research and unit Human Resources Strategic Partner or Consultant. The supervisor should then meet with the scholar or fellow to notify them that their performance and/or behavior is a concern, and develop a PFI (See Appendix D). Once a PFI has been implemented, it is the responsibility of the scholar or fellow to adhere to all parameters outlined in the plan and of the supervising faculty member to monitor and document the scholar or fellow’s progress accordingly. If the scholar or fellow has not demonstrated satisfactory improvement and not met expectations within the time allotted, the faculty member will provide a final written assessment of their performance, along with a termination letter, indicating the specific date that the appointment will end.

All Plans for Improvement must be reviewed and approved by the work unit Human Resources office prior to being implemented with the scholar or fellow. The Office of Human Resources will consult with other University offices as needed (e.g. Office of Postdoctoral Affairs, Affirmative Action Office, Employee Relations, Office of General Counsel) prior to giving approval to the faculty member to implement the PFI with the scholar or fellow.

TERMINATIONS

Postdoc appointments can be terminated prior to the completion of the contract term for the following reasons:

   a. Voluntary resignation;
   b. Unsatisfactory performance or behavior; research misconduct; or violation of University policy.

In the case of a voluntary resignation by the postdoctoral scholar/fellow, the University requests that the postdoctoral scholar/fellow provide a minimum of 30 days’ notice to the faculty supervisor and follow the appropriate exit procedures within the research group and department. If the postdoctoral scholar/fellow is being terminated prior to the end of the appointment period due to unsatisfactory performance and/or an unsuccessful performance improvement plan, the postdoctoral scholar/fellow must be given a minimum advance notice. The number of days of notice will be decided on a case by case basis.
If the postdoctoral scholar/fellow is being terminated prior to the end of the appointment period due to unsatisfactory behavior, research misconduct, or violation of University policy, the number of days of notice will be determined on a case by case basis. In certain cases where the behavior is deemed egregious by the University, termination of the appointment may be effective immediately.

Decisions to terminate postdoctoral scholar/fellow appointments involuntarily for cause must be approved in advance by the college or work unit budget executive or designee. Under any termination of appointment, postdoc scholars/fellows must adhere to University policy HR102 Separation and Transfer Protocol regarding the submission of keys, research equipment and materials, research data and all other University property.

International postdoctoral scholars/fellows must contact the Directorate of International Student and Scholar Advising in the University Office of Global Programs to determine their visa status as a result of the termination.

**GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE**

Postdoctoral scholars/fellows should always attempt to resolve problems concerning their professional situation by discussing the matter with their supervisor. If there is a reason for the postdoctoral scholar/fellow to believe that this avenue is inappropriate, he or she may seek recourse through the department or division or program head, or from the college’s associate dean for research. The scholar/fellow may also seek advice from the college ombudsperson, HR unit and Office of Postdoctoral Affairs.

Occasionally, there are disagreements between postdoctoral scholars/fellows and their supervisors that cannot be resolved in the administrative structure of the department, division, program or college. Such problems include but are not limited to alleged violations of academic freedom, professional ethics, and procedural fairness and consistency. There may be disagreements concerning authorship credit or intellectual property ownership. If a resolution of such problems cannot be achieved at the department, division, or program level, the following procedures are to be followed. *This procedure is not to be utilized for instances of unsatisfactory performance or behavior by the postdoctoral scholar or fellow.* If for some reason the proper procedure is not clear, then the vice president for research shall decide on the appropriate procedure.

- For disagreements that are unresolved at the department or program level, a grievance process will be initiated when the postdoctoral scholar/fellow files a written grievance with the dean of his or her college. The parties to the grievance process shall be the person(s) filing the grievance and the person(s) responsible for the act or omission that gave rise to the grievance.
- In response to the grievance, the college dean shall appoint and convene a Hearing Committee consisting of five members. From the time a Hearing Committee is appointed until the hearing ends, the college dean refrains from involvement in the dispute. The Hearing Committee consists of two postdoctoral scholars or fellows, two faculty members, and an administrator who will serve as chairperson. All members of the
The Hearing Committee will be from outside the academic department or unit in which either the postdoctoral scholar or faculty member who is involved in the grievance participates.

- Each party is allowed up to three disqualifications from this committee without cause. An indefinite number of disqualifications is allowed with cause, as determined by the college dean. The college dean makes additional appointments as necessary to fully staff the Hearing Committee.

- The Hearing Committee attempts to resolve the disagreement within 30 calendar days of receiving the complaint.

- The hearing is not public. During the hearing, either party may have present an adviser, who must be a postdoctoral scholar/fellow, faculty, or a staff member of the University. In light of the nature and spirit of the proceeding, representation by legal counsel is not permitted.

- The Hearing Committee may have present at the hearing such assistance as it deems necessary.

- The Hearing Committee is not bound by strict rules of evidence and may admit any relevant evidence.

- The hearing will be audio recorded, and a recording of the hearing will be kept though any appeal processes. The parties involved may request to listen to the tape and take written notes until it is destroyed, however, copies are not provided.

- The parties are afforded an opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary and other evidence. The department or program involved makes all reasonable efforts to cooperate with the committee in securing witnesses and making available documentary and other evidence.

- Each party has the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. Expenses incurred in obtaining a witness will be the responsibility of the party presenting the witness.

- The Hearing Committee’s findings are based solely on the hearing record. In cases where issues involve authorship, the Hearing Committee should adhere to the spirit of Policy IP02.

- The Hearing Committee will submit its findings and recommendations in writing to the college dean and to the parties involved. Based solely on the record of the hearing, the college dean may endorse all, part, or none of the Hearing Committee’s recommendations. In coming to a decision, the college dean may consult with the Vice President for Research. A written notice of the decision of the college dean is provided to the Hearing Committee and the parties involved within three weeks of receipt by the college dean of the Hearing Committee’s recommendations. If the college dean does not endorse all of the findings and adopt all the recommendations of the Hearing Committee, an explanation will be included in the written notice. The decision by the college dean shall be final but does not preclude existing independent avenues of appeal (e.g. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities). The record of this decision, along with supporting documents, shall be submitted to the Office of General Counsel and the Vice President for research and kept by the Vice President for Research for not less than five years from the date of the resolution of the complaint.

- After the final decision, all efforts should be made to reconcile the situation within the research group. In the rare case where irreconcilable differences exist even after the resolution, and where the decision is made against the faculty member, it will be the responsibility of the college dean to find another similar position in the University for the
postdoctoral scholar/fellow, and, if necessary, to provide bridge funding for this position for up to six months.

**POLICY EXCEPTIONS:**

This policy applies to all individuals designated as postdoctoral scholars and fellows. In extenuating circumstances, exceptions to this policy may be requested to meet specific training or personnel needs. All such requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Any request for an exception must be submitted by the principal investigator or supervising faculty member to the college/unit’s associate dean for research and unit human resources office for review and, if appropriate, forwarded to the director of the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs (OPA) for approval. The director of the OPA will consult with the Vice President for Research if necessary and notify the college’s associate dean for research and unit human resources office of the final decision. If the request is denied, there is no further level of appeal and the decision will stand.

**FORMS**

Appendix A - Appointment letter templates.
Appendix B - Individualized Development Plan (IDP)
Appendix C – Annual Evaluation Form
Appendix D – Plan for Improvement Sample

**CROSS REFERENCES:**

Policy [IP02](#) Coauthorship of Scholarly Reports, Papers and Publications (Formerly Policy RA13)
Introduction and Rationale
At the April 24, 2018 meeting of the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, John Hanold (Director, Office of Sponsored Programs) presented information and answered questions regarding proposed revisions to Penn State policy RA03 Eligibility to Serve as Principal Investigator (PI).

These changes comprise a reconciliation of two existing policies. Federal regulations required a policy on serving as the Principal Investigator for funded research. Researchers with certain titles required prior approval before becoming eligible. However, with the recent changes to AC21 Definition of Academic Ranks, some of the titles in the table in RA03 were obsolete and needed to be changed.

This proposal simply makes the necessary changes and has already been endorsed by relevant parties. These revisions do not change anyone’s eligibility.

Recommendation
At its April 24, 2018 meeting, the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity voted to endorse the proposed revisions to policy RA03, Eligibility to Serve as Principal Investigator (PI), and to recommend that the Senate also offer its endorsement of the revised policy.
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PURPOSE:

To identify the criteria for serving as a Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI) on a sponsored project. Although the University is legally responsible to the sponsor as the actual recipient of a grant or contract, the PI is held accountable for the proper fiscal management and conduct of the project.

GUIDELINE:

Only individuals holding full-time faculty rank above that of Senior Research Assistant may normally accept the role of a Principal Investigator. In all cases, eligibility to serve as PI also will be subject to any applicable sponsor-imposed rules or guidelines. All individuals, regardless of rank, must sign an appropriate Intellectual Property Agreement prior to serving as PI or co-PI on a sponsored project.

Who may accept the role of Principal Investigator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Can Serve as PI</th>
<th>Co-PI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Research Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Research Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Teaching Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Teaching Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Scientist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Research Associate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Associate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Librarian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Librarian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Practice</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Faculty</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Research Assistant</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Approval Requirement</td>
<td>PI Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Scholars or Fellows</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Instructor / Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval (e.g., teaching grants)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor / Lecturer</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval (e.g., teaching grants)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Lecturer</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>No (except for programs specifically designated for graduate students, e.g., NSF DDIGs). Graduate students may be listed as PI on sponsor forms as appropriate, but the student's advisor will be listed as PI in SIMS.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Cannot normally serve as PI on research awards. May serve as PI on non-research awards (instruction, outreach) with approval of Dean and/or administrative unit head. May serve as PI on Cooperative Extension and Defense Related Research Units (ARL and EOC).</td>
<td>Yes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-PSU Personnel</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Service of emeritus or retired faculty as either a principal investigator or co-investigator is subject to adherence to RAG03 "Processing Sponsored Projects Involving Retired Faculty Participation" and HR45 "Rehire of University SERS and TIAA/CREF Annuitants."

**With Department Head and Dean approval.

***Collaborators from other institutions may sometimes be listed as Co-PIs on certain proposal documents (face pages, key personnel listings), if permitted under sponsor rules. Prior to listing a non-PSU collaborator on a proposal, Penn State must secure all required representations and certifications from the collaborator's institution. NOTE 1: The Office for Research Protections uses the term "Principal Investigator" to refer to the individual responsible for managing a research protocol (as in the case of human subjects research). The
rules identified above are not intended to establish the criteria for serving as a PI on such protocols.

NOTE 2: The College of Medicine continues to use certain academic titles no longer listed in AC21. Research Associates and Senior Research Associates at the College of Medicine may continue to serve as PI and Co-PIs on sponsored projects. Instructors, Senior Instructors, Research Assistants, and Senior Research Assistants at the College of Medicine may serve as Co-PIs and, with the approval of their Department Head and Dean, as PI.

FURTHER INFORMATION:

For questions, additional detail, or to request changes to this policy, please contact the Office of the Vice President for Research, or the Office of the Corporate Controller.

CROSS REFERENCES:

AC21 – Definition of Academic Ranks

HR45 - Post-Retirement Appointments

RAG03 - Retired Faculty Participation (Formerly RAG09, Processing Sponsored Projects Involving Retired Faculty Participation)

Effective Date: September 20, 2017
Date Approved: September 18, 2017
Date Published: September 19, 2017

Most recent changes:

- September 11, 2017 - inserted Cooperative Extension in the last row of the table of who may accept the role of Principal Investigator

Revision History (and effective dates):

- February 26, 2016 - This new policy has been created as part of the policy reorganization brought about by implementation of the Uniform Guidance (2 CFR 200).
Clean Copy

RA03 Eligibility to Serve as Principal Investigator (PI)

Policy Status:

DRAFT

Policy Steward:

Vice President for Research and the Corporate Controller

Contents:

- Purpose
- Guideline
- Further Information
- Cross References

PURPOSE:

To identify the criteria for serving as a Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI) on a sponsored project. Although the University is legally responsible to the sponsor as the actual recipient of a grant or contract, the PI is held accountable for the proper fiscal management and conduct of the project.

GUIDELINE:

Only individuals holding full-time faculty rank above that of Senior Research Assistant may normally accept the role of a Principal Investigator. In all cases, eligibility to serve as PI also will be subject to any applicable sponsor-imposed rules or guidelines. All individuals, regardless of rank, must sign an appropriate Intellectual Property Agreement prior to serving as PI or co-PI on a sponsored project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Can Serve as PI</th>
<th>Co-PI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Research Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Research Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who may accept the role of Principal Investigator
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Can Serve as PI</th>
<th>Must Serve as PI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Teaching Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Teaching Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Librarian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Librarian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Practice</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Faculty</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Scholars or Fellows</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval (e.g., teaching grants)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Lecturer</td>
<td>With Dept Head and Dean approval</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>No (except for programs specifically designated for graduate students, e.g., NSF DDIGs). Graduate students may be listed as PI on sponsor forms as appropriate, but the student's advisor will be listed as PI in SIMS.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Cannot normally serve as PI on research awards. May serve as PI on non-research awards (instruction, outreach) with approval of Dean and/or administrative unit head. May serve as PI on Cooperative Extension and Defense Related Research Units (ARL and EOC).</td>
<td>Yes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-PSU Personnel</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Service of emeritus or retired faculty as either a principal investigator or co-investigator is subject to adherence to RAG03 "Processing Sponsored Projects Involving Retired Faculty Participation" and HR45 "Rehire of University SERS and TIAA/CREF Annuitants."

**With Department Head and Dean approval.

***Collaborators from other institutions may sometimes be listed as Co-PIs on certain proposal documents (face pages, key personnel listings), if permitted under sponsor rules. Prior to listing a non-PSU collaborator on a proposal, Penn State must secure all required representations and certifications from the collaborator’s institution. NOTE 1: The Office for Research Protections uses the term "Principal Investigator" to refer to the individual responsible for managing a research protocol (as in the case of human subjects research). The rules identified above are not intended to establish the criteria for serving as a PI on such protocols.

NOTE 2: The College of Medicine continues to use certain academic titles no longer listed in AC21. Research Associates and Senior Research Associates at the College of Medicine may continue to serve as PI and Co-PIs on sponsored projects. Instructors, Senior Instructors, Research Assistants, and Senior Research Assistants at the College of Medicine may serve as Co-PIs and, with the approval of their Department Head and Dean, as PI.

**FURTHER INFORMATION:**

For questions, additional detail, or to request changes to this policy, please contact the Office of the Vice President for Research or the Office of the Corporate Controller.

**CROSS REFERENCES:**

- AC21 – Definition of Academic Ranks
- HR45 - Post-Retirement Appointments
- RAG03 - Retired Faculty Participation (Formerly RAG09, Processing Sponsored Projects Involving Retired Faculty Participation)

Effective Date: September 20, 2017
Date Approved: September 18, 2017
Date Published: September 19, 2017

Most recent changes:

- Spring 2018 – Updated faculty ranks to harmonize policy with AC21.
- September 11, 2017 - inserted Cooperative Extension in the last row of the table of who may accept the role of Principal Investigator.

Revision History (and effective dates):
February 26, 2016 - This new policy has been created as part of the policy reorganization brought about by implementation of the Uniform Guidance (2 CFR 200).
Assistant General Counsel, Zahraa Zalzala, will give a presentation on examples of permissible and prohibited political campaign activity.

Classroom Activity

Permissible Activity: Offering a political science course that involves an examination of political campaign strategy and requires students to participate in a political campaign of a candidate of their choosing. Permissible activity so long as the student selects their own candidate and the University and faculty are not involved and do not influence the choice of candidate or the student’s work during the campaign. University resources (including facilities and services) are not used in connection with the student’s campaign work.

Permissible Activity: Where relevant to the subject matter of a course and its learning objectives, and as part of a neutral discussion of academic issues, Professor tells students how he intends to vote in an upcoming election.

Prohibited Activity: In response to recent news about the change in position of a particular political party, political science professor uses considerable amount of classroom time encouraging students not to vote for any member of that party that is currently running for public office.

Educational/Research Activities

Permissible Activity: faculty members maintain an academic blog on politics and elections in the United States. The blog contains educational articles written by faculty members in their areas of expertise, including topics such as the history of political party system in the U.S., economic impact of proposed ballot items, and the psychological effects of an election cycle. The blog does not evaluate, rate, or summarize the position of any candidate running for office. This blog is purely educational in nature and research is conducted as part of the University’s mission.

Prohibited Activity: One week prior to election, a faculty member posts an article on his academic unit’s Facebook page rating the fitness of all candidates running for local judicial office. The article states that the candidates are rated based on factors such as education, experience, and prior leadership roles, and information was disseminated with the goal of ensuring that those candidates with the proper character and fitness are elected. The timing of the publication, the rating system, and the goal of the publication, suggest that this is an attempt to indirectly intervene in a political campaign. Furthermore, disseminating the article through an official University social media page could be viewed as reflecting the views of the University and using University resources in support of or against a candidate.
University Resources – Facilities

Permissible Activity: law school invites prominent civil rights lawyer to sit on an educational panel on diversity in the legal field. Even though the lawyer is also running for Governor, the capacity in which she is being asked to speak at the law school is not related to her candidacy but rather to her current position as a lawyer. This is permissible so long as the law school maintains a non-partisan atmosphere throughout the event and the lawyer makes no reference to the election.

Prohibited Activity: University employee with access to a conference room permits members of the community to meet weekly in the evenings to strategize a marketing plan in opposition to a candidate running for county clerk. Use of University resources without reimbursement, particularly those that are not typically available to third parties for a fee, to intervene in a political campaign in opposition to a candidate for public office is prohibited.

University Resources – Other

Permissible Activity: University President sends an email one week prior to the close of voter registration, encouraging all students, faculty, and staff to register to vote for the upcoming election. The email stresses the importance of community engagement in the election process and the potential impact that the election can have to the University, without referencing a particularly dividing issue or advocating or opposing any candidate. Voter registration education is permissible activity so long as it is carried out in a non-partisan manner and does not favor or oppose any candidate.

Prohibited Activity: University staff employee mails a letter to 150 of her neighbors encouraging them to familiarize themselves with the candidates for city council and provides a summary of the candidate that she believes will best represent the community. The letter appears on University letterhead and is delivered through university’s mailing system. The use of university resources, including University letterhead and mailing system, to participate in the political campaign on behalf of this candidate violates University Policy AD 92.

For information on permissible student organization political campaign activities, please see the Policies and Rules for Student Organizations.

For additional illustrations of “dos” and “don’ts”, please see the American Council on Education’s memorandum on “Political campaign-related activities of and at colleges and universities.”

EXTERNAL MATTERS SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE COUNCIL

- Mohamed Ansari
- Janet Hughes
- Lisa Posey
- John Nousek
- Beth Seymour
• Matthew Woessner, Chair
University policy AC76 “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” establishes the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and defines the committee’s scope and operation. The committee may review petitions from a faculty member who asserts that he or she has suffered a substantial injustice resulting from a violation of academic freedom, procedural fairness, or professional ethics.

The 2017-2018 committee received eleven new petitions from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018; roughly the same number as in the previous academic year (12 submitted in 2016-2017). Over the five years previous to 2016-2017, the committee examined between seven and nine petitions per year. The 2017-2018 committee also reviewed four petitions which had been carried over from the previous year.

Petitioners may claim any or all of the three categories of complaints in their petition. For the 4 cases carried over from 2016-2017, all petitioners cited procedural fairness in relation to personnel actions (promotion and tenure or other reviews) while two also cited issues with academic freedom. For the 11 new petitions 10 cited procedural fairness, while one noted academic freedom; one petition also cited gender bias issues. A case citing issues related to research was also sent to the Office of Research Protections for parallel review, while one citing gender issues was referred to the Office of Affirmative Action.

The committee completed reviews of all four cases carried over form 2016-2017 and finalized decisions on 10 of the 11 new cases for 2017-2018. One case from 2017-2018 was carried over to next year’s committee for review.

Of the 11 new cases in 2017-2018, informal investigations were done for 9 petitions, with the resulting findings and recommendations forwarded to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Of the nine cases resulting in informal investigations, the topics varied from denial of tenure, dismissal from administrative or other positions, appointment status within a unit, and issues related to research environments.

Of the 4 cases carried over from 2016-2017, three involved denial of tenure and one was related to personnel reviews. Of those four, three informal investigations were conducted with the resulting findings and recommendations forwarded to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; one petition was deemed outside the scope of the committee’s charge.

The chair wishes to thank all of the members of the 2017-2018 committee, each of whom devoted significant time and thoughtful consideration to each petition. The committee members express our appreciation to all ombudspersons across the University for their contributions toward resolving conflicts and disputes at their colleges and campuses. We would especially like to thank the University Ombudsperson Pamela Hufnagel who worked to improve processes,
ensure compliance with policies and training and supported the unit ombudspersons in their work. We appreciate all the work that Prof. Hufnagel has done in that post over the years and her long service to the Faculty Senate at large. We look forward to working with the new University Ombudsperson Mohamad Ansari. The committee also wishes to express their thanks to the offices of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Associate Vice President for Research for their cooperation.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES 2017-2018

- Lori J. Bechtel-Wherry
- Deborah Gill
- Marie Hardin
- R. Keith Hillkirk
- Barbara Miller
- Richard Robinett, Chair
- Keith Shapiro
- Robert Voigt
- Gregory Ziegler
In 2009, the Penn State University Libraries completed a multi-phase plan to transform portions of the Pattee-Paterno Library facility into a collaborative Knowledge Commons environment. The first very successful phase was constructed in 2009.

- Over the past several years, Penn State has invested over $11 million to complete further phases.
- Most of the approximately 29,000 square feet of work for this phase is on the ground floor.
- The existing floor plan will be reconfigured to include a Knowledge Commons-themed renovation to an approximately 17,000 square foot portion of West Pattee, including a large flexible meeting/seminar room, student group study rooms, and numerous informal gathering and reading areas.
- A formerly underutilized interior courtyard will be infilled. The new space will improve way finding and connectivity between the Central and West Pattee portions of the library and provide much-needed student collaboration spaces.
- An enabling project in the courtyard this summer allowed us to minimize student impact, secure steel material and pricing prior to the current upswing, reduce the construction duration by one month, and to move the construction completion date forward by six months to better align with the academic calendar. An improved entrance will lead to a renewed exterior terrace.
- The changes to the upper floors are associated with the courtyard infill, including the upper portion of the atrium on the first floor.
- The second and third floors will include open office and focus rooms and the third floor will also include a digital lab and conference rooms.
- The construction finishes will be complementary to the existing adjacent spaces.
- Of note: The enabling “Starbucks” project in the Paterno Library is a great success. It is Starbuck’s 6000th licensed store and opened August 20th. It is one of the largest stores on a college campus and it serves approximately 2,000 customers on a weekly average.
- The total project budget for the Pattee Library Renovations and Courtyard Infill is $17.3 million.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES, INFORMATION SYSTEMS, AND TECHNOLOGY

- Fred Aebl, Vice chair
- Mary Beth Clark
• Barbara Dewey
• Roger Egolf, Chair
• David Han
• Michal Kubit
• John Messner
• Jacqueline Reid-Walsh
• Francesca Ruggiero
• Shuan Shen
• Harold Smith
• Jennifer Sparrow
• Cristina Truica
Chair Bérubé called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 9, 2018, in 102 Kern Graduate Building.

The minutes of the August 28, 2018, meeting were approved.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS**

Chair Bérubé reported that the following topics were discussed at the Faculty Advisory Committee meeting:

- Lobbying efforts to defray the costs of the police presence necessary on football weekends.
- How do we plan to track the activities of rogue fraternities?
- Can we expand our new policies on FT faculty, to cover part-time FT2 faculty?
- Update on the roll-out plans for a University-wide Culture/Climate survey.
- Update/summary on the "phishing experiment" and any report if similar experiments are being planned for the future.
- The links between the President's Commissions (working groups on LGBT issues and so on) and University Faculty Senate.
- Explore policies that address bullying at Penn State and the possibility of an anti-bullying policy at Penn State.
- Explore distribution and equity of student mental health care services across the Commonwealth Campuses.

Provost Jones provided information on efforts to prevent Phishing at Penn State. As far as the future goes we are planning on a “continuing education and awareness program for anti-
phishing. It will include fake-phish exercises every semester, web resources, and in person training.” Education efforts will be extended to students.

There is a LionPATH update coming in July 2019. A faculty advisor survey will be conducted. SIMBA is entering a new phase, and it is within budget and progressing well. WorkLion issues are being shared with Mary Beahm. The RFP process for grants aligned with the strategic plan has concluded and 20 awards have been funded for 4 million dollars. The plan will continue to be sharpened and tightened at the University and unit level. The University is announcing a new Consortium to Combat Opiate Addiction.

The Senate is reviewing and providing consultation on the Academic Integrity Task Force Report Recommendations and revisions to policy regarding 3rd Party Content with Penn State Courses.

**Vice Presidents’ and Vice Provosts’ Comments**

Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, gave an update on key administrative searches. The search for a new Dean of the College of the Liberal Arts is ongoing. The Dickinson Law search is in progress and the search for a new Dean of Arts and Architecture is ongoing. The search for the Vice Provost of Global Programs is getting started.

The call for Administrative Fellows is open. This is a great way to explore the administrative side of the University.

Madlyn Hanes, Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses and Executive Chancellor discussed ongoing searches for chancellors. The committee for the Chancellor of Brandywine was charged at the end of the month, and a search for the Chancellor of Schuylkill is in the interview phase. Pingjuan Werner is serving as the Interim Associate VP and Senior Associate Dean for Academic Programs until a new search is concluded. The search committee is currently conducting Skype interviews. There was a ribbon cutting for the Scranton Launch Box.

Rob Pangborn, Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education, gave an update on applications and admissions. Applications are up 26% mostly because of the new Common app, although yield from the app is expected to be lower. Overall undergraduate enrollment is predicted to be up 1.3 % and grad 3.9 percent.

Renata Engel, Vice Provost for Online Education, noted that PSU World Campus continues growth although it is slowing as the portfolio of programs is completed. Currently they have a head count of 21,300 students. A number of new student organizations are being started to engage students in the education process and develop future networks.
ACTION ITEMS

A Unit Constitution revision from the College of Education presented by the Unit Constitution Subcommittee was approved. The Dean and faculty leadership of the College of Education will be notified of Senate Council’s action.

The University Faculty Senate has a consultative and advisory role on the academic impact of proposals that involve the establishment, reorganization, or discontinuation of academic organizational units. The Senate Council acts for the whole Senate in this matter.

A proposal to Change the Program in Public Policy in the College of the Liberal Arts to the School of Public Policy was submitted and reviewed. The proposal was reviewed and approved by Provost Jones. It has also been reviewed by both Curricular Affairs and Faculty Affairs.

The Chair of the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs, Michelle Duffey provided the following comments after consultation with her committee:

“The position of SCCA was generally in support as there were not specific curricular changes that would warrant a review by SCCA. Members encourage the proposers to make sure consultation is complete and wide-spread to be certain there is not curricular duplication in the creation of the School.”

Chair of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, John Nousek, reported that the committee response was #5. We do not yet have adequate information to evaluate the (proposed action) and therefore request the following clarification before completing our evaluation.

The proposal will be brought back for the next meeting with additional information.

We had a second proposal for Council to consider from the College of Engineering. However, it was received too late for the two committees to adequately review it and provide their consultation at this meeting. It will be reviewed and discussed at their October 23rd Senate meeting and then come to the November 13, 2018 Senate Council Meeting.

DISCUSSION ITEMS  None

REPORT OF GRADUATE COUNCIL for September 12, 2018

Leland Glenna is our new Graduate Council representative. Graduate Council will have their next meeting of this academic year on Wednesday, October 17, 2018.

SENATE AGENDA ITEMS FOR OCTOBER 23, 2018
FORENSIC REPORT
There was one forensic report from the Committee on Committees and Rules to discuss the leadership changes proposed at the April meeting. After discussion, the committee decided that the report was not ready for the agenda. Council sent the report back to CC&R because Council felt that it was an attempt at a redo that could set a bad precedent if something does not go the way the leadership wanted.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS
Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid and Undergraduate Education entitled Updating Language on Conditionally Enrolled Students – Changes to Senate Policies 02-50 Degree Seeking Provisional Student; 05-82 Minimum Entrance Requirements for Admission to Associate Degree Programs; 67-10 Division I – Athletic Competition (University Park); and 67-30 Division III and PSUAC – Athletic Competition (non-University Park) The report was placed on the agenda on an Eckhardt/Szczygiel motion.

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules, Revisions to Standing Rules; Article IV – Amendments. The report was placed on the agenda by a Szczygiel/Ansari motion.

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules, Revisions to Standing Rules: Article III – Other Functions of the Senate. The report was placed on the agenda by an Ansari/Ozment motion.

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules, Revisions to Standing Rules; Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(h). This report was placed on the agenda by an Eckhardt/Nousek motion.

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules, Delegation of Authority, Section 1. This report was placed on the agenda by a Petrilla/Nousek motion.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS
Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, Revisions to Penn State Policy HR68, Postdoctoral Appointments. This report was placed on the agenda by a Posey/Sinha motion.

Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, Revision of RA03, Eligibility to Serve as Principal Investigator (PI). This report was placed on the agenda by an Ozment/Eckhardt motion.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS
The first report comes from the External Matters Subcommittee of Senate Council, Examples of Permissible and Prohibited Political Campaign Activity. The report was placed on the agenda on an Ansari/Ozment Motion. Fifteen minutes was allotted for presentation and discussion.

Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Annual Report for 2017-2018. The report was placed on the agenda by a Nousek/Hughes motion. Five minutes was allotted for presentation and discussion.
Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology, Pattee Library Renovations and Courtyard Infill Project. This report was placed the agenda by a Petrilla/Ozment motion. Ten minutes was allotted for presentation and discussion.

The final report was sponsored by the Senate Committee on University Planning, “Strategic Planning Implementation Update.” The report will be presented by Provost Jones. The report was placed on the agenda by an Ozment/Eckhardt motion. A motion to reorder the agenda was approved. Provost Jones will present this report as part of the Provost’s Comments at the beginning of the Senate agenda.

The Agenda for the October 23, 2018 Senate meeting was approved unanimously.

Chair Bérubé thanked Council members for their attendance and participation. The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Dawn G. Blasko, Executive Director
Date: October 16, 2018
To: All Senators and Committee Members
From: Dawn Blasko, Executive Director

Following is the time and location of all Senate meetings October 22 and 23, 2018. Please notify the University Faculty Senate Office and committee chair if you are unable to attend.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2018
6:30 p.m. Officers and Chairs Meeting – 102 Kern Graduate Building
8:15 p.m. Commonwealth Caucus Meeting – 102 Kern Graduate Building

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2018
8:00 a.m.
Intercollegiate Athletics – 102 Burrowes Building

8:30 a.m.
Committees and Rules – 201 Kern Graduate Building
Curricular Affairs – 102 Kern Graduate Building
Educational Equity and Campus Environment – 315 Grange Building
Faculty Affairs – 202 Hammond Building
Faculty Benefits – 214 Business Building
Intra-University Relations – 504 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building
Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology – 510A Paterno
Outreach – 114 Kern Building
Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity – 502 Keller Building
University Planning – 324 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building
9:00 a.m.
Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid – 203 Shields Building
Global Programs – 412 Boucke Building
Student Life – 409H Keller Building
Undergraduate Education – 110C Chandlee Lab

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

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

1:30 p.m.
University Faculty Senate – 112 Kern Graduate Building
Date: October 16, 2018

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

From: Rosemarie Petrilla and Elizabeth Seymour, Caucus Co-chairs

MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2018 – 8:15 PM
102 KERN BUILDING

Guest Speaker and Agenda:
David Smith, Associate Dean for Advising and Executive Director
Division of Undergraduate Studies
Topic: "Advising Matters"

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

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2018 – 11:15 AM
ASSEMBLY ROOM, NITTANY LION INN
A buffet luncheon will be provided at 12:15 p.m.

Agenda

I. Call to Order
II. Announcements
III. Committee Reports
IV. Other Items of Concern/New Business
V. Adjournment and Lunch