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* No Presentation of reports marked with an asterisk.
The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, January 29, 2019, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate building with Michael Bérubé, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Bérubé: Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the January 29 Senate Plenary Meeting. The December 4, 2018, Senate Record providing a full transcription of the proceedings of the meeting was sent to University Archives and is posted on the Faculty Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions to these minutes? May I hear a motion to accept?

Unidentified Senator: Motion.

Chair Bérubé: Second?

Unidentified Senator: Second.

Chair Bérubé: All in favor?

All Senators: Aye.

Chair Bérubé: Ayes have it. Motion carried. Minutes of the meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Bérubé: The Senate Curriculum Reports of January 15, 2019 are posted on the Senate website. The Committee on Committee and Rules has requested and Senate Council approved a request to change the name of the Undergraduate Education Committee to the Education Committee using the editorial process recently approved. For those of you who don't remember last year, because it was last year, this allows us to make non-substantive changes without going through the whole procedure.

But, these changes to the Standing Rules are on the Senate website for five days through Sunday, February 3rd. So, if any Senator has an objection, they should write to the Senate Chair, checks notes, that's me. And this report will be sent back to CC&R for regular processing. So, if you don't like to change from Undergraduate Education to Education, even though it really is non-substantive and does not change the charge of the committee, let me know.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Bérubé: Minutes from the January 15 Senate Council Meeting can be found at the end of your agenda today.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Bérubé: Announcements by the Chair. I have three. The first is a housekeeping announcement for our committee chairs. I thank each and every one of you of the 15 of you for the critical work you are doing for the Senate. Right now, I would just like to get a midyear update on that work so that the staff,
the officers, and I have some idea what to expect for the next three months. Your Midyear Reports are
due this Friday, February 1.

I am happy to report that five of you have already beaten that deadline. I really look forward to hearing
from the other ten.

And speaking of that deadline, committee chairs and vice chairs may remember that when I first met with
them in charge meetings this past summer, I urged them to think of February 1, again, Friday, as the
effective end of the school year. At the time, some chairs and vice chairs looked at me as if I had two
heads, but the rationale is this. Any reports you are working on must be submitted for consideration by
Senate Council by February 1 if they are to have a chance of being presented in our March Plenary
Meeting. Anything after that will have to be submitted on March 22 for consideration by Council for the
April meeting. And I think we all want to avoid an overstuffed April meeting that consists of vitally
important reports no one has time to read.

My predecessor, Matthew Woessner, was a marvel of efficiency as many of you will recall. And yet our
April meeting last year ran to 5:30 p.m. and included so many reports that our agenda ran all the way to
Appendix Y. Two more items and we would have to have invent extra alphabetic symbols like something
out of Dr. Seuss.

So please, if you have a report near completion, do everything you can to get it to us by Friday. I
apologize for this turnaround time. There is nothing we could do about it because last week included an
important holiday. At the very latest, we can accept some reports on the following Monday. But this is
crunch time-- not March, not April, now. Now is when we start to get some sense of what we can get
done this year in the scant time remaining to us. I am very happy to hear both last night and this morning
that many committee reports are in the pipeline for Friday. Thank you all for getting that done.

Second. In response to a number of informal queries, I have an update on the committee I charged last
summer, the committee that is reviewing the Consensual Relationships Clause of the AD85 Policy. Last
semester, we learned that the committee had decided to take that clause out of AD85 altogether since the
bulk of that policy has to do with sexual harassment, gender harassment, and sexual assault and create a
stand-alone policy on consensual relationships.

I can now report that the committee's work is almost done, that the report will focus on consensual
relationships in which one party has a supervisory or evaluative relationship to the other party or the
possibility of a supervisory or evaluative relationship, and that the report will offer detailed and rigorous
guidance for how to proceed in such cases. A final draft of the policy will soon be circulated for comment
to a range of constituencies in the University including-- and this is not a complete list-- the Academic
Leadership Council, the Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education, the Graduate Council, the
Staff Advisory Council, and, of course, the relevant Senate committees who will have this in time for
discussion during their March 12th meetings. We expect to be able to present it and vote on it in April.

My last announcement is a somber one. By now, many of you have heard, though some have not, that on
January 6 of this year our colleague and fellow Senator, Mary Miles, passed away. A memorial service
and celebration of her life was held last night in the Pasquerilla Center, but I think she deserves to be
remembered in this forum as well.
Mary was a dedicated, talented, and passionate teacher and colleague who served in the Senate with great energy and élan. Those of you who were here two years ago will surely remember the tireless work she did helping to reform our title system for Fixed-Term Faculty. Indeed, though the work of many hands went into that undertaking, I don't think it's too much to say that without Mary's efforts, that reform would not have happened.

Although I did not know Mary well personally, I worked closely with her that year and the following year when she became Chair of the Liberal Arts Caucus. And I was always grateful for her help, for her advice, and for her friendship.

I know I speak not only for myself when I say we will miss her keenly, but I hope that our grief and our sense of loss is tempered somewhat by the realization that Mary left behind a legacy; one that will affect every member of the teaching faculty on this campus and on every Penn State campus. I hope that will be one way she will live in our hearts.

Her family has asked that memorial contributions be made to the Farm Sanctuary in Watkins Glen, New York, in memory of her, or closer to home to the newly created Mary Miles Fund for Teaching Faculty. Those of you who would like to contribute to this fund can write a check to Penn State with the words "In memory of Mary Miles" written in the memo line and mail or deliver it to the Development Office in the College of the Liberal Arts in 13 Sparks. There is also a URL for those of you who would prefer to donate online. You can reach the link on the Senate's homepage. It's front and center.

Given Mary's advocacy for teaching faculty at Penn State and her long and distinguished service to the Senate, I think it would be altogether appropriate for her fellow Senators to remember her in this way. I now ask for a moment of silence in her memory. Thank you.

President Barron? I think we'll just skip that part, but he's always welcome.

It is my pleasure to recognize Provost Jones with some brief comments. Following his comments and a few questions, Provost Jones has been asked to clarify the concept of Temporary and Permanent Funds, (Appendix C) but comments first. Provost Jones.

Unidentified Senator: [INAUDIBLE].

Chair Bérubé: Oh, in that case.

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: Thank you. It's my pleasure to be here. This is a fairly tightly scripted presentation because there's a lot of detail and a lot of nuance to cover. So, but I will say, as I often say in advance of more scripted conversations, don't take that as any kind of deterrent. I welcome your questions and comments at the end, but just a lot of detail to get through here.

So today, I did want to take the opportunity to share with you an updated overview of the University's Temporary Budget. When I talked to you in March of last year, I shared information about the Temporary Budget and allocation of temporary funds through 2016-2017. This update includes information from 2017-2018 through the end of the fiscal year on June 30, 2018.
As a reminder, the process to set the University's Education and General Funds budget allows us to fund ongoing costs and to set aside funding for contingencies and long-term strategic investments. There are two main components of our current budget. Recurring revenues and expenses are in the Permanent Budget. Non-recurring funds for one time or short-term investments, such as faculty recruitment, and startup, or capital improvements, are in the Temporary Budget.

The budget planning process begins with modeling revenues and expenditures for the following year. A temporary budget is reviewed to incorporate additional tuition revenues due to enrollment growth and expenses that have been approved for ongoing funding. Units may carry forward funds from one fiscal year to the next that are less than 8 percent of their budgets. Requests to carry forward funds higher than 8 percent of unit's budgets must be approved by the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business, David Gray and me.

We need to better understand unit's non-recurring funds and get context for such carry-forward funding requests. So currently, we are asking units for more detailed information about their temporary budgets. And indeed, a couple of years ago, we weren't asking for very much information at all apart from a general indication of what they had those funds set aside for.

The University's total General Funds Budget includes the permanently budgeted revenues and expenses in addition to the non-recurring temporary funding. The General Funds budget columns on this slide include the permanent, initial operating budget approved by the Board of Trustees in July of 2017 for the 2018 fiscal year and the non-recurring temporary budget for the year.

Back in July 2018, when the information on this slide was presented to the Board of Trustees, the projected year-end surplus amount was $42 million dollars or 1.7 percent of the University's total projected income. We now expect that surplus to be closer to $90 million dollars or 3.7 percent of the University's total projected income. In the current fiscal year ending June 30, we expect to take $17 million dollars from reserves, the surplus, to fund one-time costs included in the temporary budget.

As you know, Penn State continues to face some financial challenges, including those related to the renovation and renewal of an aging physical plant. Ideally, recurring funds would be added to address these needs. However, to reduce the amount of new recurring funds that needed to be identified for 2018-2019, thereby keeping tuition increases as low as possible, an allocation was made available from non-recurring funding sources for this purpose.

The Temporary Funds Budget allocation process allows units to request funding for short-term purposes to supplement their permanent budgets. The sources of funds are approved carry forward of unspent prior year balances and new one-time funding from my office. In turn, approved budgets include funding for Fixed-Term Faculty positions, as well as one-time expenses such as faculty startup and pilot funding for new initiatives. The annual cycle starts in August when carry forward balances from the prior fiscal year are available.

This chart shows how temporary funds have been allocated from 2013-2014 through 2017-2018. Shown in purple, Academic Program Funds are allocated in support of educational priorities, teaching workload, matching grant funding, and other program related needs. Shown in gray, Capital Funds are monies available for new facilities, fuel and utilities, and major maintenance endeavors. Shown in green, the Central Contingency category refers to funds available for unexpected costs that arise during the fiscal year to support the University's operational needs. Shown in orange, Central Encumbrances are funds set
aside for specific purposes, such as investments in and implementation of university-wide enterprise systems.

Shown in yellow, the President-Provost Strategic and Reserves category refers to funding available for initiatives to support implementation of the University's Strategic Plan and its thematic priorities such as transforming education, driving digital innovation, and enhancing health. Other one-time funding is available for discretionary spending in support of high-profile initiatives and programs, such as Invent Penn State and the new Consortium to Combat Substance Abuse.

Shown in blue, Unit Encumbrances of funds for unit specific purposes, such as startup, research support, unit capital expenses, and other short-term uses. Shown in red, Unit Contingency refers to funds available for unexpected costs that arise at the unit level across the University. That's that little thin layer that looks like it's the top of the bars actually.

The funding amounts in each category vary from year to year. For example, since 2013-2014, we have seen declines in Capital Funds allocations, the gray blocks in the bar chart. Also, in the past three years, we have seen increases in Central Encumbrances, the orange blocks in the chart. These related to our work to implement the enterprise systems such as the WorkLion Human Resources Portal. Ultimately, funds for Fixed-Term Faculty appointments are all paid by academic units, the unit encumbrances shown in blue. We will better understand shifts in these annual totals by examining the more detailed temporary budget data units will provide.

Thank you all for listening. I welcome any questions. I know that's a very brief overview, but this is what we were requested to address in this presentation. So, thank you. Happy to take questions. Actually, if I may on the presentation or any other topics that may be on your mind.

Chair Bérubé: Right here. The guy standing.

Joshua Kirby, College of Education: Just a question about the 8 percent limit for carry forward. Are individual units and their executive officers, the deans and such, are they able to impose local restrictions? So, the 8 percent is a University limit and then the local unit can redefine how the departments and programs within it can do that?

Provost Jones: Yeah. So first I should clarify that 8 percent is not a limit. Eight percent is a threshold beyond which central approval is required. So, if you want to carry forward 10 percent of your annual permanent funds operating budget, you need approval from David--primarily from David Gray, but if it's an academic unit, David Gray and me.

Once that approval is obtained, it is based on a letter, or a request, or more specifically now a budget that indicates how these funds are going to be allocated over the next year or next several years. Once that is approved notionally, centrally, then it is up to the units themselves to decide how those resources are both aggregated and dispersed at the unit level. Apart from approving that request, we don't participate in how it's managed internally in the unit.

Chair Bérubé: Keith. And then--

Keith Shapiro, College of Arts and Architecture: Are there safeguards to prevent a unit from, say, using those temporary funds which are one-time funds maybe 10 times in a row, so one time for ten years
or something like that? Because we've sometimes seen, it seems like, temporary funds used to fund an ongoing project over time and time again over a number of years.

**Provost Jones**: Yeah. So, you've just exposed the other secret category of funds we have which are recurring temporary or one time permanent. I think it would be great if we had sufficient recurring resources that anything that was going to repeat for three, four, five, ten years was funded permanently. Often what we find units are challenged with insufficient permanent funds in order to do that, so they will reach into the temporary pool on a recurring basis to fund positions, fund positions or fund stuff.

Our strong preference-- and we encourage the budget executives, which in your case here mainly means the deans and the chancellors-- to use recurring funds for people wherever possible and temporary funds for things. That doesn't mean that, in many instances, we end up using one time or temporary funds for people. And a good example, in the context of the conversation is fixed-term one appointments that get renewed. Those people generally use one-time funds for that.

**Timothy Lawlor, Penn State Brandywine**: Lawlor, Brandywine.

**Chair Bérubé**: Please stand.

**Timothy Lawlor**: Oh, yeah, sure. So that does clarify things for me some. I guess the question I have is you just mentioned that the fixed term or teaching line faculty are sometimes paid by temporary funds. And I guess I never understood how is that decision made. Why not have that just be in permanent funds? I don't really understand the whole distinction between permanent and temporary funds really from the base, but specifically with Fixed Term Faculty. How do you decide that they are temporary funds not permanent funds?

**Provost Jones**: Yeah. OK. So, there's a need to unpack that question at several levels starting with we don't understand permanent and temporary funds. Neither do we, actually.

Just kidding. But there is an interesting history here and I think it is worth sharing with this group, because Penn State is-- I think most institutions have the notion that there are costs that recur and costs that occur one time. But we've sort of cemented that in this notion of permanent funds for recurring and temporary funds for one time.

The history is interesting. We were able to trace it back to about 1959 when, presumably, Penn State's entire budget was on a single page. And there was a meeting. And people at that meeting were equipped with red pencils and blue pencils. And with the red pencils, after discussion, changes that were made to the budget that were intended to be permanent were made in red. And changes that were to be implemented for the following year, but then revert to the original budget were made in blue. Right? So permanent and temporary changes to the budget. At some point between 1959 and now that morphed into sort of the notion of a Permanent Budget that recurred and a Temporary Budget that was more transient.

In terms of what funds are used for, for what purpose, there is nothing to stop permanent funds being used as a source of funding for Fixed-Term one or Fixed-Term multi-year, two, three, four, five, whatever. There is policy restriction on using one-time funds, or temporary funds, for Fixed-Term multi-year appointments that are four or five years in duration. And the check and balance behind that is simply
that if you are committing through a contract to a five-year appointment, but you haven't identified a source of funds for that five-year period, there is risk to the unit, and to the institution, and to the individual for that matter. It's sort of making a commitment of resources that you haven't necessarily put aside.

Five years ago, that applied to Fixed-Term two-year, three-year, four year, five year. And in the last several years, we relaxed that a little bit to give units a bit more flexibility. So now temporary funds can be used for Fixed-Term one, Fixed-Term multi-year, two, and three-year appointments. Four and five require permanent funds.

So that's the way that works. And it really is-- I would interpret it as-- a commitment to an individual that we're putting-- before a Fixed-Term multi-year, four, or five-year contract is offered, the unit is saying I have a recurring source of funding that will cover you through that time period. So, we've relaxed a little bit to make it more flexible, the policy, but still for those longer-term appointments, it needs to be a recurring source of funds to cover them.

Chair Bérubé: All right.

Laura Pauley, College of Engineering: How is it decided what percentage of income or revenue is labeled as temporary? For example, tuition that's received- what percentage is labeled, then, as temporary?

Provost Jones: Yeah. So actually, it's the converse that we think about. And that is what do we identify as permanent sources of revenue? And what is left beyond that are revenues that we aren't necessarily comfortable on counting on being there the following year.

So, in the case of tuition and through the admissions process, there is a level set which is our target enrollment for the University. And, in particular for Admissions, it's the target number of students we anticipate bringing in as freshmen. We use that as a baseline from which the Permanent Budget is set. If we exceed those enrollments, the amount above that, or the tuition that is generated for enrollments in excess of that modeled number or planned number, we take as windfall revenue that, obviously, we hope we will have the following year, but from a planning and modeling perspective, we don't count on it. And so, we allow that-- that is a big source of temporary funds. Many other fund sources have equivalent stories associated with them but given that tuition is order 81 percent of our Education and General Funds revenue that, what I just described, is probably the biggest driver of the temporary pools.

Chair Bérubé: OK. In the back. [INAUDIBLE]. No, Bonj, sorry.

Bonj Szczygiel, College of Arts and Architecture: Hello, Provost Jones. Bonj Szczygiel from the College of Arts and Architecture. And I am-- first, I can't believe I'm standing here asking a question about University budget issues and they're not what I do, but here I am. And it's a question I asked last spring, and it has to do with the Voluntary Retirement Program. At one point in time, there was an estimated $67 million dollars that were going to be somehow recouped through salary or benefits from the almost 600 people that chose to retire, 300 or so were faculty. And I can see how complicated mushing the funds around and allocating them.

But I'm wondering how that-- if you have a handle on what the impact was on the new hiring of faculty to replace those staff and voluntarily retiring faculty. It was suggested at the time that it was going to give
us some organizational elbow room and allow us to rethink the way we do business. So, I'm wondering what's happened there.

Provost Jones: Who said that?

Bonj Szczygiel: David Gray.

Provost Jones: I said that? OK.

Bonj Szczygiel: No, David Gray.

Provost Jones: Thanks. So, it was 597 people took the voluntary retirement program. And if you took each one of those individuals and added up their salaries in a big column what was the total of that column was order $60 or-so million dollars.

We committed with all of the budget executives across the University, deans, chancellors, and others, that when we knew who was taking the program, each of them could submit a request for what-- I think we phrased-- immediate rehires, and these were to replace mission critical positions in a lot of the academic support and in other units and, frankly, faculty in the academic units. We couldn't have students showing up for class and nobody to teach it. So, obviously, in many instances, those immediate rehire requests were focused on faculty.

In that context, I reviewed every one of those requests for the colleges at University Park, Madlyn Hanes reviewed the requests from the Campuses. And then Madlyn and I discussed in aggregate the request from the Campuses. And I would say that we likely approved order 98 percent of those requests for immediate rehires to backfill critical instructional and other support positions.

In many instances, we were replacing more senior people with more junior people who were hired to replace them. So, at the end of the day, out of that $60 plus million dollars that was on the table, there was order $14 million dollars in savings that were realized. Which meant that, basically, we didn't have to raise tuition because that $14 million dollars was available from the VRP source.

That, as you know faculty hiring processes, can often take a year. They can often take a couple of years. In some units, where there were a large number of people who took the VRP, it was prudent to spread the faculty hiring out over a two- or three-year process. So, this has continued to play out. It required a lot of additional investment from central to support startup packages for those new faculty. But we believe that that was an investment that obviously was worth making.

In some units, the number of faculty members hired after the VRP exceeded the number that took the VRP simply because the retirement of more senior, more highly compensated people created a little bit more space for the deans to be creative and hire a few more entry level faculty. So, in some units, we actually saw the numbers projected to increase as a result of the VRP.

I don't have the data with me that sort of shows how that all played out. But it's certainly something that we can provide and share with the Senate if it's interested in seeing that in more detail.

Chair Bérubé: Bonj.
Bonj Szczygiel: I'm just curious, probably more specifically, whether that impacted the percentage of fixed term faculty versus tenure track, curious about that number.

Provost Jones: I think it did. The intention was that it gave us an opportunity to-- it gave academic units, departments, colleges, campuses, the opportunity with not sort of an individual hire on the table, but several hires to more strategically allocate those resources to faculty hiring and do something-- that I've talked about a lot and Eric has talked about a lot-- and that is to allow academic units to make decisions about the composition of their faculty based on their perception of academic need rather than what the budget permitted in the past. So, I don't have the data. I suspect we would have seen probably a slight uptick in the proportion of tenure line faculty in most cases. But we can get those data.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you, Provost Jones.

Provost Jones: Thank you, very much.

**COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY**

Chair Bérubé: I'd like now to invite President Barron to make comments and take a few questions.

Eric Barron, President: So, I've been late for every single thing I've done today. And--

Chair Bérubé: You're always welcome.

President Barron: --and it continues. So, my apologies for that. Good discussion on temporary and permanent. It's something we spend a lot of time thinking about. And of course, if we didn't make long-term commitments, we probably wouldn't think this way at all. But between the fluctuations that occur in the largest driver of the budget, the number of students we have, and the fact that we never know whether a steady increase is actually a steady increase and so we always assume that it's not and that it could go the other way as a safety net as a mechanism to make sure that we have this and we can keep our commitments. But unfortunately, it does result in a very strange, kind of complicated thought process about what's actually temporary and what's not. So, it was a good discussion and one that we think a lot, a lot about.

OK. So, I thought I would just take two issues that are issues in the news and make sure you heard it directly from me. One of the things we're hearing from different people, certainly student groups, is whether or not this University should have issued an alert because of the shooting. And so, I wanted to make sure that you understood that we went through this very carefully after-the-fact to see whether or not there was a potential to do things differently. So, I want you to just understand the issues that are there.

So, first of all, this was not in our jurisdiction. Now what that actually means is that we don't have boots-on-the-ground that are sitting there in the midst of everything that's going on. The communication we get is dependent on the information being passed to us. So, it would be very tricky for us to issue alerts when the information that we have is second hand, not the primary source of information.

You can also imagine that there might be some real pitfalls here if we hear one thing-- an individual going down this street towards this direction-- and in the meantime that person turns around and goes the
other way and we don't know it for 15 minutes. Then all of a sudden, we have the potential that we're actually providing bad information if we're assuming that what we know is up to date.

And, believe me, the other jurisdictions aren't going to sit there and say let's have constant communication with something going on in another jurisdiction. So, it would be very unusual for us to take on a communication strategy for events for which the chain of command was somewhere else. And, as a matter of fact, this is one of the things that they really teach you in emergency management is to make sure—like in the case of myself if something were to happen on campus, I need to step aside to make sure that those people that are boots on the ground and are professionals are the ones that are making the decision rather than hearing from me, even though I might be briefed every ten minutes or 15 minutes or 30 minutes.

So, another factor, of course, is 24 locations, our employees and students throughout a county, in the particular case for Centre County, so what is the limit you will define that you report or not report. That something becomes very tricky, especially with so many different safety jurisdictions within them.

The third thing about it is, in fact, the assessment at the incident which was viewed as a disturbance between two individuals with other individuals interfering. We will see how that plays out. So, the decision in State College was that this was not somebody out on a rampage. This was an event that had concluded. Of course, there was an unfortunate outcome there as he broke into another residence. But their decision was not that this was any longer an active case, this was a pursuit case. This also changes the way they think about what the messages are.

The other element is that it was rapidly unfolding. So, this start-to-stop is a little bit more than an hour. So even the people that communicate to Penn State Police officers, each time this is so rapidly evolving, they're not stopping to say, OK, what do we communicate?

All right. The sheer lack of knowledge for Penn State and what the specifics were is also problematic, because that would lend you to why not a general statement. There is a shooter in State College. OK. This actually has a profound negative impact as well. And now you're providing information that you might create lots and lots of different problems, because you've not been specific at all.

All of those things are arguments and reasons why Penn State would not take the lead in being the communication. We do have cases in the past for which State College Police have come to the Penn State Police and said please issue this alert or warning because of something that was going on. And we would follow that lead. But we wouldn't dream, in our 24 jurisdictions, that we would take the lead in the communication when our boots aren't the ones that are on the ground knowing what's going on, because that would create lots and lots of different problems, including different types of messaging going out to different types of people and then creating confusion.

So, I just want you to hear that we went through this afterwards very carefully going through the timeline-- when we learned, what we might have done, what would have been appropriate or not. And you did see the State College Police Chief say, “Wait a minute. This was not Penn State's issue. And our decision was that this was not a threat to Penn State.” And he also said, “You know, when it was over, we probably should have found a way to say that it was over.”

We will look and every time we have events or characteristics we sit down to a postmortem, decide whether or not there was an opportunity for communication. And in this particular case, we will go back
and sit down with them and say, “Well, would there have been a moment by which you would have wanted us to say something?” But we're not going to go out on our own and say something and interfere with the people that are actually working the issue.

So, I just wanted you to hear that directly from me. We live in an instant world. And so, the press may have something out there. And in a one-hour event, who knows-- and people expect us to instantly respond-- but it would be wrong for us to provide the wrong information, information that's late, or to assume that even though we weren't there that we should be the communicator.

So, I'll just stop there with that one. If you have a question or comment about it, I just wanted you to know where we sat.

Chair Bérubé: John.

John Nousek, Eberly College of Science: I think your points were very well taken about the specifics of the incident. I can't speak for others in this room, but I believe that what happened, many circumstances meant that what happened is understandable. But a point I'd like to make is that I, and I think many, maybe all the members of the people in this room, carry with them notification devices on a 24/7 basis. This is a capability that did not exist in my younger days--

President Barron: No

John Nousek: --and now does exist.

President Barron: Yep.

John Nousek: And in fact, from time to time, I get messages telling me things like six months ago a sexual assault occurred on this campus and it was just repeated. And that beeps on my thing and I look at it. And compared to the fact there might be a person walking down the street with a gun that might shoot me seems to be that there should be a creative way that we can use this capability. Universities are a crossroads of innovation, crossroads of making these technological discoveries into practically usable things.

And so I think the question shouldn't stop with Penn State shouldn't be blamed for what happened here into a question which is ‘how can we make sense of this as a learning moment’ and see that maybe we can take advantage of these technologies in a way that is both legally careful, responsibly with respect to liabilities, not endangering more danger and risk and many of these things, but in ought to not to just stop with, well, we got through this one, let's not change anything.

President Barron: Yeah. So, I think the thing to discuss is whether or not there was an opportunity for a communication mechanism by which the State College Police wanted to put something out. OK. This is good. And of course, you have no idea how much I appreciate the way you framed your question, because the six-month thing, when there is no threat, is what we're required to do by federal law. OK?

So, you would think no imminent threat occurred for something six months ago. But if, in fact, we don't notice the minute we learn something that was on our campus, we get fined by the federal government. So that's why you get that notice. And does it make any sense? No, it does not, because there is no
imminent threat. It occurred six months ago. And it might be between two persons known, a date gone very badly wrong.

And so, what one is a requirement and the other is how it is you manage that level of communication when it's somebody else's jurisdiction and you're not in the room. So, you know, if we can promote that communication, maybe if we're exploring different ways in which, State College Police could provide the alert and we are the enabler, that might be a good thing.

But I completely agree with you. A good portion of a problem is the contrast between what the federal government says we must do about things that are happening on our campus and immediately adjacent, which come off as rather flaky in some ways like you've just described to prevent us from giving a fine, and then comparison to this. And you go, “Really? How does this make any sense at all?” And it doesn't. So--

Chair Bérubé: We had a question over here. Any mic at all. Thanks.

Thomas Sarabok: Tom Sarabok, Student Center from the Smeal College of Business. I kind of want to echo that gentleman's points and kind of give a little more perspective on the issue. I think the idea that there's other circumstances surrounding this and that we didn't have all the information is a very good point, but I don't think that's an excuse for not fixing things in the future. I think there's definitely a lot of things that can be improved. And I think you can see that from the student outcry in the media and that sort of thing.

Then also in terms of working with other police departments, on December 13th at 1:00 a.m., University Park Alert sent an email from Ferguson Township Police asking you to avoid the area Tudek Park about another incident. So, I think we already see here that there's already kind of a capability here even for very late at night, even for very general alerts that keep people I think safe. However, I don't think those were used, even with just a simple avoid this area, there is a police matter going on would have been very helpful.

President Barron: OK. So, I also think that's an excellent example. And it was a case where the jurisdiction on the ground provided a messaging to us that we passed on. And it was also specific information on an area to avoid. None of that information was available in this particular case.

So, it would be a good exercise to sit there and say what message should have been sent and remembering that this all took place in an hour. And just think about what message should have been sent, because then you might come to grips with, OK, what would be the consequences of that message if you-- because you're not talking about bars, it was over from their viewpoint and a domestic disturbance and one in which no students or faculty were involved and for which a town which our employees and students live everywhere.

So, you just have to think through in this particular case what message would have been a good one to send? Because the State College Police, until it was over, crashed car, a break-in, which happened in the last 15 to 20 minutes of this, they did not know where this person was and assumed that he had just fled after having this altercation with his girlfriend. So, we can't figure out what message should have been sent. The best message would have been when it was over if it had immediately been announced. But prior to that, we don't know what message we would have sent. And we want that instant information, but
I don't know what that information would have been in the speed at which this was going and the speed at which Penn State heard about it from State College.

But we look at them over and over again. But the example you gave, one that's happened many times, for which we've known a specific area and a specific case where we wanted people to avoid that particular area and passed on to us by the jurisdiction. And we passed it on. That works. That works.

In this particular case, their thought was this was over. They didn't know where the person was, didn't know what advice to provide to people. So, they could panic the county, not when they're in the middle of actively looking for his automobile. So, it's just unfortunately a different kind of case. And I keep racking my brains about what message should have been sent. But the example you described is the way it should happen, and when we know, and it's that specific, and we can tell people to avoid a particular area. All right?

Second one, real quick?

**Chair Bérubé:** Second one, yes.

**President Barron:** Well I just thought I would— and I'm hoping that you all were noticing and reading about it, but I think we've seen some rather profound positives that have come out of the Greek reform effort here. And we've really had the chance to have some rather specific statistics coming out there, including a decline from new rules from the old process to the new rules with 47 percent decrease in alcohol related crimes in the Highlands and a 51 percent decline in noise related incidents in the Highlands. Most important to me, there were 17 percent fewer visits to the Mount Nittany Emergency Room for alcohol poisoning.

This is truly significant when you realize that, for a semester, you're close to 80 fewer people that went in with an emergency. That's a profoundly positive outcome.

And some other things that I think are also profoundly positive, because when you think that Greek life includes thousands of students, the Panhellenic grade point went up three-tenths, average Panhellenic grade point went up three-tenths of a point. The average IFC grade point went up two-tenths of a point. So, we're also seeing a significant change in the grade points of the organizations. So, this is, again, a truly significant outcome.

Many, many-- and I'm talking one individual from IFC in a leadership position last night who told me that the people applying to participate in Greek Life are changing. And they're getting a more serious student. And in many cases, they're getting more interest in their organizations than they had before, which surely must tell you that there was some perception of risk whether it be academic or something else beforehand. So that in itself becomes a positive financial amplifier for the good behavior.

I have to compliment the number of leaders in Greek Life and alumni who have been in nationals that have been supporting us. There are still problems. But the number of individuals that are stepping up and saying we're going to be a part of this change is truly noteworthy.

Now we have a couple who are fighting the zoning laws in State College Borough in order to go private, which means that they would have no supervision whatsoever. One of them is already under serious scrutiny for the number of adverse things that are going on in the locality that may end up having them be
labeled as a nuisance property. But we see all across the nation that when you end up with a rogue organization like that not very healthy things occur there. And a lot of those are coming to light.

So, it's really important that we keep our commitment and that we do everything we can to make sure that we don't end up with rogue organizations that all of sudden become a haven for bad behavior because nobody's watching. So, this is something that we're looking at very carefully. The Borough is fighting back on this. We will assist them in any way we can, because with these outcomes, I'm serious, if we could manage this over several years, you're literally going to see a transformation of what Greek Life is in recapturing so many of the positives here in State College.

The other thing is that I really think that this is an institution that when we have a problem, we tend to hit it head on. And so, you may have noticed that there is an announcement of Timothy Piazza Center for Fraternity and Sorority Research and Reform. And that's because one of the things that we have discovered through all of this is that no one knows exactly what a best practice is. We just don't know because there isn't the data collection and the analysis.

So, we say, if we were to defer this, if we were to change this, it makes sense to us that we're going to start to engender better and better behavior. But in fact, nobody's out there analyzing this. And nobody has the data to do so.

And so, this is a real academic opportunity to add to a set of decisions on an important element of university life and take it to a different level where we can say the data shows, the information that we have, the analysis is this works better than this. And then we aid lots and lots of people in the process. And I'm very proud of the fact that our Board stepped up and said we should endow this. We should endow this as a statement from the University that it will impact this problem.

And many of you may remember when the Child Maltreatment Center was set up. And Penn State made the investment. And then when it came to write proposals, it became the National Center for Child Maltreatment. In my mind, this is the Penn State way. And I'm hoping that you'll see the Timothy Piazza Center taking on that same role. Where not only are we modeling the type of behavior that has more students wanting to be involved in Greek Life because of the positive benefits, but that it will be a leader in showing the way and how it is that Greek Life and student organization should evolve.

So, there was a commitment made by the Board to put $2 million dollars aside and to match any contribution up to our additional $3 million dollars with the idea that we would have an $8 million dollars endowed research center in this area. And then I think we start to have a profound impact.

So, I just wanted you, if you weren't paying attention to all of the news that is coming out there, everything from zoning laws to alcohol poisoning data released by Mount Nittany to what we perceive as the future for scholarship in this area that I made sure I had a chance to say it to you. I'll take a question on that and any other topic. And if it's in doubt, it won't be temporary dollars, right?

[LAUGHTER]

Sorry. Any other topic?

Chair Bérubé: Anything at all? Right here. Third row.
Wendy Coduti, Rehab and Human Services College of Education: Thank you. Wendy Coduti from Rehab and Human Services College of Ed, and this is related to the health care piece, which I hope that's OK to ask now. I know that's coming up down the road. But I wanted to read a statement from a newer faculty that was given to me and then I have my two cents to add after that. So, I apologize if this is a little lengthy.

But from her, she stated "Penn State is my third post-graduate job and second in academia. I have been here for a year and a half and have become increasingly frustrated with our benefits. I enrolled in the PPO plan, which I selected in an effort to control my health care costs and minimize the time and energy I would have to allocate to medical issues. However, this has not been the case.

My medical and prescription costs have been a significant burden over the past year. I spent countless hours on the phone with Aetna and my doctor's offices regarding denied claims and billing codes used. In one instance, I was billed over $900 dollars for a lab test that Aetna said was not medically necessary although my surgeon said it was. I had to coordinate information between the doctor's office, the lab, and Aetna. Ultimately, Aetna conceded that they had to cover the charge, but not before I spent two full days on the phone going over everything. As any faculty member knows that resulted in two all-nighters to catch up on the work.

I have also had to plan testing and imaging so that I can double up on what images and results are used for- regardless of whether the imaging modality is preferred for specific conditions. For example, I asked the doctors tracking my pancreas to also check my kidneys even though by their own admission this is not their specialty and I have had to hope that they are not missing anything. I recently elected not to follow all of my screening protocols due to the associated costs and the time and energy required for getting everything covered.

I also learned this year that even after the out of pocket maximum has met, you are still responsible for the copays. While this may seem a small issue, it contributed to significant financial expenditures over the course of the year. Due to some unexpected circumstances between October and December alone I had $300 dollars in copays. I am currently electing to quit surgeon prescribed PT because $60 dollars per week in copays is not sustainable.

Further, the prescription covered provided prices some medications out of accessibility for me. For example, a bronchial dilator is $210 dollars for a 30-day supply. And my maintenance inhaler is around $150 dollars a month. I cut back on my dosage last year which led to several trips to the urgent care when I lost control of my asthma.

Medical coverage and expenses should not be something that we worry about at an institution like Penn State. I really enjoy my job, but I need to focus on the research and cannot continue to allocate this level of time and energy towards health care issues.

During my first year here, I was awarded over $1 million dollars in research grants. And I was one of two faculty nationwide selected for a knowledge transfer opportunity with the National Laboratory. To continue to build a successful research program, I need an environment that would allow me to direct my time and energy appropriately. I respectfully request that Penn State consider health care options which will enable all employees to focus on maximizing their career-related performance.
For reference, my previous academic employer provided medical coverage which included five-dollar copays when we went to the University affiliated hospital. This included any therapy, PTOT, and all testing and imaging was covered at 100 percent. In addition, any surgeries or procedures were 100 percent covered. This level of coverage enabled me to concentrate on my career, not my health care, and significantly alleviated a lot of my stress.

Second. So, for me, I personally worked in human resources in another Big Ten University in a benefits office. So, I've seen how the sausage is made, for lack of a better term. And I know this is a very complex issue. But from the example that I just read, I think it's important that we realize that having insurance does not equal having access to health care.

Many Penn State employees right now regardless of their job title or pay grade are facing an undue hardship with accessing affordable health care with the current plan. I'm sure we all have examples or have heard story stories from colleagues in situations they have found themselves where they are making decisions to forgo medications, treatments, or doctor's appointments related to health care because of the costs. This should not happen at Penn State.

I've learned from working in HR that change cannot occur in one department or one office, but rather it must come from the commitment at the top in leadership showing that it values its employees. And providing affordable health care is critical to that. I've seen employers both larger and smaller than Penn State in both the private in the public sector providing a healthy workplace.

President Barron and Provost Jones, we need a commitment from the leadership at Penn State that employees are our biggest asset and that the health and wellness of all Penn State employees and their families is the top priority. We need to make sure that health care is accessible and affordable to all.

President Barron: So, I appreciate that very much. And we spend a lot of time benchmarking against our peers to make sure that we're not out of line. Incredibly important, I think this individual actually should spend some time with the benefits office to make sure that they're choosing the right thing that's appropriate because, obviously, this is a lot of things that are there.

But we're also in this position where anecdotally we're hearing about individuals. And yet when we go back, nobody is talking to the folks in Benefits about this problem or that problem and this particular bill. And instead that they're getting frustrated. And as a consequence, we're not assessing the data that we need to be able to go back.

I have had issues myself and went and said, “What is this?” and had it reversed. Now, I don't think it's because of the position. I think it's because they made a mistake in their first year of operation. It's very important I think that the complaints go directly to the benefits people so that they can see what's going on and see whether or not they can mitigate them as just a kind of step one.

But we're constantly looking at this. We're looking at it from the viewpoint of both a Senate side of it and an expert side of it using Penn State expertise in the evolution of the health industry. And like I say, every year we're benchmarking how it is we're doing to everybody else, compared to everybody else. So, we do take this seriously.
All of us are in the same boat. It isn't different from a staff member to faculty member to fixed term to administrators. We're all looking at this health care issue and the explosive growth in cost. But I appreciate the fact that you brought it to our attention. We will keep at it.

Chair Bérubé: One last question.

Gary Thomas, Hershey Medical Center: My name is Gary Thomas. I'm a Neurologist at the Hershey Medical Center. I don't want to pile on Aetna, but I would say I spent an hour a week with Aetna on the phone for all different patients. And there was never a doctor who takes responsibility for denying something. There's never a doctor who has any knowledge about-- in my case, I run an MS clinic where the drug they're denying or the MRI indication. And it almost always gets reversed, but they're usurping an hour to an hour and a half, two hours of my time every single week.

And about a year ago, the medical director from Aetna admitted under oath that they make medical denial decisions without looking at a single piece of medical information. That didn't surprise me, because I have never had a call with Aetna where I thought the doctor on the other side had any expertise or knowledge of the specific case they were denying. So, we deal with every single insurer in the state of Pennsylvania. And unfortunately, Aetna maybe the most frustrating for us as doctors as well as patients, I know.

Chair Bérubé: OK, one last, last question, really.

Jake Springer, College of Education Student Center:  So, I'm going to go back to the Greek Life Endowment. So, following the death of Timothy Piazza, it is obviously extremely important to take a learning opportunity, especially at the University where Greek Life is so important. However, there are huge, widespread systemic and social issues for much more marginalized groups on campus that are not getting the help they need, especially in terms of $2 million dollars plus. Right? And so, my question to you is how is this an example of not privileging the already privileged instead of helping those that do need help at Penn State.

President Barron: OK. So, I don't see this as privileging the privileged. I see this as solving a safety problem for students. And those dollars, in this particular case, are likely to be invested in faculty to study the problems. But we are seeing all across this nation students dying, students go into the emergency room. That's the problem we're trying to fix.

So, there are many, many different things that we could work on. There are many, many things that we don't stand up here and talk about that we do in Student Life or with different student groups. But quite literally, we are trying to solve a safety problem for our students. And if you look at many, many different things that are dangerous behavior, this has been a locus of it. So, we're trying to fix it. That's the answer.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you, President Barron. If I just may editorialize those numbers about the effect locally and State College in the Highlands are very encouraging. Let's just all hope it's permanent and not temporary.
FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Bérubé: Moving to Forensic Business. We have a Forensic Report sponsored by the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules. It is titled “Discussion of a Proposal to Reorganize Senate Leadership.” It can be found in Appendix D. Twenty minutes have been allocated for presentation and discussion. CC&R Chair, Keith Shapiro, is here to lead that discussion. As Keith makes his way up-- continuing on with that? OK.

Unidentified Senator: [INAUDIBLE].

Chair Bérubé: I can ad-lib. Because we have, for weather related reasons, so disproportionate participation from MediaSite, I'll be especially attentive to contributions to the Forensic from MediaSite. And if you're remote and you can't get in a question in time for the 20-minute discussion, please email us. It will be part of the collective discussion of this proposal.

Keith Shapiro: Could you refresh our memory at how long this is?

Chair Bérubé: Twenty.

Keith Shapiro: Twenty minutes? OK. So, we have three questions.

Chair Bérubé: The Parliamentarian is the timekeeper.

Keith Shapiro: So rather than read the background, because I'm sure you're all aware of what the background on this is, I'd like to get right to a question period. And let's address the first one. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current rotating chair-elect, chair, past chair system?

Chair Bérubé: Right here. Allen.

Allen Larson, New Kensington: I'm actually new to Faculty Senate this year, so I started in September. So, I'm actually not that familiar with the background. This was discussed before this legislation, is that correct?

Keith Shapiro: Yeah. It was in the Legislative Report here. So, what's your question?

Allen Larson: So, I guess my question is I have only been here for three meetings. And I've never seen a vote that wasn't almost unanimous. So, I'm trying to, I guess, understand the context for what's at stake in this particular discussion and legislation, if you don't mind.

Keith Shapiro: Well, our current system has a system where we have a chair-elect, a chair, and a previous past chair. In this system, it's not possible for us to have a consecutive chair. So, in other words, you can't have a chair that can have a second term, one after another, sequentially.

Chair Bérubé: If I may. By the way, I want to make clear this pertains to no person standing here right now or to my successor, Nicholas Rowland. Even if we pass it today, it would not affect-- and I wouldn't run for reelection anyway, though I love you all.
The thing is that we proposed a reelectable chair last year. What we would lose as a result is the chair elect. And the vote that came out of that last April was thoroughly ambiguous. It was 72 in favor, 60 opposed. So, 55 percent of the Senate liked the proposal, but we needed two-thirds to change the bylaws. So, we didn't know whether people were just sick and tired of discussing this, whether we wanted to revisit it, or whether the Senate wanted us to fix it and make it a better proposal. That's why we're here.

Ira.

Ira Saltz, Shenango: Yeah. Ira Saltz, Shenango. Yeah, I guess I was one of those who were sort of in favor of a reelectable chair. I've always been one who's never quite understood the rationale of term limits. That if you've got a representative that you think is doing a good job, wouldn't it be nice to keep reelecting that person?

So, you know, I think if there is the possibility of having a chair person reelected, especially for continuity in how fast this moves, and I think there's a learning curve with each of the committee chairs sometimes getting up to speed, and it's like you turnaround and it's the end of the year, and I think that certainly there could be frustrations on the part of the Chair of the Senate of, like, wow, there was so much I thought maybe we could do, and probably there's a lot to carry over to the next year. So, is there a possibility of-- in the case where there is a reelected chair-- that the runner up in the election or something could serve without the title chair-elect but serve on the council in place of a chair-elect? Let me just throw that out there.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you. Laura.

Laura Pauley, College of Engineering: I think Michael demonstrated the strength of having a chair-elect and chair when he made comments yesterday at the Officers and Chairs Meeting. He made the comment that he would only be serving as chair for a couple more weeks-- I forget how many--

Chair Bérubé: Twelve.

Laura Pauley: Twelve weeks, he's been counting them down. But he's been in communication with the chair-elect to enable continuity between the two positions. And that's the strength of our current system is that we know who the next chair is going to be. And that discussion and continuity can begin now in January to prepare for a smooth transition. The chair-elect knows that they'll be moving into chair. And so, they have a different perspective in communications and discussions. When they attend the visits for campuses and colleges, they keep in mind that there are issues that need to be brought forward next year, that should be designated to different committees for discussion next year. And all that is the training process going on as chair-elect and not as the person standing up front and guiding this group.

So that continuity is important more than what one person may possibly want to run again. And Michael described that process as working well this year as he is in discussion with the chair elect to provide that continuity.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you, Laura. It's not customary for the Senate Chair to contribute to discussion, but since I've been invoked, we're in new territory. I want to revisit what I said last night. Laura is entirely right. I'm already talking with Nicholas about what happens next year, because every new idea-- this has also informed my remarks at the beginning of this session-- every new idea that comes up at this point, I know I've only got three months left. It'll be Nicholas's charge.
So, there's something to be said for that. But what I want to say for it is that I am very fortunate that Nicholas Rowland is following me. We learned over the course of last year, we were largely simpatico on of most of the issues that have come before the Senate. We see more or less eye to eye. And so, an idea that comes and it's presented to me, I'm pretty confident that if I turn it over to Nicholas, it's in good hands.

If the incoming chair elect were indifferent to or hostile to the stuff I've been doing this year, then everything I initiate this year will be lost next year like tears in rain.

[LAUGHTER]

It is 2019, I had to do that.

**Unidentified Senator:** [INAUDIBLE]

**Chair Bérubé:** But seriously, everything depends on whether that transition is smooth. This will be. The last transition was smooth. And as long as that's in place, then, yeah, the transition to chair-elect goes with almost frictionless ball bearings. So again, that's the debate we're having. There's certainly an advantage to having the chair elect. Learning curve is steep. And there's lot to be said in favor of it.

But like I say, if I were facing a chill wind at my back within the chair-elect, it would be a very different atmosphere. Yes.

**Kimberlyn Nelson, Eberly College of Science:** And I just want to play the counterpart, because I like to do that. We're a really diverse body. So, someone's favorite chair might be someone else's, boy, I hate going to Faculty Senate because that dude's standing up there talking at me the whole time.

**Chair Bérubé:** Yeah. I know exactly what you mean.

**Kimberlyn Nelson:** And the advantage of a one-year term is most of us can handle something for a year. Right? And I think that's why you've got the 75/60 is because in there is this notion that because we're so diverse, reelecting someone, I think, we're never going to all like the same person. Right? And this gives a chance for turnover. And I think the strength is also having a chair elect, someone who knows they're going to step into that position, not a vice-chair who may or may not decide to step up.

**Chair Bérubé:** Thank you.

**Joyce Furfaro, College of the Liberal Arts:** Devil's advocate a bit. I think it's nice to hear from people who have been-- I'm sorry. Joyce Furfaro, College of Liberal Arts, Penn State Main Campus. I think it's nice to be able to hear from the Chair, and other chairs if they would be willing to discuss their thoughts on this as well. I think continuity is going to be there either way so I don't think that's a problem. But the vice chair has the opportunity to be elected the next year to run against-- as I understand it.

And also, it is a vote. It's not like we would get stuck with somebody we don't want. It would be a vote to reelect somebody. They don't automatically end up as chair that next year. So, if we, as a whole, did not like that person, I think that's something also to consider. I support this.

**Chair Bérubé:** Good. Nicholas, and then--
Nicholas Rowland, Chair Elect: Since we're breaking all the customary rules, I might as well say this too since I was brought up. As somebody exactly in this position, have I enjoyed my last year? I'd be a fool not to say yes. I mean absolutely. I wouldn't have run for the job. I mean I knew this was coming.

Would I have been ready last year? I would have readied myself, there is no doubt. But there was no need, so I didn't. So, I'm not sure that counterfactual really works.

What's more, I look in front of me right now and I see, for example, Nick has been in his role-- I think you told me at the ALP meeting a little while ago that you're the second longest, is it first or second longest standing provost?

Chair Bérubé: In the Big Ten.

Nicholas Rowland: In the Big Ten.

Provost Jones: Second.

Nicholas Rowland: We benefit from that literally every single day that we're in here. We benefit from that knowledge, that continuity in the same position over and over again. And whatever differences maybe Nick and I have had in the past, depending on how you look at it-- even though we're both Nicks-- I have to admit that if it was a new Nick every single year, we would be far, far worse for it. And I think that the leadership model that we have right now, despite the fact that I plan to honor it and I have always looked forward to it, is inefficient. We're training our leaders just in time to let them stand up for one year and then we're done with them. So, thanks.

Chair Bérubé: Gary.

Gary Thomas, Hershey Medical Center: I really like you as a chair. You're a lot of fun and you're insightful. And I would probably vote for you again if I was allowed to.

Chair Bérubé: Oh, my incept date is almost over.

Gary Thomas: I know. But what I'm just saying is it is an opportunity to build leadership skills. So, in this room, there may be 10 people who will be a department chair. There may be one person who will be a dean, maybe somebody will dean another college out here. And so, if we got somebody good and we all liked them and we had them for seven years and we had that continuity, we would get that benefit. But there may be seven other people here who maybe wouldn't get that development benefit. And so, like, for the University's sake I just wonder if we should be switching or at least have a term limit so that we can switch periodically so that we can build the leaders here so that--

Unidentified Senator: [INAUDIBLE].

Chair Bérubé: Yes.

Victor Brunsden, Altoona: I'm sorry, can I ask?

Chair Bérubé: Well, we're kind of already onto it, but OK.
Victor Brunsden: So, this the original legislation was originally written to solve a very specific problem, which is that the current three-year commitment prevents a lot of people from actually running for the position, because it is a massive commitment of time. It is three years of your life. It also, because of that three-year cycle, once you're through once, you're done basically. I have yet to see anybody foolhardy enough to run for chair a second time once they've been chair.

So, the feeling is that this is actually limiting the pool of people that might actually serve as chair. So, the original legislation was actually drawn up to address that specific problem.

Keith Shapiro: And this addresses the next question probably. What are the potential benefits and drawbacks of permitting Senate Chairs to stand for reelection?

Chair Bérubé: Jim.

James Strauss, Eberly College of Science: Jim Strauss, Past Chair. The disadvantage is that you get me back.

[LAUGHING] You don't want me back.

Victor Brunsden: Are you hungering for that again, Jim?

James Strauss: And I said-- no, not at all. I prefer my new role. I prefer to look at the great history the Senate has had over, what, 50 years since we've gone to this format. And if we even think back six years on Kulikowich and Ansari and Woessner. We've had good leadership.

So, major issues that we need to work on over several years, General Education as an example, Fixed-Term Faculty promotion schemes, and titling which we got through. These have to be worked through over many years, over many chairs. If they're a good idea, it gets perpetuated. If it's a bad flash in the pan idea, I don't feel that it does.

The notion that we're going to have less time involved, I immediately reject, because I count three years. You're talking about a vice chair and then a chair who might serve two consecutive terms, it's still three years. So, we're not saving people time.

The other thing I think is a huge advantage of the current system is that you don't have to be a vice chair to run for chair. You can be a committee chair person. You can be a Senate Council Member, you can be a member at large who just says really great things in our Senate meeting. All are welcome. All can get a nomination. All can run. All will be punished for running.

So, I'm a big fan of our current system. I really don't see advantages to a longer term and--

Keith Shapiro: We have a MediaSite question.

Chair Bérubé: We do. We're under five minutes. We have a MediaSite question. But I'm sorry. I'm not sure Jim was done.

James Strauss: So, I'm cut off?
Chair Bérubé: No.

Keith Shapiro: Oh, I'm sorry, did I--

James Strauss: The best training for me, quite frankly, was before I was actually even chair-elect. I was secretary. And before that, I had long standing service in Senate Council. So, all those are learning opportunities. And I am a firm believer that Senate does its business not through necessarily the actions of the Chair, but it's the committees and the committee chair. Certainly, they are charged by the chairs, but the work of the Senate is done by the committees and those committee chairs. Overall, the chair simply oversees the operation.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you. We're under-- we're about four minutes. We have a Mediasite question and then Matthew.

Anna Butler, Faculty Senate Staff: This is a comment from Kent Vrana, College of Medicine. "It is important to reiterate that there is always the opportunity for change. It is a reelection, after all. And we had proposed term limits of two consecutive terms."

Chair Bérubé: Matthew.

Matthew Woessner, Harrisburg: This is a terrific discussion. Woessner, Harrisburg. This is a wonderful discussion and one that should have taken place last year. I was the architect of the initial proposal. And we talked about this in committee. We talked about it with various groups. We talked about it with individuals. And the one place we didn't really talk about it was here where it's most important.

And so, I think when it came up in April, people are like what's the problem we're trying to solve and we hadn't clearly articulated that, which was some of the source of controversy. And this is a really deep and thoughtful discussion.

And I want to reiterate a couple of points. One is, imagine if we had a president who was selected every year, how difficult it would be to engage in long-term planning, strategic planning, Penn State 2025. These would be nearly impossible because of the having to coordinate with each consecutive president. And I'm not saying it's the same office, but there are similar principles of looking into the future and thinking about the long term is important and it is something that's difficult for us to do as a Senate.

Additionally, we already have multiple year terms in other contexts. If you think about our Senate Secretary, Ann Taylor, it's her third year. She's excellent. She gets better every year because she's familiar with the job. I think about Michael Bérubé who served two year, two critical years as Chair of Faculty Affairs in the year where we created the promotion system and the title for Fixed-Term Faculty. That expertise was essential in doing that job well.

And I think about our other offices, Parliamentarian, the Academic Trustee, the new Senate Historian. All of them have multiple years because we recognize that experience usually improves the quality of service. So, we're having a very good debate. I just want to say I thank the Senate for having this discussion, because it really deserves a sobering reflection including those important when we think about into the future, because this is how viable will we be in the long run as a Senate to both contribute
to the University's well-being, but also set a vision for the long term, something which is difficult on a one year tenure. Thank you.

Chair Bérubé: You want to address quickly?

Keith Shapiro: Yes.

Chair Bérubé: The final safeguard question.

Keith Shapiro: I think this is a critical question. If Senators were permitted to run directly for the office of chair, what safeguards would be required to ensure that the office holders would have necessary experience to perform the job effectively?

Chair Bérubé: Roger.

Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: The way the legislation was set up last year I think addressed that. And in order to run for chair, you needed to have some level of Senate experience as an officer before or as a chair. I don't remember the exact limits, but I do remember, in my opinion, there had been enough experience necessary. It was not allowing people to run directly with no leadership experience at all. They had to get involved in the leadership process in some way first. I think Council is, I think, allowed also if I remember right.

Chair Bérubé: Council, Committee Chair, Secretary. Your call.

Keith Shapiro: Thank you.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you, Keith. Thank you, Victor. And because that was a Forensic, we were just talking, nothing follows. We'll go back, and I want to reiterate, though, if you have thoughts about this that you'd rather share by email with me or with any of the other Senate Officers, please do. We will take the guidance of the Senate either way, any way, you seek to guide us.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Bérubé: We move to Legislative Reports. We have two today. Before we begin, please check your clicker to ensure the blue light is on to indicate that it's working. And if it is not, raise your hand, and we'll bring you a new one.

The Senate Committees on Admissions, Records Scheduling and Student Aid and the Senate Committee on Education, “Revision to Policies on Academic Advising: Changes to Policies 32-00 Advising Policy; 32-10 The University’s Advising Program; 32-20 The Nature of the University Advising Program; 32-30 Responsibilities of Advisers and Advisees; 32-40 Assignment of Adviser; and 32-50 Audit of Unfulfilled Requirements.” Let's just call this the ‘Advising Report’. Appendix E.

Elizabeth Seymour, Altoona: Yes.
Chair Bérubé: Committee chairs Mary Beth Williams and Beth Seymour are here to present the report and answer questions. A report is brought to the floor. Here we go.

Elizabeth Seymour: We're also being joined up here by two faculty, Jacob Moore and Jonna Belanger, who both sit on the Undergraduate Advising Council in case there are any specific questions about that. And we're also, I'm going to ask David Smith, who's from the Advising Office to come up too and speak. I just wanted to start by saying that this is a very comprehensive report.

You've seen from both now Education and ARSSA over the past year or so, reports where we're trying to be more consistent with language and being more holistic in the vision of that section of our policy. And so that's why you see so many changes at once. If I can ask David to speak and sort of give the overall vision for this.

David Smith, Executive Director, Division of Undergraduate Studies: Thank you, Beth. So, I am David Smith. I'm the Executive Director at the Division of Undergraduate Studies, and I also have responsibilities as Associate Dean for Advising. I along with members of the University Advising Council really worked on this-- this policy rewrite. Academic advising is really a critical part of the educational mission of any university.

Penn State has had an advising policy that's embedded in its Senate policy for several decades. This attempt is really to try to re-imagine that. There are professional standards in the world of academic advising established by NACADA, established by the-- by CAS, the Council for Higher Education-- Standards in Higher Education.

And what we're really trying to think about are, what are the-- what are the learning outcomes? What do we want students to actually learn as a result of their interaction with academic advising? And so, to really begin to do that, we need to think about how we structure that, right? How do we deliver academic advising to students really in an intentional way?

And this-- this policy, in many ways, is aspirational. It challenges us to think more broadly about academic advising, think about how we're going to deliver that, think about what those learning outcomes actually look like. But it should be that place, right? Advising should be a place where students are coming together and talking in a sustained way about how their education matters, right? What are the pieces of their education, and how do they come together so that they can really articulate what they've gained as a result of being here at Penn State for the four years that they've been an undergraduate? So, we're happy to take questions and hopefully vote on this piece of legislation.

Chair Bérubé: Bill.

William Kenyon, College of Arts and Architecture: So, I've been reading through the section here about the ‘advisor will’, and then you have 11 points that are bulleted, which are very comprehensive. But I think there's one thing that's kind of missing from all of this, and this comes from something that we've experienced a great deal in our major. So many times that's not even unusual anymore, where students come to us in their junior year and say, “Oh, my god, I've been wanting to do this major for so long but my advisor in whichever college or DUS said, oh, we don't have that degree on this campus or, in some cases, that's not even a job you can get.” Whereas, I represent one of the top 10 programs in the country in what we do.
And so, it's really, I think one of the critical things here. Line Number 10 says, "participate in engaging professional development-- in ongoing professional development to keep informed of and current with advising practice and University policies." What that should include is "comma, ',' and somehow, giving the advisors the opportunity to really educate themselves about all of the degrees that are on campus" - because I just don't see anything about that in here.

It says that they should they should know them, but it doesn't give them the opportunity to really experience what they-- all of the different things we offer. And we're such a huge University, you know, that's a lot.

David Smith: I think that's an absolute problem at Penn State. Academic information is an absolute challenge, right? The scale both in terms of geographic and scale of programs that are available. The mastery of those options I think becomes really challenging. There's been progress in the face of an academic bulletin that's online that does a much better job of presenting degree requirements, but it is-- it's an ongoing piece of what needs to happen to ensure that academic advisors are well informed and able to provide students with accurate information that they can then act upon.

One of the things that we would follow, if this is passed today, would be a Forensic conversation about what do we need, right? How do we get to that point where we're actually a better able to reach some of these goals that are embedded in this policy? So, I think continuously trying to think about how do we ensure that, how do we ensure knowledge of the different degree requirements, and that's work that we have to continue to work on. This is really a starting place to begin to place-- to put that foundation down so that we really have some-- some momentum behind us to start moving in a direction that will help us enhance the level of advising that we're providing the students.

William Kenyon: OK, thank you.

Chelsey Wood; Chelsey Wood, UPUA Student Senator and also the Academic Affairs Chair for UPUA: So, I just wanted to share a couple sentences from a resolution, Number 15/13 passed in November of last year from the UPUA supporting these changes to the advising policy. And just to quote it says, "Academic advising is the cornerstone of successful academic experience at Penn State. It is the responsibility of both the advisor and the student to do their part in facilitating the success."

So, I wanted to share with everyone that the University Park student government does support these changes, and we are very excited to work on their implementation and seeing how about these advising changes will help students in the future.

Chair Bérubé: Alan and then no, we'll do it in that order. So, yeah, to your right and then Alan. I'm sorry. I don't know your name.

Kevin McDade, Penn State Shenango.: I read through the report, and one of the things that I wanted to reiterate was it seems that at the individual Commonwealth Campuses, sometimes there's a need to try to keep your students on your campus. And I think that's something that we've seen on a lot of our different locations.

But, you know, there's this whole notion that we have all these degrees. I think there needs to be kind of a support from the individual centers that it's OK if you don't make it in say anatomy, that you can go into
another field, even if that takes you off of our campus. But that also needs to come from kind of the notion of support for a campus to do such a thing, and I hope that that's iterated with that report. Thanks.

Chair Bérubé: OK, Alan.

Alan Larson: We had an interesting discussion among our Faculty Senate about the document, and there were a number of questions, but one that really stood out for a University College campus, which is that part of the ways that the documentation for what the requirements for tenure and promotion are within the University College include specifically language about advising as a responsibility for faculty.

I haven't looked at all the other colleges. I'm not sure if that's specific to the University College, but I do know that the way that the assignment of advising responsibilities happens is different on campuses and colleges. So, then there is a line that says, advisor will be assessed-- as-- and I think it includes a line, peer review. So, there's a lot of concern about adding a level for University College faculty of assessment for promotion that maybe is, first off, inconsistent in the University, but also with little understanding of what the assessment of a faculty advisor would look like, especially as part of a promotion and tenure case.

So, I'm wondering if David-- and it's a legitimate question I asked our brilliant advisor at New Kensington, because I know she's a member of the National Association, what does that look like? And it wasn't a very clear answer. Thank you.

David Smith: I guess, in my mind, the legislation largely is talking about the assessment of advising at a macro level, right? So, are we as an advising office, as an advising unit, helping students to reach the learning outcomes that we intend them to reach as a result of their advising, right? So that, in my mind, is that goal that we really need to be aiming for.

Embedded in there, as you're pointing out, is this question about how then does a faculty member who's providing academic advising as part of their comprehensive contribution to the University and educational mission, how does that get recognized, evaluated, and assessed, right? I think that's something we have to uncover through a Forensic in part, right, and sort of uncover where and how is that happening. And then as we move forward with any form of implementation really think about this not as a single one-size-fits-all approach to this, but we really have to think about, as the policy lays out, it's the unit of delivery that's really responsible, right? The unit of enrollment is responsible for writing academic advising. And I think we have to really push on those areas to think about and be transparent about the value that they place on academic advising as part of their review process.

That's what I would argue for from my vantage point, right? But-- but I'm myself, and I can't necessarily make all that happen, but that's, I think, in my mind, what we would want to see happen, right? This is really, again, from my vantage point, about how do we help students understand the value of their education? And, how do we put some structure around advising so that it's intentional, we've defined learning outcomes, and we're working towards that, right?

It's not just a student coming and finding out what classes do I need to take next semester? What do I need to graduate? But what does all this mean, right? How do I as a student, at the end of the day, articulate the value of my education both in terms of the major I chose, how my general education has fit with that, as well as the things that I've done outside of the classroom, right?
How do they shape and inform who I become as a person? Who's that person I can rely on for the time
that I'm here at Penn State to help me get that voice to articulate the value? That's, I think, the grand
scheme of what we're really aiming for in how we start to think more about advising.

There's a lot of detail, absolutely. And I think that can be fearful when it's unknown. But I think there are
things that were in place between the Forensic and other efforts to really think about this in a holistic way
that really respects the contributions that people are making, whether staff or faculty.

Chair Bérubé: Roger? Then the question from MediaSite.

Roger Egolf: Advising is very important. However, in my 30 years at the University, I've never seen
anybody seriously penalized for doing a bad job or seriously rewarded for doing a good job. And
changing that culture is going to be really, really difficult. The most important thing is that students get a
good advising experience, and it might be better in some ways to find faculty that take advising seriously
and give them more advising, assuming that that's what they want to do. And there are faculty that truly
enjoy advising, and maybe they should take on more of it and faculty that really could care less about
advising and do a lousy job, don't get penalized for it, and it's very difficult for me to see them ever
getting penalized for it if their scholarship is good and, in the classroom, they're good, I don't see a
faculty member getting materially penalized.

Maybe it's best just to give those faculty a pass on advising and just-- not that I think that they shouldn't
be doing it. But the important thing is that the students get a good advising experience. If that's what it
takes, maybe that's what we need to do.

Chair Bérubé: MediaSite.

David Smith: Yeah, I think that's part of what we want to uncover in the Forensic, if this passes.

Anna Butler: OK, this question is from William Wenner from the College of Medicine. "Would it be of
value to look at the resources needed to meet these goals prior to adopting them?"

Chair Bérubé: Short answer, yes.

Elizabeth Seymour: The-- I think, for me, the most important thing is that we have to provide good
advising to our students. That is incumbent upon us, the same way it's incumbent upon us to provide
good teaching in the classroom. So, this document lays out a vision, a coherent vision, for what good
advising should be at Penn State-- at Penn State as a whole University.

And while that does vary who's doing the advising across the University, that's part of what we want to
explore with the Forensic. The Forensic will also allow us to identify where we might need to ask for
additional funding. And out of that Forensic, if that's where we go, we want to continue with an
Advisory/Consultative Report to pass that on to the president.

Chair Bérubé: Keith.

Keith Shapiro: I support this strongly. I would like to add that there's my experience-- there's two
different kinds of advising. There's the official and the unofficial and that-- we'll find students who will
bring their degree audit to a trusted instructor that they've known for a long time simply because they're looking for the kinds of things you're talking about in this document.

I think that the real challenge will be-- is to put this in the hands of people, of as many faculty who are-- who are actually doing that work as possible and having them read it because I think a lot of people think they're doing advising. And I think this comes down to what William had said before, but maybe they're not really doing it the way they need to in order to meet the goals that we're talking about here, especially if those students are going to go to them anyway.

**Chair Bérubé:** Thank you. For the transcript, that was Shapiro, Arts and Architecture. Steve.

**Stephen Snyder, Penn State Berks:** So, Chair, I have a number of questions or comments about this. How much latitude are you going to give them to the chair? Can I ask several questions?

**Chair Bérubé:** We have the room for the rest of the night.

*[LAUGHTER]*

**Stephen Snyder:** All right, we'll wrap it up before 7:30. So my first question is with section 32-20. And when you scroll down to the section called Academic Advisors, Number 4, there's a statement that says, "should articulate clear expectations regarding their advising responsibilities to departments and academic units." I'm not really sure I know what that means. So, I would like a clarification on what that means first.

**Chair Bérubé:** Can you read it again so I can--

**Stephen Snyder:** Yes, academic-- it's section 32-20, "Organizational Structure," OK? And then it goes down to "Academic Advisors," and it is Number 4. So, I understand the other three, should have access, should receive, should participate. But then the piece says, should articulate clear expectations regarding their advising responsibilities, and I don't know what that means?

**Chair Bérubé:** Keep going. 32-20.

**Stephen Snyder:** There it is. That's it. Down one more, little bit-- a little bit lower.

**Chair Bérubé:** "An academic advisor should [INAUDIBLE]."

**Stephen Snyder:** Right there.

**Elizabeth Seymour:** It’s there.

**Stephen Snyder:** I just don't know what that means. I-- I am to articulate the expectations?

**David Smith:** I think it-- well, I'm confused too, I guess, at the moment, so I apologize.

*[LAUGHTER]*

**Stephen Snyder:** So, it's not just me?
David Smith: No. So, I mean, it's really-- that section is talking about the items that advisors have these responsibilities, right? And that they should-- it's that first one, professional opportunities, recognition for-- there needs to be recognition of the good advising, ongoing assessment by the supervisor peer review, and then should articulate clear expectations regarding their advising responsibilities, departments, and academic units.

I mean, some of that, I think, is certainly the ability to indicate where and when advising is actually happening, right? How is the advising being provided to students, for instance, right? What are those expectations for the student and their interaction? Are they-- what are the hours when advising is being provided?

Stephen Snyder: I, as an advisor, get to articulate that?

David Smith: In concert--

Stephen Snyder: Because what it sounds like--

David Smith: I think it should be in concert with the unit and the responsibilities that you have, right? So, it's going to look different, depending on the organizational structure. So, where faculty provide advising, that might look different than where advising is provided by a staff member who's part of an advising office as a professional advisor, right? And their expectation is that they are there Monday to Friday, 8:00 to 5:00, for instance, right, or something like that.

Where a faculty member may be available for academic advising in a different window of time, and those expectations need to be articulated and transparent, right? It's not just sort of catch me if you can, but there is some time frame in which I'm available for academic advising.

Stephen Snyder: OK. My next point is in 32-30. So, if you scroll down to 32-30 under "Responsibilities of Advisors." I have two concerns. It uses the-- says, the 'advisor will.' So, when I see the word 'will' in policy, I don't take that as directive. I take that as an act of will, which suggests that I have choice. I don't know if that makes sense to you, but it's not a directed 'shall', that I shall do this. It's an act of will and that I will or will not do it and that there is freedom there to choose if it is my will.

All Senators: [INAUDIBLE]

Unidentified Senator: We asked that.

Chair Bérubé: So, when God created man--

David Smith: Are you proposing to change it to shall then?

Stephen Snyder: Are you suggesting that it should be--

Chair Bérubé: Well, this was also predestined.

Stephen Snyder: --free directives, that it should be ‘shall’.
Chair Bérubé: I don't-- from one English professor to another, we may be dancing on the head of a pin here.

Stephen Snyder: My other concern is Number 5, the verb ‘ensure’. I don't know that I can ensure that they are aware of procedures and policies. I can give them to them. I can tell them about them, but I can't make them access it and read it. And anybody who has ever given a student a syllabus knows exactly what I'm talking about.

[LAUGHTER]

Stephen Snyder: And then my last concern is-- I'm not trying to be funny, but I can't help it. I'm not sure Number 11, if we scroll down, should be policy. This is the statement about engaging in scholarship of teaching, learning, and advising. I don't know that we should direct that. And I know it says the sort of weasel-words, where appropriate, and that's fine. But I'm not sure it really belongs in policy, and that's my point.

David Smith: As a person that oversees an advising center of professional advisors, the ability for my staff to be able to have space to participate in research and have it sort of codified somewhere in policy is an absolute positive to them compared to other institutions where professionals-- professional advisors are not afforded that opportunity. And there's nothing that-- that supports them.

Stephen Snyder: So, you're saying they're allowed to, not that they should be doing that. That you're not depriving them--

David Smith: That there is--

Stephen Snyder: -- of the privilege.

David Smith: That there is-- that there is within the work that they do for our unit, part of that could be scholarship, right? And so, there's space in their work to be actively involved in scholarship around academic advising. So, I think part of the challenge with this policy is that it affects not just faculty, but it affects a mix of people that provide academic advising at the University. And I think that's where we get some difficulties.

I mean, you come back to sort of Alan's point, right? Because I think one of the really central things for professional advisors for their evaluation, not in terms of what pay raise they might get, but in terms of their improvement as a professional advisor is actually to do peer reviews of each other, to sit in on each other's advising sessions and provide feedback to one another about the strength of how they approach different problems that students are bringing forward and having conversation about.

And so, this is a policy that really has to-- it has to broach a number of different sort of elements of our University and the complexity of our universities. And I think there has to be some recognition that there's going to be some ambiguity in order to capture the wide audience that we have to bring together, right? So, we talk about resources.

If we're going to do advising well, we're really going to have to be, at some level, you know, creative around where those resources come from. And, again, that wide audience that has to participate in this
process as to the policy, I think at some level, needs to speak to that wide audience that we're going to have to embrace in this process.

**Stephen Snyder:** My point is that as a person with approximately 20 advisees every year, it's not really feasible for me to engage in the scholarship of academic advising. And so, I'm reading it as the faculty member.

**David Smith:** Then it's not appropriate, right? So, it's not appropriate for you-- it is or it isn't, right?

**Stephen Snyder:** Right.

**David Smith:** But again, I think it really is--

**Stephen Snyder:** And that [INAUDIBLE].

**David Smith:** The scholarship is a really important part of this, right? I mean, if you really look at what academic advising is, it is an area of scholarship and having some way, particularly for staff that serve as advisors, to have some space to say that where it's appropriate for them to be engaged in learning more about how to improve the practices of academic advising through active scholarship and research, that that is a legitimate part of their work and work effort at the University.

**Chair Bérubé:** Speaking as someone who didn't write any of this report, I read words like will and ensure as aspirational rather than imperative, but that's-- anyway, we have a question from MediaSite.

**Anna Butler:** This is from James Fairbank in Penn State Erie. "I concur that good advising is essential, but the question is, who does that advising? In my experience, we need to have professional advising because of the issues with faculty incentives, rewards, punishment that was stated previously."

**Elizabeth Seymour:** And I think getting to that question, I think that's going to vary across the University, and that's part of what I'm hoping our Forensic will be able to untangle is some of what that might look like across the University.

**Chair Bérubé:** Carey, and perhaps to wrap it up.

**Carey Eckhardt, College of the Liberal Arts:** Just following up on what Michael said, in the document as a whole, we are being asked to approve it without a cost estimate at the moment and without anything in detail in terms of what the caseloads for advisors will be because these will be very different around the University. Could the proposers of the document agree that this is an aspirational statement? It's not a mandate and that every time it says ‘will’ or ‘ensure’, that's not binding on people? It all will depend on implementation that will need to come along later.

**Elizabeth Seymour:** That is correct.

**Unidentified Senator:** Call the question.

**Chair Bérubé:** All in favor?

**All Senators:** Aye.
Chair Bérubé: The report is brought to the floor by committee. It needs no second. Are we ready to vote? Senators joining the meeting by MediaSite, you know the drill. You may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, A, to reject it, B.

Anna Butler: I would like to ask that you give Poll Everywhere a little longer because I have 61 participants on Poll Everywhere today.

Chair Bérubé: Winter.

Unidentified Senator: Wow!

Anna Butler: OK, on Poll Everywhere, I have 18 accept and 9 reject.

Paula Brown, Faculty Senate Administrative Coordinator: And in house, we have 83 accept, 25 reject.

Chair Bérubé: Motion passes. Thank you all very much.

On to the Forensic, which was mentioned a couple of times. Our second Legislative Report is from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules. Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, Senate Committee Structure, Section 6. L? I?

Unidentified Senator: I.

Chair Bérubé: It can be found in Appendix F and Keith Shapiro and Committee Chair of Research Scholarship, and Creative Activity, Janet Hughes is also, no?

Keith Shapiro: Well you can-- if we need you, you can-- you can come up.

Chair Bérubé: That was just random. Go ahead.

Keith Shapiro: This report comes to CC&R or from RSCA. And its purpose is to give undergraduate research a stronger voice in the Research Committee. The mechanism for it-- for that, is to add an additional member, the representative from Undergraduate Education responsible for undergraduate research.

Chair Bérubé: This one's relatively easy. Any comments? Questions? The report is brought to the floor by committee. It needs no second. Are we ready to vote? MediaSite? Poll Everywhere? If you accept this motion, press A, reject it, B.

Anna Butler: Poll Everywhere, I have 26 accept.

Paula Brown: In house, we have 95 accept, seven reject, one vote not counted.

Chair Bérubé: Motion carried. Thanks very much.
ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Chair Bérubé: We have no Advisory/Consultative Reports today. And you've already gotten a sense that the days of adjourning by 3:30 are definitively over.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Chair Bérubé: We do have six Informational Reports.

The first is from Senate Council. The report on “Spring 2018 Commonwealth Campus Visits.” The Executive Summary is in your agenda as Appendix G. Additional details are provided in the Senate Meetings Tab of BoardEffect. We have five minutes for presentation and discussions, and Senate Secretary, Annie Taylor, will present. Annie?

Ann Taylor, Faculty Senate Secretary: Sorry. So, thank you, I know that this is a very long report, and I will not bore you by repeating what you can read, but I do encourage you. We had incredibly important visits with each campus. As you know, we meet with faculty. We meet with staff. We meet with students, each separately, and then we debrief the administration and also hear their own-- their own concerns, their own responses.

At each campus, we do hear unique things, and we also hear some commonalities across all of them. In our executive summary, I summarize, with the help of my fellow Officers, the common things we've heard. But then we try to tease out what some of the unique features were. The report itself, if you haven't read it yet, is only a few pages long, the Executive Summary. But as Senators, you have access to my full notes.

These are almost transcripts of what we've heard. I sat down with Nick, and with Madlyn, along with my fellow Officers, and we went over this information, and then they added their own responses and feedback. So, things didn't come out. This wasn't a session under redacting information. They added- so that we can really make sure that where there was misinformation- that it's been corrected, where there was agreement- it has been heard, and where there are responses- they've been added as well.

So, I do hope you'll take the time to at least skim the whole report. I know it's long. And do feel free to share it with your constituents as appropriate. If you have any questions, we can collectively try to answer them.

Chair Bérubé: One right here.

Kathleen Mulder, College of Medicine: I just wondered, I see that we had a visit at our campus, College of Medicine, in April, and I don't see it listed. I don't see it summarized. Is there's a reason we didn't get to that yet? Or is that--

Ann Taylor: Yeah, thank you for that. So, we did a separate report on Special Mission Campuses. So, you're right. We visited four Special Mission Campuses, and that was written up in a separate report, and we will share that separately.
Chair Bérubé: It wasn't an oversight. You're a different kind of creature.

Ann Taylor: You're exactly right, yeah. But they have also received a Special Mission Campus Report as well. And I did share--I actually had-- I will volunteer this. I had a request from the administrators at the Medical School to have a copy of our report; from that, to be able to share back. They took it very seriously, which was nice.

Chair Bérubé: That's worth recording, sorry.

Ann Taylor: Just repeat. Yeah, if you could just repeat that.

Kathleen Mulder: As Ombudsperson, I did receive a copy of it, but not a lot of other people did. So, I'll be interested to discuss it when it comes out.

Chair Bérubé: Great. Thank you, and I just want to underscore something Annie touched on because also this is her last semester as Secretary. The fall visits report will run to 68 single-spaced pages. You don't have to read every single one of them. I did. I can tell you also Madlyn Hanes does, Nick Jones does.

They give detailed feedback on every single item Annie brings forward, and her reports really are transcripts. If you have an idle moment, especially at some point over the summer, it'd be a silly thing to do, but also fun, these reports are actually full of amazing little details from each campus.

If you're curious about this, these things are incredibly informative, and they are, as Annie says, listened-to and responded-to. So, if you have the time, and it is a commitment of like an entire afternoon, these reports are well worth your time. Thank you so much.

OK, the second, the next report is from the Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits and Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits titled "2017-2018 Annual Report on the Status of Benefit Changes," something we have already heard about this afternoon in Appendix H. We have 20 minutes for this report and this discussion. Renee Borromeo, Ira Saltz, and Greg Stoner will be presenting the report. Welcome, Greg. Renee, Ira, it's all yours.

Renee Borromeo, Penn State Mont Alto: Thank you. I'll just do a brief introduction that this status report is presented by the Committee on Faculty Benefits on behalf of the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits. The information in the report is provided by the Office of Human Resources and JCIB is grateful for the continued invaluable resource information provided by this office.

The report was prepared in accordance with the six Guiding Principles endorsed by the University Faculty Senate back in March of 2016. Briefly these Guiding Principles include, maintaining choice of health care insurance plans, approximately 75 percent-- 75 percent, 25 percent cost sharing between the University and the employees in aggregate, affordability and equity, informed utilization, transparency, accessibility, and cost effectiveness, and the promotion of a culture of health. I'm pleased to introduce Greg Stoner, Senior Director of Compensation and Benefits, to answer any questions you might have about the report.

Greg Stoner, Senior Director of Compensation and Benefits: If I may, Mr. Chair, can I respond to the feedback from earlier.
Chair Bérubé: Yes, please. And thanks for kicking us off early.

Greg Stoner: OK. Thanks, first of all, for welcoming me to your session today. But I also wanted to thank the individuals who shared the feedback regarding Aetna this afternoon. I personally can't speak to the clinical aspects. Aetna, as any third-party administrator, has provider network relations professionals who would address those particular questions.

But the member questions I take very seriously. Dr. Barron referred to that in terms of making sure HR knows if there are roadblocks to your care, to getting claims paid, to having access to physicians or facilities, certainly exhaust the resources available, whether it's Aetna, whether it's CVS Caremark. But if you're finding a level of frustration, for whatever reason, please contact HR services. Please submit one of the Neocase inquiries through WorkLion.

I own the relationship with Aetna. I own the relationship with CVS Caremark. I will be contacting Aetna probably tomorrow. I have somebody working on a meeting already to address a lot of the feedback I heard today. That's how serious I take it. I know it's new. It's a big change.

Many of you have been used to Highmark for a decade, and I get that. There was a lot of time and effort spent on making the decision to move to Aetna. It was not a decision taken lightly. I think Dr. Barron and the Provost, would agree with that. But, again, we have a three-year relationship with them. We're just entering year two. And I want to make sure I continue to hear from you as the members, your families. I'm in the same plans as many of you. I, too, have provided feedback and, again, I want this to be a very healthy, productive, constructive relationship with Aetna and CVS Caremark. And the way we ensure that is that you talk to and share all your feedback with us. So, I just wanted to take a minute and acknowledge that.

Ira Saltz: Let me just also just add something real fast. Just to add to what Greg just said, absolutely. If there-- if you hit some sort of roadblock with Aetna, do contact Greg or somebody in HR. I have. You know, what? So now you're going to get all these e-mails. But I have, and I've been put in touch with people who took away the roadblocks. So, really, take advantage of that.

Chair Bérubé: We have a question here and a question here.

Gary Thomas: I think it would be helpful when we negotiate with any insurance company, on behalf of our employees, that we have a stipulation that says, if they're going to reject a test or treatment that they have to have a person with specific medical knowledge in that arena to do the rejection and take responsibility for it. So, it's not acceptable to ask a family doctor about an MS drug or a neurologist about an OB/GYN ultrasound, and they're employing people who are not competent in the rear in the area for the care.

So just preemptively, when we negotiate, we should be saying, you know, if you're going to reject something, it's got to be a specialist who knows that area. Otherwise, it's malpractice, honestly. And they're not going to report because they're all worried about their jobs, and they're busy, and they're stressed out. They're not going to report all these little things. Well, I'm telling you happens every day. That's the first comment.

The second comment is we have a similar policy, as this states here, and we've had it at Hershey for a long time, that your premiums and co-pays are based on your salary. And the notion is that it's fairer if
people who are making more pay more. So, our surgeons pay more than we do. We pay more than the nurses do. Nurses pay more than transport people.

But the problem is some of my co-workers-- I have a co-worker whose husband is a nurse, and I have a wife who is a radiologist. And we have a part-time employee whose husband is a private practice GI doc. In terms of family income, the part-time employee whose husband's a private practice GI doc has the most money. But she pays the least because she's part time.

My co-worker, who is a stroke doctor, takes insurance through her husband, who is a nurse at our hospital, and she pays less than we do because she's getting it through her husband. I don't get it through my wife because neurologists don't make as much as radiologists. So, I pay based on my salary. Whereas her co-workers have to pay a higher premium.

None of it is actually fair. You know, it's not about who's utilizing or who's really has dispensable income. It's a notion of an employer trying to impose a fairness which the employees don't always see. They see real world on the ground, like, how come their premiums are half ours. Well, because she married a nurse? That doesn't make any sense to me.

Ira Saltz: Let me just respond to that for a minute. Actually, that very issue you just raised came up today in Faculty Benefits. And I think we will have some ongoing discussions about that structure, just the assumption that the higher-- the higher salaried employees are necessarily in a position to pay more, you know, and that stuff. So, it's a good point to raise.

Chair Bérubé: Rose.

Rosemarie Petrilla, Penn State Hazleton: Just a point of clarification, if we have a concern, do we really call you or just HR or someone else in HR?

Chair Bérubé: Just not me.

Greg Stoner: Just not me directly. No, the way-- the most proper and most efficient way to do it is going through HR Services or submit through the WorkLion portal then Neocase inquiry. The main reason I say that is it enables us to track it.

Rosemarie Petrilla: OK.

Greg Stoner: Track your inquiry. It enables us to establish other patterns with inquiries. Is it leading for us to need to take action or communicate something? So, Ira can contact me personally, but, no.

Ira Saltz: I just chose to [INAUDIBLE].

Rosemarie Petrilla: Because, often, on other HRs usually they'll say, talk to your local HR person. But we should go directly to the University HR.

Greg Stoner: Yeah, anything that involves what I would say enterprise-related issues like benefits certainly go through HR Services, whether it's telephonically or through the Neocase portal.
Rosemarie Petrilla: And then the second comment I have is regarding the Value-Base Benefit. I brought it up at our local senate, and they were so pleased that somebody brought it up because people who were on Value-Based under Highmark never got converted over to Aetna. Some of us did. Some of us did not.

And then, since then, I have-- but every time I have to go for that blood work, I have to call and say, you charged me again, and, oh, the first time is, well, we didn't have the coding right. But it's still occurring. So that's been a problem. And just a point of clarification too, with the Value-Based Benefit, is it-- are the co-pays-- the co-pays are taken care of?

So, it's to encourage wellness and for you to go. Then I'm hearing from them that, well, now you still have to pay a deductible. So, I'm confused about that. So, if I have blood work, and, you know, initially I'm getting-- you have $60 dollars, and then I call them. They say, oh, no, no, that should be it. But then I'm still paying a deductible. Is that correct?

Greg Stoner: Yeah, I think it's really dependent on the particular position and kind of the list of services that would be covered. I guess getting back to the original-- one of your original comments around individuals who were in the VBB Program and aren't now, please contact Aetna because you can enroll at any time, and once you're enrolled, as long as you remain in the PPO plan, you're not disenrolled, while you still have that-- that condition.

Rosemarie Petrilla: And is there information on the site that really explains what that benefit is now?

Greg Stoner: Yes, on the HR site under the Benefits section.

Rosemarie Petrilla: OK, I'll pass that along. All right, thank you.

Greg Stoner: Absolutely. Thank you for raising it.

Chair Bérubé: Right here.

Tim Robicheaux, College of the Liberal Arts: So, quick anecdote. I actually was declined by Aetna several years ago for an emergency appendectomy. They said that I didn't get preapproval-- all right, I didn't get pre-certification. So, I called, and I was a grad student, so let's say that was two years ago. Let's pretend.

But so, I was a grad student at the time, and I called, and the guy on the phone said, oh, yeah, no, our doctors always do that, we reject, which is what came up. And I said, but it was an emergency appendectomy. He was like, I'll send it back to him. He said, we wait for you to call.

And so, since then, in California, which is probably what you referred to, in California, the CEO admitted that this is what Aetna does, openly. And I'm curious if anyone was aware of that before choosing Aetna? I had to complain to them to the Nebraska Insurance Commissioner, and I got an-- I used to have it framed, but I got rid of it when I moved. I got an apology letter from some higher up at Aetna for declining me.

But I had to go through the Nebraska-- I mean, I had to complain to them. And this is their MO. I mean, they've been doing this for years now. And then it completely-- that's my-- in a completely unrelated, is there-- we used to get-- be able to go to the Hershey Clinic and not have a copay, which was awesome. I
don't know if that's just the case that I switched to the low-deductible plan or not, but that was fantastic, and I don't understand why we don't have that with the new plan.

But, again, going back to the Aetna, I mean, this is their MO, and it's just-- it's weird to me that that was-- and I wasn't-- I don't know if this was a Faculty Senate issue last year, moving to Aetna or not, because I wasn't on it. But this is-- like, they've done this for a long time, and it's out there, like, it's open, so just to note that--

**Chair Bérubé:** You asked whether it was a Senate issue. I think I can address that. It was a Senate concern. We were not involved in the decision, but we'd been tracking. It, as has Greg in his office ever since. As for the emergency appendectomy, mine was 14 years ago. You had to plan ahead.

**[LAUGHTER]**

**Ira Saltz:** You should have anticipated it.

**Chair Bérubé:** Make a reservation. Oh, I'm sorry MediaSite question. Yes, Anna, you did. Let me know.

**Anna Butler:** This question is from Cristina Truica from College of Medicine. "Is there a way to have a depository, e.g., a contact person or a person's email for us to report concerns regarding Aetna in real time? As a physician, I see issues on a daily basis. We, in fact, call Aetna as Aetna-not for better health."

**Greg Stoner:** I guess I would just request that there's been a lot of judgment calls said today. I mean, I just want to acknowledge that faculty was involved with the decision making. They participated as part of the RFP process. It was a very diligent process, and I think there should be a lot of credit given for the efforts made when the choice was made.

I understand there may be individual issues. That should be addressed through the proper channels. I will provide the feedback to Aetna regarding the provider contact. You know, I guess addressing your other issues, there are things that have come out in the media we've contacted Aetna about.

I just want to make sure that we focus on us as Penn State as a plan sponsor, what's happening with our relationship with Aetna. That's what I need to hear from you. I can't rely on anecdotal information. I can't rely on what-- what's happening in the media. I need to rely on what is happening with Penn State. So that to me is the most important, and I will address all of these issues with Aetna directly.

**Chair Bérubé:** Question here?

**Brian King, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences:** I wasn't planning on asking you a question, but kind of following you up on that, so some of my colleagues are going to ask, in one of the tables, if I read it correctly in this report, it suggested there was a 24 percent increase in out-of-pocket costs last year.

Let's address that. So how is that being interpreted? If I read the data correctly, that's a pretty substantial increase from 2016 to 2017. They're going to ask you about this tomorrow, so I need a good answer to the question.

**Greg Stoner:** OK. No, thank you. Thank you for asking that. So, each year, in advance of the following plan year, there's a lot of analysis done. We actually consult with a health care consultant who has
actuaries, and based on Penn State's plan experience, as well as certain assumptions based on market data based on our own trends, they come up with methodologies and estimates to add to the endeavor to meet those Guiding Principles.

When that happens, you know, going into 2017, 2018, and 2019, as I think you'll see in the report that was submitted, we are shooting for from a financial perspective, that 75 percent-25 percent cost sharing. Actual experience, though, will most likely always be different than that because these estimates are done well in advance of the plan year for which these designs and cost sharing apply.

So, individuals may shift from the PPO Plan to the PPO Savings in which there's hired upfront deductibles. The premium collections could vary based on individual salaries in which plans are therein. So, I understand that when you look at the specific numbers, there are increases. At the same time, keep in mind that there are a lot of assumptions that go into it.

And as Renee and Ira know, when we looked ahead to the following plan year, that's one of the things we look at is the planned performance from the previous year and make sure we're, again, looking to those Guiding Principles. In fact, that's one of the main reasons, you know, moving to Aetna and CVS Caremark, we had 2018 plan design and cost sharing.

None of that changed for 2019 because we wanted to see that baseline year for 2018 and then compare 2019 to ensure that we are meeting those Guiding Principles? So, heading back to 2017, again, I acknowledge, yes, there was a cost increase differential, and, hopefully I helped explain at least some of the reasons why that can happen.

Chair Bérubé: Matthew, I think we're under three minutes, Matthew.

Matthew Woessner, Harrisburg: You've mentioned that the faculty had a role in helping to select Aetna, and I'm sure there was some faculty involved. I know a couple who were involved. But it really wasn't Senate. When I was chair last year, I found out after the decision was basically made, not long before it was announced to everyone else.

And I don't feel like we were deeply involved in the choices between the various options. And we can go back and check the timeline. Maybe I'm misremembering this. But I really feel like we were caught blindsided to some extent. And we certainly weren't in the leadership involved in the cost-benefit analysis of Aetna versus Highmark.

So, whether or not Aetna is a good plan, please be cautious about describing it as consultation. I just don't feel like we were deeply involved in that process. Maybe the experts should be involved, but it certainly wasn't a faculty-driven decision. And, I hope the next time we have a discussion, the leadership will be more integrally involved in the tradeoffs between options because I'm hoping we could've at least raised red flags that we're hearing here about Aetna and the quality of the services they provide. Thank you.

Chair Bérubé: And thank all of you. This is a tough nut, and I appreciate all your efforts. Thanks.

Ira Saltz: Before the next report, I just wanted to ask all of you to remind your faculty and staff at your units to fill out the survey. There was a survey sent last Friday asking for your feedback about your satisfaction with Aetna and CVS Caremark. If you've overlooked that, go back to your emails from this past Friday. An email came from Nicholas Jones and David Gray.
It's a survey. It should take you five, ten minutes at the most. So far, I understand we have a 15 percent response rate. We really would like just to get a much, much higher response rate. There’re opportunities for you to write in your comments, and, you know, Faculty Benefits- we intend to look at all of the data from that and all of the written responses.

Chair Bérubé: Yes, I want to underscore what I said because, partly, that came out of your committee. If you're talking about Faculty Senate consultation, this is it. Please, please fill out that survey. Let your constituents know about it. This is not Nick Jones on a phishing expedition. This is real.

Next report is the Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits, “2018 Report on Child Care at Penn State University”. The report is Appendix I. Five minutes are allocated for presentation and discussion. Holley Rochford? Do have that right?

Ira Saltz: The survey is open for a week. So, a week from Friday.

Chair Bérubé: As someone who goes through life as Bérubé -- I have to sign my ticket. Holley Rochford, Director of Early Childhood Programs and Services will present the report and answer questions. Thank you.

Holley Rochford, Director of Early Childhood Programs: Thank you. So, this is the third annual report on early child services. Erica Smithwick helped bring this opportunity forward to us a couple of years ago, just to have an avenue for faculty to understand the services that we provide for child care across the system.

So, we're honored to do this report every year for the Faculty Senate. And we just see it as an opportunity for you to know about what we're doing and the great investments we're making in early child care services. So, I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have about the report this year. [INAUDIBLE].

Chair Bérubé: Do we have any questions from our child Senators?

Holley Rochford: OK.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you so much.

Holley Rochford: OK, thank you.

Chair Bérubé: In Appendix I, we have the "Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, Academic Year 2017-2018 (Division 1 Athletics at University Park)." We've allocated ten minutes for this presentation and discussion. I see Chair, Mark Stephens, and Faculty Athletics Representative, Dennis Scanlon, will present and stand for questions. Mark, Dennis?

Mark Stephens, College of Medicine: Thanks, Michael, I'm going to go off script just for a second. Wendy, thank you for sharing that story earlier. I feel like-- I'm from the College of Medicine, and I am personally and professionally quite interested in the human experience of illness. And hearing a lot of the stories today touched to the human experience of illness.
So, my mom is battling breast cancer right now, and she was admitted for a complication last night, and it's my-- what I do is whenever I travel professionally and speak, I always take a selfie and send it to mom. So, if folks-- I'm going to have people sort of line in here. I'm going to turn the camera around.

You want to take it? She always gets a kick out of it. She's struggling right now.

[LAUGHTER]

So that has nothing to do with Intercollegiate Athletics, but thank you all for that great--

Chair Bérubé: The selfie has been moved and seconded.

[LAUGHTER]

Mark Stephens: So, I had-- I had a few slides for you, but really, I'm a prelude to-- Sandy Barbour is here today as well, and I wanted to give Sandy an opportunity, really, for the majority of our time. I do want to tell you about the work of the committee. It's definitely in the report.

Last year, we worked with the folks in Student Affairs on the "Time Management Report." And I think that went pretty well. I see a number of our committee who are here. And I want to thank them for that.

Another thing that I think everybody deserves to know, I'm new to Penn State. I retired from 27 years of active military service. And I would say, thank goodness the men and women wearing the cloth of our nation don't have to deal with Aetna. It's a real blessing- it sounds like.

But Penn State went through some challenging times before I got here, and I think you all know that. And Bob Boland is here. And Bob has been part of that. He works as our Athletic Integrity Officer. And I think Bob and his team have done-- Bob has done a real terrific job. So, I wanted to acknowledge the work that Bob has done.

Thanks to Keith for helping us to change some of the language in our business processes. It allows us to be a little more efficient in terms of approving schedules and so forth. This year, we're diligently working on a charge from the Senate looking at when students are in the situation with tough coaching. And so, we're working on that pretty diligently.

We have a few more things going on in terms of language and improving our business processes. I'll pause there, recognizing the hour is late, entertain questions. Dennis is here as well. Thanks to our committee. But I do want to give most of the time to Sandy.

Chair Bérubé: Any questions for Mark and/or Dennis?

Mark Stephens: Well, thank you very much.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you. The Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics will sponsor a Q&A with Athletic Director, Sandy Barbour, for 15 minutes (Appendix K). Sandy, welcome to the Senate.

Sandy Barbour, Athletic Director: Thank you very much. There we go. I will not take 15 minutes. So, I know you'll be happy about that. But thank you for this opportunity. I've been at Penn State a little over
four years. And this is the second time I've had the opportunity to present some-- a substantive update about what we're doing within Athletics.

I view this as an opportunity to just give you an update on Intercollegiate Athletics and mainly prompt questions or give you an opportunity to ask questions today or engage with Athletics outside of the Senate meeting, and, you know, we're always looking to improve. I believe we're very good, but there's no doubt we have lots of room for improvement everywhere you look.

So that's how I view this opportunity. In the back, as you leave, there's a one-sheeter on our Strategic Plan. So, I won't spend a whole lot of time on this, but I do want to comment on our vision, which is preparing the students for a lifetime of impact. Notice that does not refer to student athletes. It refers to the student and the lifelong piece for them.

And I'm very proud to tell you, sometimes they use different words. But I have heard at least two-thirds of our coaches reference this. And I remember I was sitting in the press conference after the Rose Bowl, and James Franklin said something; again, he didn't use these exact words. But it was about preparing them for what's next, or-- and he was not referring to the NFL.

And I looked at my deputy athletic director, and I go, “He's been listening.” So, the vision statement preparing students for a lifetime of impact. Then, quickly, and you'll be able to see this on the one-sheeter, but our five strategic goals are around “Comprehensive Excellence”. The "We Are" promote our story- incredible history of a tradition of success.

Our Strategic Plan is named, titled, “Proud Past, Bright Future”, and three is “Key Partnerships and Relationships”; four, “Culture”- primarily an internal objective around our people; and then five, the “Financial Model”. And, again, I would encourage you to grab the one sheeter on your way out if you have interest and curiosity around it just a little bit-- a little bit more.

So academic highlights, and I appreciate the many, many partners in this room. Mark and Dennis, certainly, are just two faculty members who engage with us on a very consistent basis. But, certainly, also Rob Pangborn, who oversees the Morgan Academic Center, Russ Mushinsky and his entire team are incredibly integral to all of these statistics, all of these metrics, all these successes that I have-- that I'm going to talk about here, as are the many faculty members in the room who I've come to refer to as our students' coaches in the classroom.

So, it is truly a team effort. But, 90 percent NCAA graduation rate in 2017. The timing of this gives me the opportunity to give you last year's overview and then a little bit of maybe through the fall this year. So, I have those for academics.

Eight programs earned 100 percent GSR, which is the Graduation Success Rates an NCAA metric. Eight programs earned 1000 percent, or 100 percent, GSR in 2018. That includes field hockey and women's tennis, who earned the 100 percent GSR for the fourth-- each for the 14th consecutive year. Those young women are pretty spectacular and their coaches deserve some modicum of the credit as well.

One-hundred forty-five graduates in 2017-2018, a record 42 in the fall of 2017, a record semester of 3.15 GPA for spring of 2018, record 26 teams over a 3.0, record 360 academic All-American, excuse me, all Big Ten honorees in 2017-2018. There's a little bit of a theme here, record. Record tying, 66 percent of our student athletes earned over a 3.0 in spring of 2018.
Twelve programs with a perfect APR score, that's another NCAA metric. It's called the Academic Progress Rate, and the NCAA came up with that to address the lack of real-time reporting around the graduation rate, which lags six or seven years. So, the APR is more of an annual year-to-year, are students in good standing, are they making progress towards their degree, et cetera.

So, we use those two in tandem. APR is supposed to be a predictor of the graduation success rate. We're still a little too young in that relationship to figure out whether it truly is. But that's the idea behind it. Five NCAA programs of distinction, and what that is is if you are in the top 10 percent of APR for your sport, you get the Program of Distinction Notation.

And that's women's fencing, men's golf, women's tennis, women's volleyball, and wrestling. And, obviously, our wrestling program has combined academics at a very high level with their competitive success. And then, three, kind of the ultimate individual honor for a student athlete from an academic standpoint is to be named CoSIDA Academic All-American in your sport, and we had three of those last year. So, we're up to 204 historically, which is fourth in all-time in Division I.

Fall 2018, a little bit of some of the same. We announced our new-- our next year GSR, Graduation Success Rate. And that, again, is 90 percent, which is-- ties our all-time high. We've ranged in the course of the last 13 years from 80 percent-- or 86 percent to 90 percent. So, we're at the top of that range. And we're working hard to bust through that to get to 91 percent, 92 percent, 93 percent, et cetera.

Thirty-four graduates for the fall, tied the record semester at 3.15, tied the 26 teams, and then 64 percent of our student athlete body over 3.0. Athletic highlights, the three Big Ten Conference championships, 11 Big Ten individual champions, the one NCAA team championship, wrestling, which was the third year in a row and their seventh out of the last eight.

My first year was the year they didn't win it. I didn't think I would survive the spring. Seven NCAA individual champions, one in men's gymnastics, two in men's track and field, and four in wrestling, the men's basketball NIT championship. 10 of our programs finished in their respective top-tens, 25 out of the 31. It's not on this slide, but 25 out of our 31 programs were represented in postseason play last year. And then we are-- we finished 12th in the Learfield Director's Cup.

And we are one of nine programs to have finished to the top 25 each of the 25 years of the Director's Cup existence. So, it shows overall excellence, comprehensive excellence athletically in your program. Then fall of 2018 women's soccer, one Big Ten Conference championship. Both women's soccer and women's volleyball finished fifth nationally. Field hockey finished ninth. Men's and women's cross country both finished in the top 35.

Our football program was top 12 in the CFP, 17th in the AP ranking, and went to the Citrus Bowl. And we are currently third after the fall in the Learfield NACDA Director's Cup. We have a history of doing really, really well in the fall, doing pretty well in the winter, and then we fall off a little bit in the spring. It might have something to do with our weather.

OK, and then, finally, there is a-- there's kind of a third-- a third area that we engage in as an athletics department. Obviously, the academics, certainly the athletic and competitive pursuit, but then there's also the community engagement piece. And growing up not too far from here, but in Maryland, I knew a lot about Penn State. I knew a lot about their athletic programs and knew a lot about the academic programs in that combination.
I did not know about the servant hearts of this community. That's been one of the really, really pleasant surprises about my time here. And our student athletes are merely doing what the rest of our student body is doing. I had never heard of THON. That's something that I think we need to get out there more and more and more because it's just such a powerful thing.

But as you look at our student athletes, 2017-2018, Mark mentioned time management, the NCAA time management requirements. We've had-- we've had to change some things in our community service, our community engagement programs because we're not allowed to track their hours anymore because we're not allowed to require, which is fine. We never required it. But if you can't require it, you can't track them either, according to the NCAA. We could have a long conversation about that, but so-- a year ago, it's over 6,000 hours. You can see here the list of things that our student athletes participated in from Coaches versus Cancer Pennsylvania Pink Zone, obviously THON, Uplifting Athletes, Centre Safe, LifeLink, on and on and on.

So that was the entirety of the 2017-2018 year, and then fall 2018, Be the Match Bone Marrow Drive, THON 5K, Mack Brady Memorial Youth Soccer-- the Memorial Game, Centre Safe, Giving Tuesday, United Way Day of Caring, on and on. It's-- I think it's one of-- as good as we are athletically, as proud as I am of the academic performance of our student athletes, it's probably this piece that gives me the most joy.

And supporting all of this is the Morgan Academic Center and their folks, as well as our student welfare and development team. One of the first things that we did together, again, lots of partnership in this several years ago, a consolidation of the-- I think we probably had four or five different satellite sites throughout campus. There was a consolidation that had been contemplated, and it was kind of on the shelf.

And Russ and I worked together with others to take that off the shelf and make it a reality. And it is a-- it is really, really-- it's a beautiful facility, but even more than that, it's really efficient and lots of spaces for our students. It's something they're drawn to. Actually, they're probably drawn to it too much. We have issues with noise and some other things that we have to address.

But the Morgan Academic Center facility, the centralized location, we've also worked together to provide additional staff. One of them was a tutor coordinator a couple of years ago to help streamline that process and then an expanded Student Welfare and Development Program, which is headed by Keith Embray and Liz Johnson that work the life skills, harm prevention, financial literacy, the Athletic Directors Leadership Institute, and career counseling and networking.

And then, finally-- just quickly, there's a lot of talk around Intercollegiate Athletics and Facilities. It certainly is a big part of what we are doing, whether it's raising funds to do the facilities or creating what I call conditions for success for our student athletes. But in the last four years, I've talked about the Morgan Academic Center, multiple phases of the last renovation, Panzer Lacrosse, Holuba, new turf for football, field hockey, and rugby, some renovations and Rec Hall, fueling stations, and a men's basketball-- I'm sorry, not a men's basketball, basketball, field room, and training table.

And then the future priorities, most of you have probably have some familiarity or have heard about our facility's master plan. The first phase priorities are aquatics, soccer, tennis, Center of Excellence, and an indoor field, while we continue some of the projects that are ongoing, which are around Lasch, basketball locker room, sports medicine and strength and conditioning, and a field hockey stadium Phase 2.
So that's what I'm busy doing. But, again, I can't stress enough the great partnerships on behalf of our students benefiting working towards helping our students prepare for a lifetime of impact, and I appreciate your help. Thank you.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you. One quick footnote, you mentioned LifeLink. It's not the ambulances. That's LifeLink PSU, which is a partnership with the local high school. It serves intellectual-- people under 21 with intellectual disabilities. My own son graduated from it.

And I can tell you, they take appropriate courses at Penn State. He loaded up on history. The number of volunteers for that program is in the hundreds, and the athletes are among the dozens. They turned out-- it's a really wonderful program. It's unique to Penn State. Most states, you're just warehoused in high school till you're 21.

Here, you graduate from high school, and you can go on to Penn State Life Link PSU. So that's what that's like. Questions? Renee?

Renee Borromeo: Yeah, I just have a comment. This is Borromeo from Mont Alto. And I want to publicly thank you. Two of my own children have been involved in the athletics programs here in lesser known sports that make no money. And I appreciate that Penn State supports all kinds of athletic endeavors, not just the big moneymakers, and I think it's easy to focus on one or two major sports and forget all the others. And I see from the list there that we definitely see our lesser known sports showing up and getting accolades, and I do really appreciate that. And thanks so much for your hard work.

Sandy Barbour: Thank you. If we're going to do it, we're going to try to be good at it.

Chair Bérubé: Right here.

Kevin McDade: We're really happy we just started a basketball program at Penn State Shenango, and on that note, are there ever plans to make faculty and facility enhancements at some of the Commonwealth Campuses? And is there a plan in the future as that rolls on beyond the Main Campus?

Sandy Barbour: Those athletic directors are working individually on their own campuses and then, ultimately, with the Commonwealth Campuses Chancellor to work on those. So those are each independent of us at University Park from that standpoint.

Chair Bérubé: So, the short answer is, yes. And our trips and the Senate officers, both the Abington and Dubois, their athletic facilities that, at this point, don't have air conditioning. And in September, that was an issue. People could have fainted. Floorboards are warping. So, yes, it's local, but it is being-- it's on the radar, literally.

Sandy Barbour: And I had the pleasure, the great pleasure, of being at the Shenango launch event for a-- for your basketball and volleyball, correct? Those two? Basketball and volleyball, right?

Kevin McDade: Basketball and volleyball. [INAUDIBLE].

Sandy Barbour: Yeah. Yeah, it was a lot of fun.

Chair Bérubé: Mark?
Sandy Barbour: Not allowed.

Mark Stephens: Stephens, Medicine. I just wanted to tell everybody mom said thanks.

[LAUGHTER]

Chair Bérubé: Here's to social media. Keith.

Keith Shapiro: Over the last few years, I've had student athletes in my class, and they, on a whole, have done very, very well. However, some of them tell me that instructors in some of their classes are maybe not patient with them when they have to go on trips and those sorts of things.

Do you find that, across-the-board, that there are students who have problems with faculty members who may not be understanding that they're-- they've got these obligations and-- which are good for them, they should be doing them, but may not be getting that kind of support that they could get?

Sandy Barbour: So, Russ Mushinsky would be more spot-on familiar with that. But, obviously I'm-- I have some knowledge, and I would say, generally, our faculty are incredibly supportive. And they are-- when you talk about the young men and young women in your-- in your courses who are proactive and tell you when-- they bring the materials that they are provided, here is when I am going to miss class, they do it upfront, they do all the things that they're supposed to do, they make up their work, it's rare.

It happens, but it's rare that a faculty member is not supportive. But there are situations, and I'm very appreciative of Dennis Scanlon and Russ, and Rob Pangborn, who give us great support to try to navigate that on behalf of students because they are representing the University. They're required to do it. And we hope to give them some help to combine their academic and their athletic pursuits. Is that a fair assessment, Russ?

Chair Bérubé: Thank you so much, Sandy.

Sandy Barbour: All right, thank you for the opportunity, appreciate it.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Bérubé: Our final report is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity. It can be found in Appendix L. It is titled "Sustainability at PSU." I'm glad folks stuck around because this is literally the fate of the planet, our local version. We've allocated 15 minutes to save it. Janet?

Janet Hughes, Libraries: All right. For you hardy souls who stayed, thank you. It's my pleasure to introduce to you today Dr. Paul Shrivastava, who is our Chief Sustainability Officer, the Director of our Sustainability Institute, and a Professor of Management in Smeal. After a very long and varied career in academia, management, and entrepreneurship, he came to Penn State in 2017 in July in order to lead efforts, to elevate sustainability, and to become an integral strategic part of Penn State. And so, today, he's going to tell you a little bit about that vision.

Chair Bérubé: Paul, Thank you so much.
Paul Shrivastava, Chief Sustainability Office, Director of the Sustainability Institute: Thank you. Thank you, Michael. Thank you, Janet. And thank you all for giving me this chance to share with you what I've been doing over the last 18 months since I've been here. So, before we begin talking about what's going on over here, I thought I'll set the stage by taking the big picture look.

And since all of you are academics in this room, I thought I'll start with a little bit of science to explain where we are in the world. And I'm going to do that by talking about this idea of the Anthropocene, and what does it mean to prepare Penn State for the Anthropocene? I'll talk a little bit about the solution that has been proposed which is sustainability, particularly sustainable development goals that the United Nations has agreed to and then finally say a few words about what we are doing at Penn State, where we are, where we need to go.

So, the science behind it can be summarized probably in a couple of slides. This slide shows a number of variables on the socio-economic side on the left and on Earth's systems on the right. And this is tracking of these variables for 260 years from 1750 to 2010. On the left, you see social economic trends like world population, rural GDP, foreign direct investment, urban population, primary energy used. There are actually over 100 social variables that are being tracked, and on the right-hand side, you see Earth system variables that are being tracked. And they include carbon dioxide, nitrogen, methane, stratospheric ozone, surface temperature, ocean acidification, et cetera, et cetera. Again, there are many more variables. I'm just giving you a sampling because there's only one trend that I want you to notice.

Somewhere in the 1950s, and I don't think I have a pointer over here, but in the 1950s, things started going from sort of an even keel to exponential rise. And this points to the fact that we are now living 60-70 years after that expansion, in a period of the Great Acceleration. And this acceleration has gone to such an extent that is now putting at risk some of the basic life systems that support life on Earth.

A more recent study on the planetary boundaries that support life systems points out that out of the nine boundaries, two of them are already in the red or a risk zone, boundaries and biosphere integrity, including genetic biodiversity and biogeochemical flows of phosphorous and nitrogen. Two others, climate change and land system change, are in the yellow zone, which depicts extreme uncertainty and to the point of risk.

There are several that we don't have good quantification on. But the bottom line on all of the science that we know is that we are not-- we cannot continue to move forward the way we have done in the past. We are truly in a different period. And this is the period of the Anthropocene.

The term Anthropocene means-- is designed to give centrality to humans as the ones that are driving the change. Human activity, social activity, is the cause of this change. And if we continue along the path that we have in the last 100 years, we are surely going to fall off the cliff.

In fact, today we're about 7.3 billion people, expected to go to 10 billion, before we stabilize around the mid-century. By that time, the economy will double. And that would normally be a good thing. But the fact is that we are not building an economy that is doubling because of our productivity. We are building an economy on credit, and we are borrowing from our children and our grandchildren, literally.
The world debt today is $233 billion dollars. The world income, if you count GDP as income, is about $80 trillion dollars. So, we are globally four times in debt. If this was your household, it would take you three generations to pay it off at 3 percent interest.

So, we are literally borrowing the economic wealth and well-being from future generations. This is not a sustainable situation by any economic standards, and it is not sustainable politically. Now, we also have an aspiration to let some parts of the world grow because they are not even getting two meals a day, but other parts of--

Unidentified Senator: Can you lower the volume, please? You're very, very loud.

Paul Shrivastava: All right, maybe you can turn this one down, or I could move back. OK. So, before things get better, we need to change the way we operate. And universities, as the place where students get trained have a particular responsibility. So, one of the solutions that had been articulated and agreed to globally is this solution of sustainability.

In 2015, the United Nations, 192 nations, signed the Sustainable Development Goals and the Climate Treaty. Those are the two driving forces. This is a very positive sign that we have global consensus on this. But now it's time to implement this global consensus.

So, what do these global Sustainable Development Goals mean? I just want to very quickly flip through a few of them because they're not about the environment. Only six of the 17 goals that have been agreed to by 192 nations, and over 10,000 corporations, and several thousand universities, only six deal with the environment. The remaining 11 deals with many other things.

So just take a quick look. Goal number one is end poverty in all its forms and everywhere. Goal number two is end hunger, achieve food security. Goal three is ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all ages. Goal four is ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education. Five is achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls.

Goal six, ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation. Seven is about ensuring access to affordable, reliable energy. Eight is about promoting sustained inclusive and sustainable economic growth. Nine is about building resilient infrastructures. Ten is on reducing inequality within and among countries, making cities and human settlements inclusive, ensuring sustainable production, and consumption, taking urgent action to combat climate change, conserving sustainable use of oceans, et cetera, et cetera.

These are comprehensive. These are about sustaining life on Earth. They're not just environmental, do-good tree huggers, hippie kind of things. These are for the benefit of you and me and for our children and grandchildren. How are we doing on these goals?

Let's begin with Pennsylvania because we can't make Penn State sustainable if the environment in which we are operating is not. This is a report put out by the Sustainable Development Solutions Network, an international body of the United Nations, measuring likelihood and progress towards meeting these goals. Pennsylvania ranks number 30 out of 50 states.

The color scheme on the chart represents yellow as the lowest. Green is that we are likely to achieve it. Look at Pennsylvania. We don't have a green at all. Any of the 17 sustainable development goals, we are
not on track to achieve a single one. Even a goal like water, which is water quality and sanitation, which we have a surplus of, we are not going to achieve the sustainable development goals unless we pay attention to it.

Luckily, this week, this month, you probably saw the governor of Pennsylvania announce his Executive Order 2019-1 establishing the Green Government Council, which has many of these goals as its mandate. So, hopefully, there will be progress.

How is Penn State doing on these goals? Well, we don't have a measure of how Penn State is doing on these particular goals, but we have a measure of how Penn State is doing on sustainability as defined by the American-- sorry, the association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education, ASHE, a body that has 800 colleges and universities as its members, does something called the STARS program. The STARS program has 69 different metrics that it measures sustainability on.

They include academics. They include operations. They include student life. They include community engagement. And in 2011, when we filled out the STARS program, we scored about 58.8. In 2014, we jumped up to 66.7, and then we plateaued around 67.3 in 2017. We do this every three years.

We have a lot of opportunity to improve. This is a little bit of detail. You can see in academics, which are the first set of charts, we improved a little bit. But there's still big scope on operations. We improved a little bit more, but there's a big scope. There is a 350-page report for those of you who have time and insomnia that I'm willing to share.

So how are we tackling this challenge at Penn State? What are we doing? On the left-hand side, you see four work areas. Before I say what we are doing at the Sustainability Institute, let me say that the Sustainability Institute is not going to be able to make Penn State sustainable. Sustainability has to be owned by you, by every college, by every campus, and by every budgetary unit of this University. It's a collective task. We can be facilitators. We can be instigators. We can help from the Sustainability Institute. And the way we are designing the institute and its activities for the next three years is to support you all to organically grow sustainability from the inside of each individual unit. And at least the early indications are that the strategy is working.

So, let me just say they are five work areas in which we provide services-- Curriculum and Teaching, Research, particularly Solutions Research, Student Life and Co-curricular Activities, Finance and Business, and Community Outreach. We have a one-person staff or two or three people under each of these five areas. And we are working with colleges and campuses to develop sustainability from the inside.

So how are colleges doing? Well, what we promised was that if a college was willing to hire a person to champion sustainability within the college, we would pay for half of it. So, several colleges have taken us up on it. There was-- Smeal and already established a sustainability director, a part time- who's become full time, and the College of Engineering has just announced it's establishing a sustainability council with Dr. Rachel Brennan chairing it.

The College of Arts and Architecture has hired-- we are helping co-hire a spouse, who is an expert in sustainable design, to lift sustainability within College of Arts and Architecture; College of Health and
Human Development, we are buying out partial time for faculty to develop sustainability there; the College of Nursing and College of Medicine are also working to establish their sustainability council.

In addition, a number of campuses have sustainability councils or coordinators, Altoona, Behrend, Brandywine, Mont Alto, New Kensington. We are working with chancellors of the other campuses to make it happen internally for them. We are also promoting this idea of living labs. There are a number of living labs on campus. We are-- living labs is this idea that you use operational spaces.

I keep coming close to it. And then I look at you and at the back. [LAUGHTER]

But these living labs are opportunities for students to learn in operational spaces. If you think of it, Penn State has a budget of $6.5 billion dollars. You know, that is bigger than the GDP of 40 countries. Think about it for a second. We have two power plants. We have our own water treatment plant. We run part of the airport here. We have bus stops. We have station and bus services, and we have a gazillion operations. We buy and sell about $2.2 billion dollar’s worth of goods. So, these are all opportunities to bring out research and teaching.

And this idea of living labs is something that is going to institutionalize that, help faculty to find the opportunities both in terms of data and in terms of experiences for their students. And we're going to be doing this in a systematic way, and we'll be announcing some programs on that.

OK, so in terms of focusing for the next few years, we have-- I'm just going to highlight three important focus. One is on Sustainable Solutions Development. This is a collective task that we want to work with SBSN Network that we helped co-found last month at the Earth Institute at Columbia University. Eighteen universities came together along with five big cities, and we established this network, which is designed to help both universities and their regions achieve the sustainable development goals.

The second is climate change. I don't know what will make this more urgent. In the last six weeks, there have been reports from the IPCC, from the US Government Program on Climate Change. Ray sitting here in the room was the author of one of the reports. Penn State is huge in this research world of climate change.

We have the most IPCC authors across this University. But do we have a climate action plan? No. Do we need one? Is climate an emergency? Well, if you listen to the mayor of London, who on Sunday declared a climate emergency in the city of London, and he's going around building a whole emergency infrastructure.

I'm also a member of Club of Rome. Last month, we announced our program on Climate Emergency Initiative. Eleven cities have now declared a climate emergency, including Vancouver, Bristol, Manchester, cities in South Africa, cities in Australia. So, this is not something that is in the future, ladies and gentlemen. Climate change is happening now. It is happening in your backyard.

Anybody counts how much rainfall happened this season? Yeah, we might almost be 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent more rain this year. And guess what it does to the stormwater system? And guess where that stormwater goes, into our streams, and what it does to the oceans.

So, this is not something of the future. We need to do this now. We- all of you, and me, and all of us at the Sustainability Institute. So, this presentation to you today is not really a report. It's more an invitation.
It is an invitation for all of us to collectively think how we are going to take Penn State into the Anthropocene.

What is our responsibility? The Senate to me is, in one sense, the conscience of the University. It is not just another body. It is a body with a lot of moral force, and I think this is the time now that we as a University have to decide how much effort we are going to put into this.

We can treat this as one more presentation at the end of a long, hard day, which I do appreciate your patience over, or we can take it a little bit more seriously and try to do something in our own quarters, in our own departments, in our own colleges and schools, in our own campuses. I want to skip a few so that we have a little bit of time for questions.

OK, this one we can skip. I just want to end on this one, which is asking the Senate to consider, among the many things that you all could be considering, the need to make every student literate. I'm just asking for basic literacy. It is responsible for us to send our students into the real world without educating them on the basics of sustainability.

The knowledge in this area is growing by leaps and bounds, and all-- by all sort of anecdotal data that I have, I find that students, about maybe 5 percent of the students, are highly motivated. They understand what's going on, but 95 percent of them don't think sustainability is a challenge or a big issue.

We live in a very sheltered world in Central Pennsylvania. We don't really get to see what's going on. But the problem of sustainability the planetary one. And we have responsibility not only in our own backyards but contributing to global sustainability.

So, help us create General Education programs in which sustainability is the required course. Help create more courses in sustainability in each of the 13 colleges. Include the Sustainable Development Goals and Climate Action into the faculty work agenda and into the unit plans. We are working with the Office of Planning and Assessment to try to bring sustainable development goals into unit plans.

And then, finally, we'd like to convene a number of conversations around sustainable development goals and climate change because it is urgent. We need this education to be happening not just among faculty, but also among our stakeholders outside and certainly among our students. So, thank you very much for your patience. I'm happy to answer questions. I'm sorry for the abbreviated nature of this talk. I appreciate the time.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you for your patience after spending about two hours with us before you finally took the stage. Are there questions for Paul? I'll just editorialize, again, even though it is a quarter to 5:00.

I'm Betting that-- Paul and I met in the summer. I said, one of the things that's unique about the Senate is we are structured to represent every campus, right? And if it is a campus-- if it was a university-wide initiative, this is a good place to air it for that reason. Now I can give you a longer history about why we're loath to revisit the Gen Ed requirement because we just did that.

However, piggybacking off what we did in the last revision of Gen Ed, this is the perfect kind of subject for interdomain courses. Those of you in the humanities and the arts will know that the Anthropocene has been topic one for the last ten years, ever since Dipesh Chakrabarty put it there in an essay called The Climate of History.
And there are all kinds of avenues for collaboration with our colleagues in the life sciences, within geology, excuse me, throughout the University. So those of you for whom this is a pressing issue, and that should be all of you, interdomain courses could be one way we could intervene and forward this, I think, especially effectively. Renee?

**Renee Borromeo:** I mean, this is a really big question, and I don't know that you have the answer. But this is a problem we face in Mont Alto. We're really, really rural. And anytime we try to talk about science, we don't believe it. And sometimes just by being the instructor and the college-educated person, immediately, the family and the church don't believe what we say. And it's very, very hard when, you know, we try to teach it, but we really do face quite a roadblock when the other thing you're hearing is fake news. This is something China invented. It's really hard, and people believe this in their hearts. They believe it in their hearts. And I-- any advice that I could be given to help in that, I would really appreciate. Thank you.

**Paul Shrivastava:** OK. I'll try to answer this. Of course, a big question, right? And what we're trying to say to people is, you don't have to believe in climate change. You don't have to believe in Sustainable Development Goals or the United Nations.

You want good jobs. You want to eliminate hunger. You've got food insecurity in your community. Every 20-- every one of our 23 campuses have food insecurity, not only among our students, among our staff, and among the communities in which they live.

So, the proposal that we want to make doesn't have to have this language that raises-- that becomes a lightning rod and politicize it immediately. We need to reframe the question of sustainability to what the local concerns are. You have health care concerns where health is goal number three or four.

And we don't ever tell you that, but, yeah, we are concerned about health care. We want better health care. We want community engagement in addressing that question. So, I think although, as academics, and we as professionals in sustainability, we are steeped in that language. We need to sort of pull back a little bit and see where the pain is for the community that we are in.

The idea of doing this across the 23 Campuses was to make sure that we were making a contribution to the whole Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, so that we're not thinking about this as only a small thing to be done at University Park, but something that is broader. So, I think engaging, having conversations, not necessarily getting stuck with the particular words and the particular concepts of sustainability or climate change.

**Chair Bérubé:** One more. Right here.

**Kevin McDade:** I'll keep this real quick forwards. Kevin from Penn State Shenango. A free, massively online class can be something that we can offer in this arena.

**Paul Shrivastava:** Yeah there is one, actually. The Sustainable Development Solutions Network that I mentioned to you that's led by Jeffrey Sachs at Columbia, they are putting together a MOOC on-- more than one MOOC on Sustainable Development Goals. And they're looking to Penn State to be one of the leaders on that project. So, if you're interested in that, we'd be happy to work with you and others in the room who want to work towards building teaching portfolio. Yeah.
Chair Bérubé: Right here. [INAUDIBLE], thanks.

Ray Najjar, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: I do think that-- that sustainability does rise to the level of it being a required element in our General Education classes, just like we have the US requirements and the international. Maybe sustainability could fall under international as well, but I think it does deserve its own, I hate to say it after we've just revised them, but I do agree it's a great idea for an interdomain class as well.

I also like what you said about, you know, the Sustainability Institute is not going to solve the problem. You know, there's a tendency for us to say, oh we have the Sustainability Institute. We've checked that box. We're fine. I mean, we really have a tremendous amount of work to do. So, I mean, I have a couple of questions. One is, what can be offered in terms of developing classes about sustainability? I've thought about developing a course. I know it's a huge amount of work. It's a little bit outside actually my own area.

So, I'd like to know more about what the Sustainability Institute at the University can offer. Another question I have is that it's not really clear to me what the University's goals are with regard to greenhouse gas emissions. I know they've declined. I know, you know, if I look online, I'm looking for a graph that shows, yeah, we want to get to zero. We want to get to something by 20-something or other. But I can't-- I can't really seem to find a clear commitment. Am I just missing it, or have we not really developed that commitment to reducing our greenhouse gas emissions? So, there's a number of questions there. And I appreciate your patience.

Paul Shrivastava: I'll take a few of those. So, the first question around teaching and what kind of teaching support the Sustainability Institute can provide. So, we have on staff Curriculum Specialists in Sustainability, and we are working with individual colleges to do several things. One is a kind of asset mapping of what courses currently exist within the college that have sustainability in them or that could include sustainability in a legitimate way.

We do that this asset mapping to point out to the dean and the administration that there are a number of places that sustainability could be slid in relatively easily. We also are working and have a support within the Sustainability Institute to work with individual instructors, who want to incorporate sustainability, but don't want to become experts. So, we could give them maybe two, or three, or four modules that could be used as an introduction before they launch off into-- and make the connections to the materials that they're going to follow. So those are two types of services that we could support.

With regard to climate goals and carbon goals, I think you are right. We are somewhat confused ourselves. We've got several things on paper. There has been a big debate over the last decade, I believe, before I arrived, that committed us to sort of following the Kyoto-level goals of reducing our greenhouse gases by 2040 by 80 percent of 2005. Then we signed-- the US signed the Climate Accord, and we signed that we are still in. So, there is some part of the University that wishes to move to the Paris level. But there is no consolidation. There has been no internal integration of these multiple goals that are floating out there.

In the meantime, while we are sort of not clear about goals, I think the trajectory is clear. We are making commitments to reduce our carbon, something that will get announced this week, if it has not already
been announced, is a huge power purchase agreement on solar. We are going to be the that's the only consumer of a utility-scale solar power plant, the first one in Pennsylvania.

And that will reduce a significant chunk of our carbon footprint out in out-years. So, we are doing--operationally, we are doing things, but we need a lot more systemic action on this. And it begins with conversation, perhaps doing a conference or a repeat of the conference that happened in 2014, where we talked about a path to zero.

Maybe it's time for that. Jon Brockopp has brought this up in other forums and we'll work with him to see if we can revive that. There is also--we joined--created a partnership with something called the Drawdown Group, which is headed by Paul Hawken. Drawdown refers to drawing down carbon to negative, not just reducing carbon, but drawing it down.

There are 80 technologies and social practices that they've identified that can be used to draw down carbon. We are going to hold the first drawdown science conference in September of this year to bring attention to these techniques and practices and hopefully implement some of them within Penn State. So, you're absolutely right. There is a lot going on in the carbon world.

There are proposals also to impose a carbon tax. There is a student group that has already issued a directive, the Student Sustainability Advisory Council, has made a proposal on that. There are several other smaller conversations. So, there's a lot going on around carbon, but there is no policy coherence around it. So, we are going to be working in the next 12 months or so to create a unified strategy to deal with carbon and find our path to zero carbon.

Chair Bérubé: Going back to the first question, not only does the Sustainability Institute have resources that could help you. I want to go back to the plug I made in another context in the fall for the provost strategic plan and the CFPs that follow from it. Those are millions of dollars available for faculty initiatives. It's totally blue sky. This would fall under a number of the five headings. And what you could get together with other colleagues in EMS or elsewhere, again, in an interdomain kind of way to propose not just new courses, but a program under sustainability for the next round, whenever it occurs. And on that hopeful note, thank you so much, Paul.

Paul Shrivastava: Thank you.

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Bérubé: We have no New Legislative Business. Is there any New Business? Correct answer is no.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Bérubé: Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the University. Are there any additional comments for the good of the University?

I have one for all of you from the campuses who came here in person, safe travels back.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Bérubé: May I have a motion to adjourn?
All Senators: So, moved.

Chair Bérubé: All in favor.

All Senators: Aye.

Chair Bérubé: Motion carries.

[GAVEL]

The next meeting will be March 12, 2019, right here. See you then.
The following Senators were noted as having attended the 1/29/2019 Senate Meeting.
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• Laman, Jeffrey
• Lang, Teresa
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• Mocioiu, Irina
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**Elected** 166  
**Students** 17  
**Ex Officio** 6  
**Appointed** 8  
**Total** 197