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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, March 13, 2018 at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate building with Matthew Woessner, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Matthew Woessner, Faculty Senate Chair: The January 23, 2018, Senate Record providing a full transcript of the proceedings, was sent to the University Archives and posted to the Faculty Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions to these minutes?

Unidentified Senator: None

Chair Woessner: OK. A second?

Unidentified Senator: Second

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

Senators: Aye.

Chair Woessner: All opposed. OK, the minutes of the January 23 meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Woessner: The Senate Curriculum Report from February 20, 2018 is posted on the University Faculty Senate website. The Senate calendar for 2018-2019 is updated on the website and listed in Appendix S in your agenda. Note that the January 2019 Council and Senate meetings are one week later than previously announced to provide more time for traveling for Senators to celebrate Martin Luther King Day and the day of service.

Additionally, the September Plenary session of the Senate will be held 30 minutes earlier at 1:00 p.m. to allow for a time for those observing Yom Kippur to return home. The morning meetings will remain at the same time. So please update your calendars as appropriate.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Woessner: Item C, Reports to Senate Council. Minutes of the February 20, 2018 Senate Council meeting could be found at the end of your agenda. Included are the minutes and topics that were discussed at the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President on February 20.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Woessner: Item D, Announcements by the Chair. Senators using MediaSite are asked to use the “ask a question box” to send the message that you have successfully connected to the live feed so your name may be included in the attendance of the meeting. As a reminder to Senators joining today by MediaSite, we are again using the system ‘polleverywhere.com/facultysenate’. Instructions for using the voting system were e-mailed to all Senators and posted on the Senate website. For those of you on MediaSite today, please log into polleverywhere.com so you can be ready when we take a vote.
The link to the online committee preferences form will be sent soon for the 2018-2019 Senate sessions. Although it is not always possible to give first choice, the preference form plays an important role in determining what committees you will serve. Senators should consult with their unit caucuses to determine the most appropriate Senate committees. Be sure to indicate if you would be willing to undertake a leadership position as a committee vice chair or committee chair.

The Penn State chapter of AAUP will be hosting a discussion titled “Academic Freedom In and Out of the Classroom” on March 23 from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m. in the Carnegie Cinema Building Auditorium on the first floor. The administration will be hosting a town hall meeting to focus on the graduate student unionization this evening, March 13. It will be held on Room 22 in the Bio-Behavioral Health Building on the University Park campus. It will also be live-streamed at LiveEvents.psu.edu for community members who wish to attend that by remote.

At its February 20 Senate Council meeting, the following Senators were elected to the Committee on Committees and Rules for a two year terms: Renee Borromeo, Penn State Mont Alto; Beth King, College of Earth Mineral Sciences; Binh Le, Penn State Abington; Keith Shapiro, College of Arts and Architecture; Rodney Troester, Penn State Erie; Dennis Jett, will be serving as an alternate to fill the vacancy for 2018-2019 year. Congratulations to all those who were elected to CC&R.

[APPLAUSE]

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Woessner: Comments by the President. President Barron is representing Penn State at Capitol Day today. So he is in Harrisburg and was unable to attend the meeting, but he sends his regards. And we know he is doing important work in building support for Penn State in the state capitol.

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

Chair Woessner: Comments by the Executive Vice President and Provost. Provost Jones will be giving remarks presenting the 2017-2018 Operating Budget Report in Appendix B. I am pleased to invite Provost Jones to offer his remarks.

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: Usually the lights are not dimmed for me, but I just want you to know there's no metaphor in play here, OK?

[LAUGHING]

Just saying. So in place of my regular remarks I will do the University Budget Report. It is lengthy. It is always lengthy. We added a little bit this year to it to make it longer. At the request, actually, of the Planning Committee who wanted to have a little bit of perspective on our temporary funds budget, we added a couple of additional slides just to expand on that a little bit.

Happy to be here and have the opportunity to share with you information regarding the University Budget. First, for most of this presentation, I will review the University's Operating Budget for the current 2017-2018 fiscal year. Then, I'll briefly explain our financial appropriation request to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and related budget planning for the forthcoming 2018-2019 fiscal year, including Governor Tom Wolf's recently announced proposal for 2018-19. And after the presentation, I'll
welcome any questions or comments you may have on the budget or if there are other things that are on your mind I'm happy to hear from you.

The total operating budget for 2016-2017 was just over $5.4 billion dollars. 2017-2018 budget changes for all Penn State units across general Funds, Restricted Funds, and Auxiliary Enterprises totaled $95 million dollars. In addition, budget changes totaled $157 million dollars for Penn State Health. Those adjustments put Penn State's total operating budget at $5.676 billion dollars for the fiscal year that began on July 1, 2017.

This pie chart shows the sources of Penn State's revenue for the current fiscal year. Tuition and fees provide 31 percent of operating revenue. Hospital and clinical revenues at 39 percent exceed those from tuition and fees again this year. And, for those who recall from prior years, this percentage has steadily increased.

Auxiliary Enterprises and Restricted Funds activities are self-supporting and mostly funded externally. They also provide reimbursement to the University for General Funds-based services that provide support for all of our units. The medical center also provides support to the College of Medicine.

The General Funds Budget comprises four main areas; education in general, agricultural research and cooperative extension, the College of Medicine, and the Pennsylvania College of Technology. Three sources of revenue support the total General Funds Budget shown in the multicolored bar on the left side of this chart. Tuition and fees represent the significant majority at 75.6 percent. And appropriations from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania account for almost 13 percent. Other sources combined to contribute their remaining 11.6 percent. These include support from the medical center for the College of Medicine, contracts, indirect cost recovery from grants, and income from short term investment of the University's operating cash.

Historically, we have presented the General Funds Budget without including the medical center and the College of Medicine. So the breakdown shown in the center bar is provided for comparative purposes. With that support excluded, the General Funds Budget totals $2.058 billion dollars. Tuition and fees still represent the significant majority of that amount, contributing 79 percent. The Commonwealth's appropriation provides 13 percent and the other smaller sources can combine to contribute the remaining 7.6 percent.

The Education and General, or E&G subset of the General Funds Budget, is heavily dependent on tuition and fees at 81.4 percent of the total. This year the percentage of the E&G budget provided by our Commonwealth appropriation is 10.8 percent of the total. Those funds support the cost of attendance for Pennsylvania resident students.

Final passage of the Commonwealth's 2017 budget was delayed until October of 2017. But the appropriations parameters we adopted in July were approved by the General Assembly and signed by the Governor. The budget included level funding for Penn State's general support appropriation. It also included a half-million dollar increase for agricultural research and cooperative extension. A $2 million dollar increase for the Pennsylvania College of Technology, and level funding for medical assistance.

The state's increased investments in these two areas help us, as Pennsylvania's Land Grant Institution, to provide access to a world class education to all qualified residents and to support one of the state's most significant industries - agriculture. The breakdown of the total appropriation is shown here. It includes
general support of $230.4 million dollars, $22.1 million dollars for Penn College, $52.3 million dollars for Ag Research and Cooperative Extension, and $13.4 million dollars for the Hershey Medical Center from state and federal medical assistance funds.

This chart shows the Commonwealth's general support appropriations to Penn State for the past 17 fiscal years, including this year's total of $318.2 million dollars. The annual totals have increased slightly since 2012-2013. But this year's amount is still $40 million dollars less than the appropriation received a decade ago.

The next few slides focus on the 2017-2018 Education and General Budget, which is supported by the general support appropriations of $230.4 million dollars. Detailed planning for the 2017-2018 Operating Budget began nearly a year in advance with the preparation of the budget plan and appropriation request that is submitted to the Commonwealth in September. Penn State requested a $25.3 million increase, or 11 percent, as part of the 2017-18 Budget Plan and Appropriation Request. At the requested appropriation amount we would have had no base tuition increase for Pennsylvania resident undergraduate students.

Governor Wolf ultimately presented his 2017-2018 Executive Budget in February of 2017. He acknowledged that the challenging fiscal situation in the Commonwealth required scaling back his plan to restore prior years funding cuts to higher education. So he recommended level funding compared to the prior year for all of Penn State's line items. After the governor presented his budget plan Penn State adjusted the planning parameters for the 2017-2018 Operating Budget to include level appropriations. That incorporated the final 2017-2018 increase of $500,000 dollars for Ag Research and Extension, and $2 million dollars for Penn College.

The parameters and priorities that guided our 2017-2018 budget planning focused on getting to the lowest possible tuition increase and adding to the pool of institutional student aid for our neediest students. To achieve these goals, we identified more than $21 million dollars in expense reductions and re-allocations, while still providing the necessary resources to address the cost increases associated with institutional priorities and mandates. Putting everything together the 2017-2018 E&G budget ultimately included a net increase of $60.4 million dollars, for a total E&G Budget of $2.0 billion dollars.

The Operating Budget balanced the need to fund critical priorities and mandated cost increases while keeping base tuition increases low, or at zero, for Pennsylvania resident undergraduate students. Cost increases for salaries, employee benefits, facility needs, innovation, and student aid, along with targeted budget reductions combined to yield a net increase in the E&G Budget of $60.4 million dollars. The proposed budget plan included more than $21 million dollars of internal budget reductions. These comprised operating savings from having a new health care plan administrator and prescription drug cost reductions, capping and reducing the subsidy provided to the World Campus and Outreach, increasing the overhead tax on Auxiliary Enterprises, and savings in various budget areas where reductions would not negatively affect operations. The 2017-2018 rate charge to Auxiliary Enterprises equal 4.75 percent of the prior year income.

The largest expense change this year, totaling $27.4 million dollars related to employee benefits, with increases split between health care costs and mandatory retirement plan contributions. The increase in the mandatory contribution to the State Employees Retirement System, or SERS, constituted $12.3 million dollars of the total of $14.7 million dollars. Approximately one-third of Penn State's full time employees
are enrolled in SERS, with the other two-thirds participating in the TIAA-CREF Retirement Program, a defined contribution plan.

The second largest cost change, totaling $24.8 million dollars, was for an adequate salary pool to help Penn State stay competitive with its University peers. This funding increase went toward contractual amounts for labor agreements that apply to Penn State's technical service employees and campus health professionals; centrally funded amounts for faculty promotions and the professorial ranks; a two-percent pool to provide merit based and market salary adjustments for faculty and staff; and salary related benefit costs.

Funding in the following areas together represented the third largest expense change, totaling $18.4 million dollars. We budgeted $9 million dollars for innovation initiatives to advance the thematic priorities outlined in the University-wide Strategic Plan. $5.7 million dollars was earmarked to increase the recurring pool of funds for need based student aid and grants-in-aid. And, $3.7 million dollars was budgeted for programs supported by student fees.

The fourth largest change related to facilities related expenses with $10.7 million dollars budgeted to address facility and maintenance needs. Included in this total was $3.2 million dollars for the maintenance and operations of new, or newly remodeled facilities, scheduled to come online this year. Also, $4.2 million dollars was allocated for utility costs associated with the new, or newly renovated, facilities, the loan amortizations for the West Campus Steam Plant, and energy savings projects.

We established the E&G Capital Improvement Program to address the urgent need for modern laboratory and classroom space as a supplement to the capital funds received from the Commonwealth. These funds enable the University to incur debt for building, construction, and renovation. Extraordinary budget pressures, including the sharp appropriation reductions that began in 2011, prompted the University to delay any additional investments in the Capital Improvement Program for a three year period.

In 2016-2017, in order to keep the Chemical and Biomedical Engineering Project on schedule, we budgeted $5 million dollars to support borrowing. This year we budgeted $3.4 million dollars to support significant improvements to the College of Engineering areas, and to replace the outdated Henning Building. Because these projects were to occur very early in the next capital plan, funding for related debt service needed to be in place before the design phases for these projects to get underway.

Penn State continues to face financial challenges related to the renovation and renewal of an aging Physical Plant. Ideally recurring funds would be added to address these needs-- or permanent funds--recurring or permanent. To reduce the amount of new permanent or recurring funds that needed to be identified for 2017-2018, thereby keeping tuition increases lower, an allocation was made available from non-recurring funding sources for the second consecutive year.

The sources supporting the 2017-2018 Operating Budget are summarized here. The tuition rate increases, which are presented in more detail on an upcoming slide, provided $44.4 million dollars. Additional tuition income of $5 million dollars was budgeted through a conversion from the temporary pool with $1 million dollars available from the rate increase that applied to the Summer Session in the previous budget year. This is also covered in more detail on a later slide.

Other E&G income changes included $3.7 million dollars from an increase in the Student Initiated Fee, which students approved. We budgeted $6.3 million dollars related to an increase in the Indirect Cost
Recovery and continuation of the plan to gradually phase out the E&G appropriation transfer to the College of Medicine. We also budgeted for modest growth in the International Fee income.

Targeted budget reductions and captured cost savings, as well as strong enrollments and addressing some needs with non-recurring sources, enabled us to have an aggregate base tuition increase of 2.45 percent for Pennsylvania resident undergraduate students this fiscal year. This aggregate included the continuation of zero tuition increases for Pennsylvania resident undergraduate students at eight of our Commonwealth Campuses. This slide summarizes all of the lower division resident and nonresident tuition rate increases by percentages and dollar amounts.

Pennsylvania resident tuition rates for lower division students at University Park increased by 2.74 percent, or $232 dollars per semester. Increases for Commonwealth Campus resident lower division students ranged from zero at eight campuses to $155 dollars to $173 dollars per semester at the other campuses. Tuition for lower division students who are not Pennsylvania residents increased by 3.85 percent at all of our campuses.

As part of the strategy to drive down the total cost to achieve a degree, 2017-2018 marked the third year in which we did not increase the Student Information Technology Fee. When we introduced this fee nearly 30 years ago, Penn State needed a dedicated and immediate revenue stream to pay for emerging technologies. Today, the infrastructure supported by the Information Technology Fee revenue, is as integral to University operations as any other costs supported by tuition revenue.

Students have said they want to include the fee as part of tuition, so the allocation of all separately assessed mandatory student fees will be under their control. To that end, we also would like to eliminate the fee by combining it with tuition. However, this combination while not raising the cost of a degree, could have negative optics- looking like a tuition increase to students, parents, and the public. To make this change, we need clear informational outreach to ensure that students and parents, in particular, understand that they are IT Fee was rolled up into tuition, and in turn, that the total dollar amount was no different than if the fee had remained a separate line item.

For reference, shown here is a list of some of the publicly reported resident tuition increases at other major public research universities. The list includes many of our Big Ten peers, most of which receive more financial support from their states, as well as Temple University, the University of Pittsburgh and the PASSHE member institutions.

Agricultural Research and Cooperative Extension are also in the General Fund Budget. However, unlike the education and general component, these activities are not supplemented with tuition revenue. While still appreciated, the state appropriation increase of $500,000 dollars did not fully cover the inflationary costs for employee salaries, and a program funding reduction of $1.3 million dollars was necessary.

As shown here, Penn State Health and the College of Medicine have an overall total budget of more than $2.4 million dollars. I should note, for context, that in the fall of 2016, the College of Medicine implemented a single tuition rate for Pennsylvania resident and nonresident students. The annual tuition for medical students did not increase this year, however, remaining at $49,800 dollars.

The final component of the General Funds Budget is the Pennsylvania College of Technology, or Penn College, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Penn State based in Williamsport. The Board of Directors approved a 2017-2018 Budget Plan in June of 2017, before the state appropriation was finalized.
Therefore, the approved budget did not include the $2 million dollar appropriation increase. The 2017-2018 Budget included increases in general funds expenses, and income of $1.1 million dollars, as well as reductions in Restricted Funds, and Auxiliary Enterprises, totaling $76,000 dollars, for a total Penn College Operating Budget of $153 million dollars.

The temporary budget process allows units to request funding for short term purposes that supplements their permanent budgets. Because the source of funds is approved carry-forward of unspent prior year balances, and new one-time funding from the Provost, approved budgets include funding for fixed-term positions as well as for one-time expenses, such as for 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 for 2012-2013 fiscal year through 2016-2017.

Shown in purple, Academic Program Funds are allocations in support of educational priorities, teaching workload, matching grant funding, and other program needs. Shown in gray, Capital Funds are monies available for new facilities, fuel and utilities, and major maintenance endeavors. And, I'll point out that the gray section of these bars has been decreasing over that five year period as we expanded them through the Capital Plan. So that explains that decrease.

Shown in green, Central Contingency refers to funds available for unexpected costs that arise during the fiscal year to support the University's operational needs. And you can see - just an eyeball of that- you can see it's a little over $200 million dollars. And if you recall that two of the past three years the University's appropriation has been in question. It is important that the University maintain a reserve should it need to tap into one.

Shown in orange, Central Encumbrances are funds set aside for specific purposes, such as investments in, and implementation of, University-wide enterprise systems. And so the orange section, you will see, has been growing over the last couple of years as we have built resources to pay for the implementation of the new Business Information System. That project is about to begin and we will see that section decline over the next couple of years.

Shown in yellow, Presidents and Provost Strategic Funding and Reserves refers to funding available for initiatives to support the University's Strategic Plan, including transforming education, digital innovation, and enhancing health. Other one-time funding is available for discretionary spending in support of priorities, such as Start-Up Week, Invent Penn State, and the Dream It Ed-Tech Accelerator.

Shown in blue, Unit Encumbrances are funds for unit specific purposes. These include start up, research support, unit capital expenses, and other short term uses. And so these are funds that exist out in the colleges and at the campuses.

Shown in red, Unit Contingency refers to funds available for unexpected costs that arise during the fiscal year at the unit level across the University. You can sort of see the red at the top, there. Which in part explains why there is green, because if a unit needs some additional resources, if they don't have the resources themselves, they will come to Central for support.

The funding amounts in each category vary from year to year. But since 2012-2013 we have seen declines in Capital Funds allocations, as noted, as we implemented the University's Capital Plan. In 2015-
2016 and 2016-2017, we saw increases in central encumbrances, as noted, as we work to implement enterprise systems, such as WorkLion, and the upcoming Business Information System.

Before I conclude, I would like to review with you our State Appropriation Request for the forthcoming 2018-2019 fiscal year. Penn State submitted its request to the Pennsylvania Department of Education in November of 2017. A request for state support for operations in 2018-19 included a request for a 6 percent increase in the general support line.

An increase of $13.8 million dollars from the Commonwealth would enable us to keep tuition expenses, or tuition costs, flat for Pennsylvania resident undergraduate students across all of Penn State's campuses, excluding an increase previously approved to support the new Capital Plan. The proposal also included the same percentage increase for the Agricultural College, Land Scrip Fund, medical assistance funding for the Hershey Medical Center, and a $2 million dollar increase for Penn College. The support requested through the Department of Education includes $24.1 million dollars for Penn College for a total of approximately $268.3 million dollars. Their request through the Department of Agriculture for the Script Fund totals $55.5 million dollars. Including an increase for the funding allocated through the Department of Health of Human Services for Hershey Medical Center the total amount in our appropriation request is approximately $338 million dollars.

Since making our appropriation request, Governor Wolf released his proposed 2018-2019 budget. Last month, he revealed a plan that provides $1.8 billion dollars for higher education. As part of that total, Governor Wolf recommends that appropriations for the four state-related universities, Penn State, Pitt, Temple, and Lincoln Universities, remain level for a third consecutive year. So if that plan comes to fruition, Penn State will not receive its requested appropriation increase, but the dollar amount also would not decline.

That amount, however, does not account for inflation or increases in the Consumer Price Index. Thank you for listening. I'm happy to take any questions or comments you have on the budget presentation or any other subjects. Thank you.

Chair Woessner: Thank you. Questions or comments for the Provost?

[APPLAUSE]

Provost Jones: And I have Mary Lou as backup if there's a hard one.

Chair Woessner: Please wait for the microphone and be sure to announce your unit.

Sharon Holt, Abington: Thank you for that very helpful presentation. What is the population growth, either general or college eligible in Pennsylvania against which we are trying to provide education? And what do we what do we do with that number, which I assume is disparate when we go to the legislature?

Provost Jones: So it's complicated. The answer, the demographic changes across the Commonwealth depend on where you are. In the east and the southeast we are seeing increases in traditional college aged students. In the west, there has been, for a number of years, a decline. Although, that is we think leveling out now.
That pattern has provided significant headwinds for us in terms of successfully enrolling students at campuses. So, it has been a challenge. We have been looking beyond traditional college aged-- college bound age-- students straight out of high school to look at adult populations across the Commonwealth. There is a large population of potential adult learners who have some or part of a degree and are looking for opportunities to complete. So, we've been working very aggressively to recruit more adult students.

We also can look out-of-state. We are seeing headwinds internationally, although we are holding our own reasonably well. Applications are down, but the yield is strong. And also out-of-state of course. We are still keeping our admissions balanced, so we bring in slightly more than half of our students from Pennsylvania. We like being where we are, being in contrast to some of our peer institutions around the country who've really flipped and serve many, many more out-of-state students than they do in-state students. And so we are proud of our positioning as Pennsylvania's Land Grant Institution.

So it's a great question. It has been challenging. But I think overall the Penn State brand, educational brand, is remarkably strong and we are really doing a great job of holding our own. And in fact, continuing to maintain strong enrollments across the entire University.

Sharon Holt, Abington: [INAUDIBLE]

Provost Jones: We make our case to the legislature. Whether it's as persuasively as it could be, I think we make the case as strongly and persuasively as we can. I think they listen.

Realistically, I think the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has really been suffering from severe financial challenges the last few years. Honestly, I think the legislature would like to give us more they just don't have more to give. But, I think as you heard the President is in Harrisburg today. We miss no opportunity to make our case that dollars provided to Penn State represent an investment - not a cost.

Chair Woessner: Thank you. Other questions?

Rosemary Jolly, Liberal Arts: Rosemary Jolly, Liberal Arts. First of all, one of your slides, and I don't know quite why it did this, but it said ‘inflationary in relation to salaries’, and then in brackets ‘merit increase’. And, so I was just a little concerned about the optics of that, especially in terms of a related question, which is how the Board of Trustees received this budget for the past year. And the fact that we've made incredible strides in doing cost cuts, is that recognized by the Board of Trustees?

Second of all, have we changed at all for the upcoming year our definition of temporary funds, as opposed to permanent funds? And thirdly, how are we planning to deal with deferred maintenance in the future? Thank you.

Provost Jones: I will answer question two first. No, we have not changed our definition of Recurring versus Non-recurring Funds. But we continue to think about more effective ways that we look at institutional resources and how they are allocated. So that is an ongoing discussion.

I think number three was how are we funding deferred maintenance? We're approaching this in a number of ways. Chief among them is we have an approved Capital Plan for the University for the next five years to follow the current plan which is about to end in June. This Capital Plan was $3.2 billion dollars over five years. The next one is 4.9. That is one way to address deferred maintenance. With many of the major
renovation projects or replacements that are slated to be done, the maintenance backlog basically gets reset to zero. So that is a big, and probably, the most effective way.

We have been challenged the last few years to increase the maintenance budget on permanent funds or recurring funds. So we've tended to back-fill the needs with one time funds. So we've pulled resources out of the temporary budget and use those to fund some of the most critical maintenance and renovation needs.

The first question had a number of parts. I remember one of them being about merit slash inflationary. Merit salary increases from a budgetary perspective are inflationary- in that they increased the cost of our salary pool. In no way was that combination of words supposed to be pejorative in any way.

It's just reflecting that the awarding of merit does increase our salary pool. We remain committed to providing salary increases for our faculty and staff. We think it's important. We think that salary increases beyond promotion should be based on one, market considerations, and two -merit. So we are increasingly focused on allocating salary increases based on merit, rather than simply cost of living increases, which was a tendency in the past.

How is the budget received by the Board? I think the record will show that, if I'm recalling correctly, that there was support for the institutional budget. But there was not complete support for the tuition increases that were necessary to fund the institutional budget. So we will continue to work with our Board to ensure that they have the information necessary to support our budget request. We are working on that this year, including thinking of different ways to present the budget request to the Board of Trustees for approval in the July meeting to make the case in a more compelling way. Did I get them all? OK.

**Chair Woessner:** There's a MediaSite site question, I believe.

**Allison Albinski, Senate Curriculum Recorder:** Daniel Perkins, from the College of Agriculture asks two questions. Why do we not want to raise tuition a reasonable amount? And, are we considering shrinking the number of campuses, why or why not?

**Provost Jones:** We are thinking of raising tuition a reasonable amount. The current iterations of the budget suggest that we will need to raise tuition this year and in the absence of an increase in funding from the Commonwealth. We are committed to keep the cost of a Penn State education as low as possible. And there is a lot of downward pressure on tuition increases. So we try to be mindful of that as we go through the budget setting process and we're looking for every opportunity we can to drive costs out of our system.

What was the second part of that?

**[INAUDIBLE]**

Campus, oh, yes. This is a perennial question that comes up. And there are a number of ways to respond to that. First, our mission as Pennsylvania's Land Grant University is enhanced, or the fulfillment of our mission is enhanced, by the presence that we have through our Commonwealth Campus system, first and foremost. We are able to better serve the citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with the structure that we currently have. Every financial analysis that we have done has really suggested that, except on the margin, it really doesn't make a whole lot of sense for us to think about closing campuses.
In fact, the opportunity is truly to make strategic investments where and when appropriate in order to strengthen those campuses and make them more vibrant.

**Asad Azemi, Brandywine:** I have three questions regarding your presentation. You have two slides which have a summary of budgets through years. Are they adjusted for inflation?

**Provost Jones:** Yes.

**Asad Azemi:** Second question is, you have expense changes reduction, which has some about health care and administrations. Does this also include any increases in the contribution from the faculty or staff in there?

**Provost Jones:** No. These represent the expenditure of University funds. And so the investment of University funds in health benefits is supported-- well, that is matched with a multiplier by the contributions from individuals. Those contributions from individuals are not included in our numbers. It's just the University contribution.

**Asad Azemi:** OK. And the last one is, you have, in one of your slides, you have a tuition increase for 2017-2018, which varies from campus to campus. What factors contributed to changes that you see from zero to 2.74 percent?

**Provost Jones:** That is really a consideration of access and affordability at the campuses where the tuition increases are zero. Those are generally tend to be in locations that are socio-economically more challenged. And we are trying to make those campus locations better accessible to students and families in those areas. And then there's a gradation between those eight campuses, where the increase was zero up to University Park. If we look at many considerations, like the average family income, in areas that different campuses serve you can see that the incomes are much lower in the campuses where the tuition increases are lower.

**Chair Woessner:** Any other questions? One or two more.

**Rogerio Neves, College of Medicine:** This morning I was in our caucus and I was expressing my frustration on what is going on in our campus. Mostly regarding, less and less time for the academic mission that brought us to this University, and more and more how they are pushing us to do clinical work. And, showing your slides today, now it starts to make sense, because almost 40 percent of our budget income comes from the medical center. And if I'm not wrong, maybe a few years ago was 36 percent, so you keep increasing that amount.

So, now it makes sense in a very cold eye of administrators to put us to work and see more patients than to teach and do research. My concern is where are we going? Since I'm here, I always thought that Penn State’s business was education. And now we are seeing almost half-and-half healthcare and education.

How is it going to be when you go to the politicians and they ask for more money saying that what we do for education when you are now in a health care business more than anything else? So, how do you see--what is our future as an education-business model University just moving in this way. Where, now all academic things are on your time at night, or the weekends, because we need you there generating more money?
Provost Jones: So let me answer, if I may, your question in two ways. First, the reduction that you referred to from 40 percent to 36 percent over the last several years. So a big driver of that has just been the growth of the medical enterprise. And I referred in the pie chart to the-- that showed the split between tuition and fees of 31 percent and medical revenues to 39. If we go back just three or four years ago, those were more equal, actually. So, there has been significant growth associated with Penn State Health and Hershey. So the denominator has gotten bigger if you will. In addition, you may have picked up in one of the other slides that I referred to, a reduction in the E&G transfer to the College of Medicine. So that has actually made that University's contribution to the College of Medicine smaller. And I'll just explain why that is there and why it is being reduced.

A number of years ago, maybe 15, there was a period where -what was Hershey at the time- now really Penn State Health but Hershey, at the time, was really under serious financial pressure and serious financial challenge. And the University stepped in and increased, provided a subsidy, to the College of Medicine to help it through that period. Therefore, taking the pressure off the clinical enterprise.

Now that Hershey is a healthy and growing concern again this is a time to back off that subsidy. Just as you saw we're also reducing the subsidy to World Campus and Outreach for similar reasons to reduce that subsidy. So those two factors combine to produce that change that you talked about. The broader question you ask is how big does Penn State Health become before it becomes the dog, rather than the tail. Sorry, David.

[LAUGHING]

But I think that is a very important question. And if you look at academic medical centers around the nation there are many different models for how the health enterprise is connected to the University and what the nature of that relationship is and where the college or School of Medicine fits into that structure.

We, like every other University in the nation that has an academic medical center, are thinking very hard about what is the best model for Penn State. We have to. It makes sense that we do that. And there's a lot of people who are giving a lot of thought to what will work best for Penn State moving forward, both in terms of our ability to deliver a clinical service to the Commonwealth, but also the academic mission associated with the research and education that is going on in the College of Medicine. So this is a topic for ongoing discussion as we try to better figure out how to do this well and how to maintain the commitment to mission and balance that we're looking for.

Chair Woessner: One more question. Two more questions I guess.

Mohamad Ansari, Berks: Good afternoon, Provost Jones. This is Ansari from Berks. Question, of course, we go back to the General Salary Increases. You know that we have had discussions at FAC. Where do we stand with respect to our sister universities in the Big Ten? Are we number one, number five, what's our number?

Provost Jones: If I recall-- I don't have it in front of me. I'm working on memory. Not as young as I used to be.

Mohamad Ansari: You're still younger than me.

[LAUGHING]
Provost Jones: So if my recollection is correct, I think— and I'm remembering the sheet that talks about tenure line faculties so for professorial and associate professor appointments I think we're generally number two or three in the Big Ten. For assistant professor, we are a little lower, maybe seven, or so, so a little bit lower. That's my recollection. Bottom line is, I think, we remain reasonably competitive relative to our Big Ten peers.

Mohamad Ansari: Great. I want to borrow a phrase from my colleague, are we making decisive cases with the Board to increase the General Salary Increases, because two percent last year— it was horrible?

Provost Jones: Yeah, I think we would all like salary increases more than over two percent.

Mohamad Ansari: Right.

Provost Jones: We make the best case we can. When we do a-- and I wasn't on one of my slides but-- if we do an across the board General Salary Increase of one percent for the University faculty staff it costs--

Mohamad Ansari: About $11 million dollars?

Provost Jones: --Recurring Funds over $12 million dollars. So if we do two percent, it is $24 million dollars, if we do three percent, it is $36 million dollars. Those monies need to come from somewhere. So if we increase the expenditures by that much then we need to increase the revenues. The only knob that we can turn that can make those types of increases is increasing our tuition. Because an across the board tuition increase will generate an additional revenue of over $11 million dollars. So it's not exactly one for one- but it is pretty close.

And so we're always trying to balance the GSI versus the increase in tuition. The other knob is are they opportunities to drive costs out of our system. And so we are working very hard and are always very mindful of looking for opportunities for us to become more efficient. And that doesn't mean by having people work harder, it means by taking costs out of our system that don't need to be there.

Mohamad Ansari: So the answer is yes? You're making a case?

Provost Jones: We are making a case. And we are working very hard, yes.

Mohamad Ansari: Thank you.

Chair Woessner: Quick question.

David Han, College of Medicine: This is actually more of a comment than a question. Just to respond as the faculty person on the Board to the question about-- and now too about the receptivity of the Board, and the budget discussion. I'm not in a position to speak for the Board, but I'll speak from my own personal perception, which is that the information that is presented is thoughtful, it is thorough.

The discussions that are typically very robust are around the optics, if you will, of level tuition. That's something that's very easy to see. And I can tell you that the Board's response to that has been, initially, the formation of a Tuition Task Force, which has now morphed into an Affordability Task Force looking exactly at the kinds of things, both on the revenue and expense side, to try to allow for and accommodate
the necessity of a tuition increase when it's appropriate. Coupled with appropriate spending on the kinds of things that have been brought up here in the setting of controlling costs where they can be done.

So, I guess, all I would say in response to the question is that this has, in my opinion, is very much a dialogue, and is not a, ‘here's the information’, ‘here's what you'll do with it’. And as Provost Jones has said, it's not always resulted in tacit agreement. There has been robust discussion, which doesn't always end up in unanimous vote. So, I think that there's clearly been a dialogue, and you know it's trying to balance the revenues against the expenses, which is a challenge in an institution this size.

Chair Woessner: Very good. Thank you Provost Jones.

Provost Jones: OK, thank you all very much.

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Woessner: Forensic Business. We have no Forensic Reports.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Woessner: Unfinished Business. We will use clickers to vote today. The system provides a precise count for each vote taken. It also allows for confidential voting and gives immediate results. Senators should have received clickers before entering the auditorium. Please raise your hand if you don't have a clicker, or if your clicker is malfunctioning.

We have one Unfinished Business item, as was introduced by the Committee on Committees and Rules in January. Shown in Appendix C, is a proposed change to the Bylaws, Section 6, on adding the option of a written minority opinion on the committee votes. CC&R Chair, Kent Vrana, will respond to questions.

Kent Vrana, College of Medicine: Thank you, Matthew. This is a very straightforward request that we afford the opportunity to committees that are making a report or presenting a report before the Senate. If it was not a unanimous vote, we would like to offer the opportunity for a minority opinion to be provided by members of the committee. Questions?

Chair Woessner: Any discussion? Or questions? OK, are we ready to vote then? OK. No questions? Very good. OK. To vote-- we're ready to vote. To vote on the measure - press A. I'm sorry, to vote for the measure - press A. To vote against - press B. I think we lost our clicker. Technology is wonderful until it stops working. OK, try again. To vote for the measure - press A. To vote against - press B. For the record those who vote against this measure, we will be recording that as a minority opinion regardless of the outcome.

[LAUGHING]

As a reminder, I presume Senators on MediaSite can also vote. So, we're going to wait for those results.

Allison Albinski: From polleverywhere-12 accept, and zero reject.

Paula Brown, Senate Office Manager: OK, the in-house vote 115 for, eight against. One vote not counted.
**Chair Woessner**: Motion carries. Thank you very much.

### LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

**Chair Woessner**: Legislative reports. The first new Legislative Report is from the Committee on Committees and Rules, and is a change to the Bylaws, Article I – Officers, Section 1.

This report proposes a change to the structure of the Senate leadership. It appears as Appendix D in your agenda. You will note that the Legislative Report includes both the ‘Frequently Asked Questions’ section as well as a draft of the proposed Standing Rule changes, which would accompany any reform to the Bylaws. CC&R has asked that Senators carefully review the supplementary material in order to prepare for a robust discussion when we discuss this and vote in April. I'm presuming there's no questions for clarification. OK. As a change to the Bylaws, the report will be voted on and discussed in the April meeting.

The second Legislative Report from the Committee on Committees and Rules is a change, Revision to the Constitution, Article II, Membership, Section 5(c). The report adds one member of the Graduate and Professional Student Organization as a representative of the Senate. It appears Appendix E in the agenda. And unless there are any questions for clarification we will place on the agenda for a vote and discussion in the April meeting. OK, thank you Kent.

### ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

**Chair Woessner**: Item J, Advisory/Consultative Reports. We have four Advisory Consultant Reports today. The first report is from the Faculty Benefits Committee, and is titled “Recreational Facilities Memberships for Faculty at University Park”. It is shown in Appendix F. Committee co-chair Erica Smithwick-- that should be vice chair-- will present the report and respond to questions.

**Erica Smithwick, Earth and Mineral Sciences**: Thank you. So first I want to thank Laura Hall, who is the Director of Recreation, members from UPUA, as well as members from Student Affairs, who met with Faculty Benefits on several occasions. That serves of the basis for this report. They were very open and providing data and justification.

So as explained in the report, what we uncovered in those discussions is that decisions about recreational facilities are very complex, and address a number of different factors, including the size of the facilities, best practices, and safety standards, as well as considerations about equity between students who are paying fees, and faculty, some of which who were not paying fees, because of other choices of recreational activity.

We also recognize that there was a benefit in having a uniform fee structure across all of the recreational facilities of $19 dollars a month, which is pretty reasonable, which provides access to all of the facilities, which was not the case before. However, we also uncovered that there were issues related to the data that was used to inform the decision. We felt that in some cases, it might not have been fully vetted or as robust as it could have been.

We are concerned that there was no communication to the Faculty Senate prior to the decision. We are concerned about the community limits of only having 200 members of communities which you recognize could increase in the future. But that might set an unhealthy precedent in terms of the relationship
between the University and the community. And we were, of course, conscious of the University's Strategic Plan of enhancing health, and thought that some of these changes perhaps were in conflict with that goal.

So what we have-- I don't know if you have the recommendation-- based on those we came up with the following recommendations, so that any further decisions about the recreational facilities be deferred until there is adequate communication with Senate.

To accomplish that we propose the second item, which is that there is a change in the governance structure. And we provide a few suggestions, including basically people sitting on each other's committees. Right now there is no communication between Student Affairs and decisions about recreation and what happens to faculty benefits. And we see this as important to the mission of the Faculty Benefits Committee. So we'd like to see some change in the governance structure.

And then third, we are recommending that a task force be created to more fully delve into the complexity of these situations. We didn't have all the data in hand to make our own informed decision. We also constrained our analysis to University Park, but we recognize there are other considerations when we include the Commonwealth Campuses. So we're recommending that there be a task force to further explore the issue. I'd be happy to answer any other questions.

Chair Woessner: Please wait for the microphone to come forward. Come down to the front rows.

Jonna Belanger, College of Health and Human Development: This is more of a comment than a question. And a thank you for pursuing this, because I happen to be Department of Kinesiology. And therefore, I live in Rec Hall, and it is not fun to get in and out. In particular the communication part, because Campus Recreation stated that Kinesiology Faculty requested access, because we want a shorter distance to our cars. We like wellness. We are fine walking to our cars. But what they did when they locked off access, is they locked off access to teaching. So that shared space between Campus Rec, Athletics, and the Kinesiology Department got shut down. And that made it very difficult for us. So without that communication. We had to go around and fight to get more access to teaching. So please continue your process. That will be great. Thank you.

Erica Smithwick: Thank you for that comment.

Chair Woessner: Other questions or comments? Are we ready to vote? OK. Senators joining by MediaSite, you can cast your votes at polleverywhere.com. To accept- press A. To reject - press B. We'll wait for polleverywhere.com.

Allison Albinski: From Polleverywhere- ten accept, zero reject.

Chair Woessner: Motion carries.

Paula Brown: We have 128 approve, 11 reject.

Chair Woessner: Wonderful. Thank you very much. Congratulations.

OK, we have a second report comes from the Senate Committee on Global Programs, and is titled Global Citizenship and Global Competency. The report can be seen in Appendix G. Associate Vice Provost,
Robert Crane, will present the report. And standing with him will be the Committee Chair, Willie Ofosu and Martha Strickland, committee member.

Willie Ofosu, Beaver: Good afternoon. What we try to basically present, to start off with, is the fact that when the standing committee, the Global Programs Standing Committee was set up, it was intended to support the Office of the Global Programs. And what has happened over the years is that there's been very good cooperation between the committee and the Office of Global Programs. The report we have today is one of the results of that corporation. And so I ask, actually, Martha to do the presentation.

Martha Strickland, Harrisburg: Hi, Martha Strickland with Penn State Harrisburg. And as we know, from our Strategic Plan at Penn State, that we are committed to enhancing global engagement. And central to that mission, then, is equipping our students to have opportunities to become global citizens and provide a vehicle for Penn State's impact to extend around the world.

In light of that context, we were charged to define what global citizenship and global competency was and how it could look across the campus here at Penn State. This charge is a broad and complicated charge because it is actually something that no university or higher education institution has successfully done.

Therefore, we went after this with a scholarship that was already being done, through Robert Crane, and through the scholarship that was accessible to us. We are putting before you a framework that we believe is cutting edge. And at the same time addresses what we mean by global citizenship as a higher education institution who is designed and committed to equipping students' opportunities to become global citizens and impact the standard global environment around us.

So in order to just give you a few points, for those of you who haven't read all the report, I'm going to have Robert Crane give you a synopsis of what we are talking about. And then, we're going to ask--recognizing that the recommendation is that we put this forward to the administration as a framework for a definition and approval.

Robert Crane, Associate Vice Provost for Global Programs: Thank you, Martha. So, I don't want to go through the whole report. Everybody's had a chance to look at it. And so I will simply want to highlight a few items from it. The first thing I think I want to state here is that what we've come up with, we think, is a framework that's adaptable anywhere across the University. So the important point to make here is these definitions, from our perspective, they are the core of the definition. And we fully expect that across the University, in different units, different departments, and colleges, you will take these definitions and adapt them, so they fit your discipline. So that's the first point. These are meant to be adaptable. They are meant to be a core that everybody can work with.

A second point to make about them is that when we look at the way everybody else approaches this, there's a huge amount of scholarship behind intercultural competency. There's very little behind global competency. So a lot of people have studied intercultural. A lot of people know how to assess it. There's a lot of instruments out there to do it. When you turn to global competency, it is a very different state of affairs.

And what you find when you look around what other people are doing is a transition. They will start talking about global competency, but by the time you get to the end of the paragraph they're talking about intercultural competency, because that's what we understand and that's what we can assess. So what we
try to do is separated these things out. So we can see the difference between global competency and intercultural competency. We can see some of the ways we might divide that field up. And we want to show how all of these presumably present a pathway towards what we're defining by global citizenship.

So another thing to note about this is that while we have a framework, and while we have definitions for global literacy, global awareness, global literacy, intercultural competency these are not mutually exclusive terms. And although it looks like a hierarchy, we don't expect people to move through that like a hierarchy. This is very much an iterative process as you build these skills, and as you turn towards using the skills in a way that, we would say, promotes competency and promotes global citizenship.

I think maybe the last point we want to make about this is that assessment is one of the reasons we're interested in doing this. One of the things you find is you try and assess any of this is that, without a good definition, it's extremely hard to start an assessment process. So that was one of the motives for coming up with these definitions.

The other is that it's actually extremely difficult to assess this. And this discussion isn't about assessment. We're simply trying to lay the foundations to think more appropriately about how we would assess this as we move forward. But again, the central message of this is as we do assessment, as we start to attach the learning outcomes to some of these goals, or to some of these definitions, then again, we think very strongly that this has to happen at the unit level. If you're in Civil Engineering your view of global competency is going to be very different than if you're in Art History, for example. We don't want to try and define this for everybody. We think it's up to the units to define this what we want is simply a framework that will allow that to happen. Thank you.

Chair Woessner: Questions or comments? Are we ready to vote? Oh I have question over there. Microphone's on its way.

Sharon Holt, Abington: How did you consider education abroad within this framework? Does it have a place in your matrix, because it's not visible?

Robert Crane: It's there. We didn't pull out any particular mechanism for achieving any of these. There's no goals in this, but when we look at those definitions for achieving literacy, or awareness, or competency for any intercultural competency or global competency there has to be interaction across cultures. There's various ways that can happen. It happens through study abroad-- is the way most of us would automatically start to think about this. But it happens through having international students in the classroom. It happens through various types of student engagement, student brigades, and alternative spring break. There's all sorts of different ways that competency of various sorts can be developed. So education abroad is one. It's certainly not the only one. In fact, in terms of the number of students impacted it's probably not the largest one.

We probably will end up doing more through collaborative teaching with partners around the world. Where we're in the classroom here, they're in the classroom there, our students are interacting with each other, rather than sending students. As I'm in Global Programs, I'm happy to send as many students as you want to lead programs for.

Chair Woessner: Other questions or comments? OK, are we ready to vote? Senators joining by MediaSite, you can cast your vote at polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion- press A. To reject the motion- press B. We'll wait for result at polleverywhere.
Allison Albinski: From polleverywhere, 11 accept, zero a reject.

Paula Brown: In-house we have 120 accept, 11 rejects.

Chair Woessner: Wonderful. Motion carries. The report be forwarded to President Barron for his action.

I'd like to also offer special congratulations to the committee when we drafted that charge it seemed like mission impossible. They came up with a very thoughtful and coherent report. So thank you very much.

Chair Woessner: The next Advisory/Consultative Report is from the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities, titled “Proposed Revisions to Penn State Policy, RP06, Disclosure and Management of Significant Financial Interest formerly RA20”. It can be found in Appendix H in the agenda. Committee Chair, Andy Schultz, will respond to questions.

Andrew Schulz, Arts and Architecture: Thank you, Matthew. So this policy is designed to ensure transparency in relationships with external entities, and individuals as they relate to the academic and scholarly mission of the University. This transparency happens through reporting, as you know, through the COINS system, which I'm sure you're all very well familiar.

What the revisions consist of are proposals to expand and clarify the language around what constitutes Significant Financial Interest by adding gifts to the definition of SFI. And what this means is there can be situations where an individual is on, kind of, both sides— has a role and an entity which is making a gift, either through an equity stake or through a leadership role. And the other side may be in some way benefiting from that gift through a gift to a research program or something else. The idea is the University needs to know and understand those kinds of relationships.

And the second edition is to include language regarding income from University Health Intellectual Property. These are both recommendations that arose in the Provost Task Force on Conflict of Interest, which was convened in 2015-2016 and the-- before reaching our committee these proposed revisions are vetted by a range of entities, including faculty, who themselves currently receive income from University Health IMP.

So our committee, on December 5, voted to endorse these revisions and recommend that they be adopted. And so I'm here to recommend that we do the same in plenary session. Before you do so, I'm happy answer any questions you may have about these proposed revisions.

Chair Woessner: Questions or comments? OK, the report is brought to the floor by committee and need no second. Senators joining by MediaSite, you may cast your votes on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion - press A. To reject the motion - press B. We'll wait for the results from polleverywhere.

Allison Albinski: On polleverywhere - accept eight, reject zero.

Paula Brown: In person we have 118 for, five against, and two not counted.

Chair Woessner: Thank you. Motion carries. And the report will be forwarded to President Barron for his action.
Our final Advisory/Consultative Report comes from the Senate Committee on University Planning, “Dissolution of Facilities Planning Advisory Board” can be found in Appendix I. Committee Chair, Laura Pauley, will respond to questions.

Laura Pauley, Engineering: Yes, this is a revision of our recommendations that were brought forward in October. Since our October recommendations, we went back and contacted different units, inviting all units for input to our recommendations. And we revised the recommendations.

The main change to the recommendations are requesting that a faculty representative be added to the Project Decision Review Board to replace the dissolution of the Facilities Planning Advisory Board. The Project Decision Review Board is a more active board and would give faculty more active input in the construction process.

Chair Woessner: Questions or comments? Question out there. Please remember to rise and state your name and your unit.

Rosemary Jolly: I just wanted to ask if this particular recommendation is going to enable the faculty member to be on early enough in the process not to be presented with a set of fait accompli?

Laura Pauley: Yes, absolutely.

Rosemary Jolly: Thank you.

Laura Pauley: That's what the project decision review board is involved throughout the construction process, when the facilities planning advisory board was not receiving information in a timely manner, and not able to give good input.

Chair Woessner: Other questions? Are we ready to vote? The report is brought to the floor by committee need no second. Senators joining by MediaSite can cast your votes at polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion- press A. To reject the motion- press B. We'll wait for the results of polleverywhere.

Allison Albinski: Polleverywhere - seven accept, one reject.

Paula Brown: In-house 119 accept, five reject, five not counted.

Chair Woessner: The motion carries. And the report will be forwarded to President Barron for his action. Thank you, Laura. Please return your clickers to the box at the rear of the building as you leave the auditorium.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Chair Woessner: Section K, Informational Reports. At the February 20 Senate Council meeting, Council members voted to place the following Informational Reports on the Senate Agenda as website only: Elections Commission, “Roster of Senators by voting Units for 2018-2019”, Appendix M; Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits, “Childcare at Pennsylvania State University”, Appendix O; Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology report titled “Augmented, Virtual, and
On February 20, Senate Council voted to reorder the agenda to place the Nomination Reports first. We will begin with the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules Nominating Report for 2018-2019 appearing in the agenda as Appendix J. Committee on Committees and Rules Chair, Kent Vrana, will present the names of those who have accepted the nomination to one of the three extra senatorial committees, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, and the University Promotion and Tenure committee. Senators may make additional nominations from the floor, provided they have first received permission from the person whom they would like to nominate. Kent, will you please present the slate of nominees for the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

Kent Vrana: Thank you, Matthew. The nominees for Faculty Rights and Responsibilities are presented in Appendix J, before you now. We will break them down into component elections. We need to elect four University Park faculty, two will serve as members, and two will serve as alternates for three year terms.

Chair Woessner: Are there any additional nominees? OK, so we will move on.

Kent Vrana: Next, we'll move on to Deans and Chancellors. We need to elect two Deans or Chancellors, one will serve as a member, and one will serve as an alternate.

Chair Woessner: Are there any additional nominations? OK.

Kent Vrana: Thank you. We'll move on to University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. For that committee, we need to elect six members-- six individuals: three members and three alternates - each serving a two year term.

Chair Woessner: Are there any additional nominations? OK.

Kent Vrana: Finally, we'll move on to a Standing Joint Committee on Tenure. We will elect five individuals: two members, and three alternates.

Chair Woessner: Are there any additional nominations? OK. Is there a motion to close the nominations and approve the entire slate of the nominees?

Unidentified Senator: I'll move.

Unidentified Senator: Second.

Chair Woessner: It has been moved and seconded. And we will approve the entire slate nominees. All those in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye.

Group: Aye.
Chair Woessner: All opposed. The ayes have it. The motion passes. The slate of nominees to the committee has been approved, and the slate is closed. Thank you, Chair Vrana. Thanks for the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules.

The next Informational Report, Appendix K, is from the Senate Council Nominating Committee who reports nominations for Chair-Elect, Secretary of the Senate, and the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. In addition, you will see nominations for the Penn State Board of Trustees, Academic Trustee. The candidate that receives the highest number of votes will be forwarded to the Board as a preferred candidate for the term. Senators may also take advantage of the opportunity to nominate from the floor, provided you have secured permission from the person you wish to nominate. Jim Strauss, Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee and Immediate Past Chair will present the nominations.

James Strauss, Faculty Senate Immediate Past Chair: Good afternoon, everyone. By our rules, the elected Senate Council members form a nominated committee. And by our rules, myself, the Immediate Past Chair of the Faculty Senate is the chair of the committee.

I should also make note before we get into this that, by virtue of myself actually being nominated for a Faculty Trustee position, the discussions and contacting of other candidates for that were conducted by Mohamad Ansari and myself. I was actually recused from those discussions. Although, I have to report the complete slate. So going through the list we have two nominees for the Chair-Elect of the Senate. They are listed in Appendix K. Both nominees have given their permission to have their names placed on the ballot.

Chair Woessner: Are there any additional nominations from floor?

James Strauss: Seeing none. For the office of Secretary of the Senate we have two nominees listed in Appendix K. Both nominees have given their permission to have their names placed upon the ballot.

Chair Woessner: Are there any additional nominations? OK.

James Strauss: Let's move on. Faculty Advisory Committee. For Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, one will be elected to a three year term expiring in 2021. All five nominees are listed in Appendix K, and all nominees have given permission to have their nominees placed on the ballot.

Chair Woessner: Are there any additional nominations from the floor?

James Strauss: Move on to Academic Trustee. And again I'm simply reporting. We have four nominees for the Academic Trustee position for a three year term expiring in 2021. The four nominees are listed in Appendix K. All nominees have given their permission to have their names placed upon the ballot.

Chair Woessner: Are there additional nominees? Or nominations from the floor? OK. It has been--

James Strauss: Sorry, I'm going to just give a quick comment. As Faculty Senate, we need engaged folks just like yourselves to run for these positions. It's very difficult to run for these positions because not everybody can win. All of these candidates, in my humble opinion, are winners. And we need to continue to have good qualified candidates from the body of Senate running for our elections. Thank you very much.
Chair Woessner: Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

Is there a motion to close the nominations, and approve the slate of nominees?

Unidentified Senator: I'll move.

Chair Woessner: OK, it is moved and seconded to approve the entire slate. All those in favor of approving the slate of nominees please signify by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Woessner: All opposed? The motion carries, any election the slate is adopted. Thank you, Jim Strauss, Senate Council nominee chair. The Senate--[INAUDIBLE] --Thank you, Jim. So the Senate online elections will take place from March 28 through April 6. The election results will be reported after the results are certified by the tellers.

The next report, seen in Appendix L, is from the Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid. It is titled “Faculty Senate Scholarship Awards to Undergraduates”. Five minutes have been allocated for the presentation and discussion. Mary Beth Williams and Anna Griswold will present the report.

Mary Beth Williams, Science: As Anna comes down and before I present this report, I'd like to take just 30 seconds to recognize Anna and her service to the Senate and to Penn State. Anna, as many of you know, has announced her retirement after 27 years at Penn State. And so this will be her last--

[APPLAUSE]

This is an annual mandated report on scholarships. I brought Anna up, because she prepared this report for you.

Anna Griswold, Office of Student Aid: Actually my staff, many of them must be in the back of the room, prepared this report for ARSSA. And yes, we present this every year. And so, as the report indicates we awarded 244 students with scholarship in 2016-2017, $248,000 dollars plus.

And Faculty Senate scholarships are comprised of 21 different endowments, and one annual gift that is available across the University to students at all campuses. And our office manages the selection process on behalf of ARSSA. And so you have the report and we're happy to answer any questions.

Chair Woessner: Are there questions or comments? Very good. Thank you very much.

Anna Griswold: Thank you.

Chair Woessner: Anna, if you would remain at the podium for just a moment.

[LAUGHING]
Come on, one more bit. We just wanted to mention that-- so as it was mentioned, you served 27 years at Penn State as Director of Aid you served since 2001 on the Senate Committee Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid. Anna is well-known for her work advocating for access affordability for Penn State students.

And she will be missed. And I would like to present Anna with a certificate honoring her service to Penn State. So thank you very much. Congratulations.

[APPLAUSE]

Anna Griswold: Thank you. Thank you all.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Woessner: The next report is from the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations titled “Promotion to the Rank of a Professor”, Appendix N. Ten minutes have been allocated for the presentation and discussion. Rosemarie Petrilla, Carolyn Mahan, and Nicholas Rowland will present the report.

Rosemarie Petrilla, Hazleton: Good afternoon. IRC and Faculty Affairs were charged jointly to write an Informational Report exploring the reasons why a relatively low proportion of faculty from the Commonwealth Campuses are promoted to the rank of professor, than those at University Park. This charge was initiated due to the examination of the 2016 data that indicated 46 percent of University Park faculty from all colleges and schools, excluding Law, have earned the rank of Professor, while only 21 percent of the faculty from the Commonwealth Campuses, excluding Medicine, Law, and Great Valley, have earned the rank.

Additionally, in 2016, the cohort data provided by the Office of Planning Assessment indicated that after six years-- that six years after achieving tenure and promotion to associate professor--22.4 percent of UP faculty had earned the rank of professor, while 2.6 of the Commonwealth Campus faculty had earned this rank. Additionally, over the past ten years and regardless of location, the time that tenure line faculty remain in-rank associate professor has increased by approximately one year. So I invite Carolyn Mahan who was the lead on this subcommittee to make few comments.

Carolyn Mahan, Altoona: I think Nicholas is going to present a few slides on this. What you're going to see in the report is some snapshot data, which I think at first might be a little hard to get your head around. It's basically looking at the faculty body at one time, and what percentage of those faculty are in the rank of full professor at this moment.

One of the explanations for this is that- at the Commonwealth Campuses- there's a higher teaching load. And so that over time these differences in the proportion of the faculty that are full professors should even out. And it looks like that may be the case, but it takes 16 to 20 years to do that. And we can probably provide more information on that.

The other thing that we found really interesting, or at least I found very interesting, is that the criteria for promotion to full professor vary by unit, which makes sense if the units are disciplinary. But some of the units, as you know, at the Commonwealth campuses are multi-disciplinary. And the reason I found this out is because I now serve on several full professor committees, promotion committees. And when I
serve on a full professor for someone who's getting promoted, at York for example, or someone that's getting promoted at Penn State Altoona, or Behrend, the criteria that I need to use are different. I found that surprising.

So one thing that we did in this report for you is we've provided excerpted information about criteria and guidelines for promotion to full professor by unit. These are criteria that we could find. Sometimes it was not easy to find these criteria. And you can read those for yourself and you'll note some of the variability among those criterion guidelines.

Nicholas Rowland, Altoona: So I did not do the good work on this presentation. So I don't want to take too much credit. But I am a trained sociologist. So I need to make sure that everybody understands exactly what they're looking at when they see that-- for explicitly the table in here, because they need to echo what Carolyn just said. The devil is in the details on this one. And it's with the word 'percent'.

So we've already seen this, so the question is this, something going on? What we receive is a table that looks like this, or graph-- I'm sorry. What you find is that from a zero to six year period there is a decline. But that- this difference between the Commonwealth Campuses and University Park dissipates over time. As a matter of the percentage of faculty that are in the same rank at different periods of time, different lengths in that.

I just want that to settle in. What you're seeing here at these different points, these are all associate professors, and this is merely the percentage of all of those faculties at that time period at this moment. OK? So subsequently what you would see, let's say that we just-- and I'm not saying this right now. But if we stop hiring tenure track faculty members, if we didn't change anything, and we just kept following this graph over time, it would start to load on the right- not the left, because it's just proportional. These are just percentages. This is a healthy University, and so as a result we hire people consistently. So you would expect to see this at literally every university you would go to. At, for example, the hypothetical clown college, or the hypothetical barber college the exact same thing would happen. Sometimes these are referred to as, strangest as this might seem, as a mortality study. Because what you're looking for is when people drop out of the sample, OK? And in this case when they drop out we imagine maybe they made full professor, or conceivably they've left Penn State. Or, if we're talking about years past 20, conceivably they've retired well in rank, OK?

So I did a little more digging, because I think the general perception was that when people move from one position to the next they're falling out of the sample as a matter of count and they're earning full professor. So to give you a sense I went back and looked at some data. We usually look-- when we're talking about these things, like for example, when we talk about tenure, or we talk about promotion in general, we talk about cohorts. We almost always study them in cohorts. Take a look at any of the tenure flow reports, we look at courts. So here's 2010, 49 new associates at University Park, 39 at the Commonwealth Campuses. Now, if you fast forward to 2016, this is the zero to six that's featured in our table. Six folks from University Park ultimately leave the university, for reasons that are probably none of my business so I'll leave that be, and 11 out of the remaining 43 have earned full professor.

If you look at the cohort that's on the Commonwealth Campuses for the same period of time, four out of our 39 leave, again for reasons that are not my business. And there was one person, it turns out it was a colleague of mine at Penn State Altoona, who was able to earn full professor. So to make sure that everybody understands what they're seeing in that table, we're talking about moving to full professor at
approximately a factor of ten, is the difference over time. So just want to make clear everybody knows what they're looking at.

Chair Woessner: Thank you very much. Our time has expired.

The next report is from Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and it is titled “WorkLion Update 2018”. It can be seen in Appendix P. Lauri Catalano and Michael Busges will present a ten minute report, which appears in Appendix Q. No appendix P. We're good. WorkLion Update 2018.

Michael Busges, Director, Enterprise Project: Yes, OK, thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to give you a very brief update on where we are with WorkLion. My name is Mike Busges, and I'm the Enterprise Project Director and with me is Lauri Catalano the HR Shared Services Senior Director. Before Lauri will delve into some of the details of where we are with the rollout, the first slide summarizes the timeline-- yeah, summarizes the timeline of Implementation project. The Workday, HC, and Payroll Project is part of the larger HR transformation initiative that you most likely have heard about. From a technology perspective, Workday constitutes a second of the three administrative systems that we're rolling out, LionPATH two years ago, and the third and final one will be the SIMBA project that will start in June when we replace our financial system. So LionPATH, WorkLion, SIMBA, that's our trajectory.

WorkLion started with the planning phase in 2015. The Implementation Team with the consulting partner and a fully dedicated Penn State team was assembled in late 2015. And worked together very hard until the new HCM payroll functionality was successfully deployed last December.

Followed by the first bi-weekly payroll in early January, and then by the first monthly payroll in late January of this year. And I hope you all got paid correctly, right? Good.

Although, the initial rollout had to be delayed by six months, the project stayed on budget. And that's why the Provost’s orange chart, the orange part of the chart - did not increase. So we came in on budget. Currently, we are in a post go-live Stabilization Phase, which will last through June, and includes the roll off of our consulting partner, Accenture, at the end of the month.

And a look to LionPATH, we are also creating a permanent central work based support unit that we'll work closely with Lauri's Shared Services Team on maintaining the work system in the future. And this group will be fully operational and staffed by July 2018. So by July 2018 we'll be fully in production with Workday and we'll be fully in a stable phase of the project. So now turning over to Lauri for a few of the details about the rollout and what transpired and will transpire.

Lauri Catalano, Senior Director of Shared Services: So this slide may be familiar to you. I think one of the things that we've learned is that there's probably a little bit of confusion between Workday and WorkLion. And so WorkLion is our umbrella terminology that is inclusive of the very large system implementation, which was Workday. But it's also inclusive of our Learning Resource Network. It's also inclusive of our self-service feature, which is called our knowledge base.

And it's also inclusive of our inquiry management system, and that's the new mechanism by which we're hoping that people within the university community will engage with Human Resources. So this hopefully is familiar to you as well, this is the front page of our portal. And this is really-- what we hope
to achieve is really have a one stop shop for members of the Penn State community to be able to engage with Human Resources, to come to one location and sort of get all their questions answered.

I don't want to go into the details of this, but I want to highlight a couple of areas. On the lower left area you'll see Section F. That really is our inquiry management. So this is the area where faculty/staff can engage with Human Resources.

And just to let you know since we've gone live about, I guess 12 weeks ago, we have received 23,000 inquiries from the Penn State community. We're excited that we're able to report on these statistics. So that's new for us to be able to offer that service to you.

In terms of the types of inquiries, our highest number of inquiries related to benefits, followed by payroll, and recruiting. And then we also at the very beginning, we had a high level of inquiries just related to the Workday product itself. Obviously, people getting used to the functionality and the technology of it.

The second thing on this slide is Section G, up at the top. And that's called the ‘Manager Tools’. That's the mechanism by which we are asking the Penn State community to initiate transactions or activities with the human resource community. So for example, if you want to hire somebody that's the mechanism by which we were asking people to communicate with us. Or if you want to separate a person from your organization, or request a compensation change. So to give you some sense of what we have done in terms of that arena, since we have gone live, we have had 24,500 requests for basically changes.

To basically-- somebody is going to call them their employee record for lack of a better term. We've had 7,500 requests for part time hires. We've had 4,500 requests for compensation changes, and 3,300 plus for separations. Now separations could be just leaving a job, not necessarily leaving the University. But just to give you some sense of the numbers that are coming in to our organization.

The next thing is just sort of how Workday works. And these are the modules and this is how we think about the mechanics behind the scenes. What I just want to share with you today is that our focus, and this has been the focus that we've got from senior leadership from Provost Jones and David Gray, is from a go-live perspective our desire and our interest was to make sure that everybody got paid, and everybody got their benefits.

And we're very proud to say that we were able to complete that very successfully. We had over a 99 percent success rate with payroll. We have a couple people that we didn't get right on the first monthly, but it was literally less than 1 percent of the employee population. And that didn't mean they didn't get paid at all, it just meant they might not get paid the right amount, or maybe they got lucky and got overpaid. So we're proud that we were successful in that arena. And that has been our focus, is payroll and benefits. We recognize as we go forward that we're going to start to focus more energy on the human capital management component. We're going to focus more on performance management. And ultimately we're going to roll out a recruiting module as well.

And so one of the things that I will say is that we're proud to say that Workday is working as designed. But what we have found is sometimes the design is not really working as we hoped in practice. And so those are some of the things that as we get into stabilization we'll look at enhancing. So it is doing what we wanted it to do, but sometimes as we've gone live we found that what we thought we wanted it to do is not really what we wanted to do. And that's what we'll be focusing on going forward.
I'm going to skip this slide for timing. Actually I'm going to go back. The one thing I want to highlight on the slide is we talk about consistency.

And I know that consistency has been sort of a blessing and a curse at the same time. We do have a desire to have consistency. For example, we want to make sure that faculty and staff get the same answers when they have questions. And so that's very important to us.

So this concept of a shared services model where there's a one stop shop where a faculty and staff can go to get their questions answered, and they can get the same answer is important to us. We also recognize that consistency kind of scares people a little bit. In that, we want to recognize the differences between the colleges and the campuses.

And so we're trying to find that fine balance between the system and HR, in terms of how do we provide that consistency that we think is important to be equitable among our faculty and staff, but also to recognize the uniqueness's and the variations that Penn State has and that we’re very proud of. So we're working on that. We know we don't have it right, but we're trying our best.

And then finally, these are just a couple of questions that, we've been getting a number of questions, but I would say these were the top two questions that we get from faculty. The first is related to what involvement is Workday have and the tenure promotion process. Essentially, it's kind of the system of record for the information, but it's no more than that. The actual PTORP- is still going to be the tool that's going to be used for that process.

The second thing we get asked a lot about from faculty is it seems like there's a lot of “I don't really want to do this”. “Is there a way that I can offload this to somebody else?” There are certain things that you can leverage other people to assist you with. Timekeeping is one example, if you have staff that work for you.

One area, though, that we are asking that you don't offload is really performance management. We feel that, if you have staff that work closely with you, you know about their achievements and their accomplishments better than anybody else. And we think it's important that you have that relationship and you provide that feedback to them. So that would be one area that we asked you to continue to get engaged with. So that's what I've got.

Chair Woessner: Thank you. Comments or questions? We just have maybe a minute.

Lauri Catalano: Oh, goodness.

Chair Woessner: Maybe it should be more. We'll take a few minutes here.

Kim Nelson, College of Science. I agree, I haven't had much problem for my own personal use and for my own personal salary use. But this program is not very manageable when you manage lots of student employees, OK? From semester to semester they need to move from supervisor to supervisor and they need to move from pay designations to pay designations, i.e., which budget lines they go on. And that takes a lot of time. And you have students who can't get paid in a timely fashion, because we can't get them moved. So I think it works because it's a business model. But the teaching aspect and the pay for our students to teach is not a business model. And it's not working very well at all.
**Lauri Catalano:** Thank you. I appreciate that feedback and we are certainly willing to hear specific examples so that we can talk through your process improvements in certain areas. We do recognize that-- we do know of certain areas that has been more challenge. Commonwealth Campuses, ARL, where there's government regulations, Ag, where there's extension programs- we recognize that some of those units, OPP, where there's a union requirements, and ABS, where we have high volume hiring, are all areas that we recognize-- and there's more. But I'm just saying that we're aware of some of those things. And graduate students is another one.

**Kim Nelson:** So specific examples, graduate students teach one semester, move to research funds the next semester, move to summer funds the next semester, back to teaching funds the third semester. Each one of those may have a different supervisor. So who's supposed to approve their time is different.

And then you take 50 undergrads from one semester and you need to move them to 50 different appointments the next semester. And then the next semester, and then the next semester, and then the next semester. It is not working. They said I was being polite, but I'm trying to be polite, but it is broken.

**Lauri Catalano:** You are. And we appreciate that. And we do recognize some of those and so we are committed to continuing. Again our focus has been on payroll and benefits. But understanding that hiring and the ins and outs, and puts and takes are kind of next on our list. So thank you. It's important for us.

**Chair Woessner:** Other comments or questions. Stand and announce your name and your unit.

**John Nousek, College of Science:** My case is almost the opposite from Kim's, in that I'm only doing one. But what I used to be able to do was make my own offer letter, which included what I wanted. Now I have to find a way to make the program issue an offer letter. And it won't have things in it-- I have to deal with expert control and I have explicit clauses I'd like to have in there as part of the contract. There's no way to do that. Moreover, when I make an offer I have to now have a person accept my offer before I can give them a letter. I personally would never have accepted a non-written offer. But yet, I'm forced to beg the people who work for me to do that. So it's structurally-- I don't know how you could design a system like that and ask people to accept something sight unseen. It boggles my mind.

**Lauri Catalano:** We have had a lot of mixed opinions about the offer letter process, I will tell you. There's a lot of views and so we have been trying to incorporate that. I will tell you one thing that we have not ruled out-- we have got an agreement with Mary Beahm in conjunction with Provost Jones- have identified that FTE wants an FTM offer letters will stay in the unit.

We have not ruled that out yet. But because of that concern of the uniqueness. So that is something that is on the docket and will be coming very quickly. We do recognize that not all encompassing, however, and there's more to be in that area.

**Chair Woessner:** Michael, we need a microphone down--

**Michael Krajsa, Lehigh Valley:** You mentioned a lot of numbers since it rolled out December 10. Can you tell me which one of those numbers were complaints and problems? And which one of those numbers were actually positive facilitated things? And how did those compare-- how did the positive facilitated ones compare to what we were at?
Michael Busges: Can I just say one thing. That I'm a little bit outside of Lauri's, but obviously there were complaints, and obviously people had some issues in the beginning of the system. But the campus was very polite. People were very polite. Interactions were great.

Lauri's team has been praised many, many times for their professionalism and for their responsiveness. So the interactions were positive. I'm going to let Lauri answer your question.

Lauri Catalano: And I would actually say that the metrics that I gave you were not positive or negative. They were actually questions that people had. So the question would be, I have a role as a timekeeper can you help me understand what this is? Or I'm looking at my sick leave and I don't understand it.

So they weren't positives or negatives the metrics I gave you were actually inquiries about something about the employees or the person's profile that they wanted information on.

Michael Krajsa: Are they trending down weekly, or are they still maintaining?

Lauri Catalano: No, the numbers are trending down, which is great. We knew it would be high because it was a new system. And we knew it would be high, because it was the beginning of the semester. So it was a rough start for us to have high volume right at the beginning of the semester with the new system.

Our numbers are quieting a bit. We anticipate a spike in April and May, when we start to do summer hiring. And then our biggest spike will be in August again.

Michael Krajsa: And we [INAUDIBLE] at number two is a big problem with a lot of our professors who manage students. You know they have enough workload, particularly the science ones, without becoming an HR person.

Ira Saltz, Shenango: I had an extremely difficult process. I want to do something simple, as to take my daughter off our health insurance plan, because she got her own insurance. And so I went into Workday found, OK, change dependents, and clicked on that. There wasn't anything else clickable.

So there was a box for comments, so I just wrote in there, oh, you know, I want to remove my daughter from the health insurance. I got back a message that said your request has been successfully completed. Oh, good, right? Done. No, absolutely not. Nothing was done. And apparently that wasn't the process at all.

So three months later when I saw that nothing was done, and I went back into the system again. And then finally asked somebody and they said, oh, well, you know, do this. I said, OK, well I did that. I did the first step, and I got back a message, again, saying your request has been successfully completed. But no, that was only step one of a four step process. And every step along the way I got back a message, your request has been successfully completed, when it wasn't. I sincerely, sincerely hope somebody eliminates that message. And instead says, here's what you need to do. Thank you.

Lauri Catalano: Thank you. We did have-- we definitely did do some training materials. We've gotten some good feedback that the training materials weren't enough. There needs to be more coaching. We've definitely heard that. We did have a little bit of a perfect storm going live in the new system and also changing health care providers. That hit us hard. That's not an excuse, but we did have some hiccups with
some of those integrations as well. So acknowledging that we are accountable for that, and recognize that. But we're sorry. We thank you for being persistent. So thank you for sticking with us.

**Chair Woessner:** Your concern has been successfully completed. Thank you. I don't spend too much time just cataloging-- there's certainly a lot of issues that we're dealing with.

I don't want to spend too much time on those. Is there anything else related that we should convey or question that we have? One more in the back and then we'll wrap this up.

**Carolyn Mahan:** This is Carolyn Mahan from Penn State Altoona. I want to convey the message that it's not a software issue. Faculty should not be HR. And these are all issues.

I do not know why I am being an HR rep for everyone I hire. And we do not have staff at the Commonwealth campuses. I used to just sign a payroll sheet and there's no one to send them to. And it's not an issue for you it's just that now we've all become HR managers.

And I don't ever recall that being presented to the Senate. I don't recall us agreeing to do that. It's just what it is now. And I think that's the bigger issue versus your software, which we can improve. But HR people should be dealing with your software, not all of us faculty. So, thank you.

**Ira Saltz:** Thank you.

**Lauri Catalano:** I do think-- I appreciate that. And we've heard that. And it has been clunky and it's been tough. And I'm not going to discount that. Your concern is valid.

I do think one of the things that we have found is an inconsistent understanding of expectations. And that's something that we're working through. So one of the things that we had as it related to Workday our hope was that this tool would be able to provide you a lot more information at your fingertips, which would enable you to make more decisions about your teams, the people that you work with. And, as part of that, HR differentiates between what is an HR task and what is perceived as a role as a team leader or a manager. And so I think sometimes there's confusion about those expectations. And we're working through that. We're trying to figure out where that fine line is.

**Chair Woessner:** Our time expired ten minutes ago. Very useful discussion. So, thank you very much, Lauri and Michael.

The next report is Appendix Q. Senate Committee on Intra-University Relations, “Interim Report on Implementation of AC21”. Ten minutes is allocated to the presentation and discussion. Chair Rosemarie Petrilla will present the report.

**Rosemarie Petrilla:** OK, good afternoon again. So IRC was charged to conduct a mid-year report on the status of the Fixed Term Promotion Committee. And some specific questions; have they established committees? Have they met, and are they reviewing candidates?

Since AC21 was updated on July 1, 2017, the committee thought about how best to get some information to determine the progress. It was difficult. We had originally planned to put out a survey in October, but feedback from reaching out to the committees-- the members on our committee-- that there wasn't enough progress at that point.
It appeared that information—or there was progress but information generated by the faculty and administrators of the different units were not yet voted on by their governance bodies. They were being worked upon. So we delayed that survey to December, and early January. And the response rate wasn't as great as we had hoped it would be.

So we extended that a little bit longer. And what we focused on, what the questions were focused on, we took the actual assumptions from AC21, and we thought we wanted to ask administrators as well as faculty so we can see what the perceptions of progress were among the two groups. So we were asking what the knowledge of the changes were, the implementation of the policy in the individual units, what the composition of the committees were, and where the progress was in the development of the guidelines, and then the number of expected candidates. Because our response rate for the faculty governance representatives was only 19 percent at that point and 38 percent from the pool of administrative staff we couldn't make any global assumptions from that. But nonetheless, we felt as though any concern brought forward was still an important concern. I think in summary we could say that overall progress was being made.

There were some concerns that were outlined, because this report is being— it was about two months after the actual data was collected. Administrators have had some opportunity to address some of the concerns that were brought to the attention or brought forward in this report. So I'd be happy to entertain any questions that anybody might have.

Chair Woessner: Questions or comments about the report?

Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs: So in anticipation, or having read the report, I thought it might be useful to know what was the implementation of AC21 and from an administrative perspective. And we collected-- we've asked for the guidelines for AC21 from all of the units, so the 21 different units. And I can tell you how I counted it up. But it came to 21. And 20 of those 21 have submitted their guidelines and are being-- the vast majority of them are being properly implemented as we speak right now. All of them have been reviewed by me and sent back, some to give feedback for what they do with their next revision, some had to revise some things immediately because they were just inconsistent with the policy. Of all but one of those have come back to me.

So all of the guidelines exist. The only unit that doesn't have them is the School of International Affairs. They're associated with the Law School. They're trying to work on something. And so that unit's delayed. I think it affects like two people in that unit. So I feel like we're at about 100 percent.

We also wanted to get a little bit of an update on how the title changes are coming. Because there is a longer time window for implementation of title changes. And, to be honest with you, Workday has slowed this down a little bit in terms of implementation. But I did hear in my committee this morning that title changes are coming out, just came out in the College of Health and Human Development I believe, to great acclaim.

So we have about 12 of 21 units who have fully implemented the title changes. All of the rest are ready to go. Some are in process, some are going to get letters this week, some are waiting for Workday just to get to the point where they can approve them all.
You know so it looks like in some units zero percent but they're all there. We're just waiting for the system to catch up with what happened. So I would consider most of the provisions of AC21 well underway in terms of implementation.

**Chair Woessner:** One additional question.

**Mohamad Ansari, Berks:** Thank you. With your permission, I would like to address this question to Vice Provost. For the second promotion that we approved and President Barron ratified the Senate Advisory/Consultative Report. I would like to know, how many of those units have really established the fixed term promotion of your committees?

**Kathy Bieschke:** My understanding is that they are established. Now they're not-- this year we're in consultation with the Senate leadership. We had to talk about the composition of the review committees is quite complicated for their promotion to the highest level because we don't have at some locations-- many locations anybody at that level. So people have called in, or written in, and asked for an exception to the policy.

I don't know how many of them have people coming up to become full professors. But their policy is in place. And that they are running people through that. In some units I know they definitely have them. My impression was that all the units had them, because they had the policy and they were currently implementing them. But I didn't quite ask the question the way you're asking it to me.

**Rosemarie Petrilla:** Some anecdotal comments that we have received since the survey was completed, and just through some participation of the members of IRC in the promotional process. I think there still could be more education. There is still some confusion about the levels of promotion and titles. So I think we still need to reinforce that along the way. I would say that that has been the major source of confusion at least in the Commonwealth as far as my experience is concerned.

**Chair Woessner:** OK, thank you, Rosemarie and Vice Provost Bieschke.

**NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS**

**Chair Woessner:** New legislative business. Is there any new business? No.

**COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY**

**Chair Woessner:** Comments and recommendations for the good of the University?

**Kevin Reuning, Graduate School Student Representative:** Hi, I'm Kevin Reuning, I am the student representative from the graduate school. I know it's been a long meeting so I will be quick.

I'm also a member of the Coalition of Graduate Employees, which you all might have recently found out about. There will be a union election here for a Graduate Union early to mid-April. This comes after four to five years of work from the Coalition Graduate Employees. And if we vote “yes”, we will be joining 30-some other graduate unions, and six graduate unions in the Big Ten.
I want to tell you all that I'm here if you've got questions. I will be hanging out in Kern afterwards. You can also get information from our web site ‘cge-psu.com’. I know there's a lot of questions about what this might mean for faculty. And we are also in the process of setting up a meeting with some faculty that were unionized as graduate assistants to talk about what that relationship was for them and who have been on the other side as well. I just wanted to make sure that everyone knew because I know this is an important and somewhat mysterious issue to a lot of you.

Chair Woessner: Are there any other comments for the good of the University? None.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Group: Aye.

Chair Woessner: All opposed. Motion carries. The Senate is adjourned until April 24, 2018.
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