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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, March 12, 2019, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate building with Michael Bérubé, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Michael Bérubé, University Faculty Senate Chair: We start with Agenda Item A, Minutes of the Preceding Meeting. The January 29 Senate Record providing a full transcription of the proceedings was sent to University Archives and is posted on the Faculty Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions to these minutes?

[INAUDIBLE]

Chair Bérubé: Second?

Unidentified Senators: Second.

Chair Bérubé: All in favor?

Unidentified Senators: Aye.

Chair Bérubé: All opposed? Okay. The ayes have it. Motion carried. Minutes of the January 29 meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Bérubé: Item B, Communications to the Senate. The Senate Curriculum Report of February 19, 2019 is in your agenda as Appendix A and is posted on the University Faculty Senate website.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Bérubé: Item C, Report of Senate Council. Minutes from the February 19, 2019 Senate Council meeting can be found at the end of your agenda. Included in those minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the president at the February 19 meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Bérubé: Item D, Announcements by the Chair. I have only one announcement today, but it is a critically important matter for the future of shared governance at Penn State and I will be happy to take a few questions about it. Do we have a screen?

Together with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Kathy Bieschke, I have convened a special Senate committee that will be devoted to the question of how to proceed in cases that involve substantial violations of University policy that do not merit a possible termination of employment.

I want to stress that this committee, and whatever policies and procedures it eventually recommends to the Senate, will not give University administration any new powers. It will simply create reliable, transparent, standardized procedures-- procedures that will, for example, establish a review process for
anyone who believes that he or she is not in violation of University policy and has been wrongfully accused of misconduct.

Look, for example, at the bullet points at the end of policy AD85 on Sexual and/or Gender Harassment, et cetera, a policy I have spoken about to you before. All these many things are things that can already happen to people who violate this policy.

I mention AD85 because it's kind of topical these days. And also, because we are working on it as we speak, as I mentioned in January's meeting. And, the Consensual Relationships Report is now being reviewed by three committees and we will have it out for you in April.

The problem, though, is that we don't have any standard operating procedure for how any of these things can happen. Deans, department heads, chancellors, and faculty have no roadmap, which means that any application of any of these sanctions is random and can differ from campus to campus and from department to department. So, that is what this committee will be trying to fix.

The committee will be co-chaired by Vice Provost Bieschke and former Senate Chair and current University Ombudsperson, Mohamad Ansari. From administration, the committee members will be Katherine Allen, Associate General Counsel; Suzanne Adair, Associate Vice President for Affirmative Action; Kathy Drager, Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education in HHD; and Candy Yekel, the Associate Vice president for Research.

From the Senate, we will have, in addition to Mohamad Ansari, Carey Eckhardt, Galen Grimes, John Nousek, Rick Robinett, and Samia Suliman. I think of this on the Senate side as a kind of dream team for a committee this sensitive, and I thank each of you Senators for agreeing to serve on it.

The charge meeting will be held next week on March 21, and I will be writing the charge between now and then. And I would like to open the floor for a few questions for anyone who has them. [PAUSE] Great. If you have them in private, if you want to email me personally or any of the committee members, feel free.

Senators using MediaSite are asked to use the ‘Ask a Question’ box to send a message that you have successfully connected to the live-feed so that we may add your name to the attendance list as being present.

As a reminder to senators joining by MediaSite, we are again using the voting system at polleverywhere.com/facultysenate. Instructions for using this voting system were emailed to all senators and are posted on the Senate website. And, for those of you on MediaSite today, please log into polleverywhere.com so that you are ready to use it when we get around to voting.

The link to the online committee preference forum will be sent soon to 2019-2020 Senators. Although it is not always possible to give everyone their first choice, the preference forum plays a vitally important role in determining committee assignments. So, there is an element of the Hogwarts sorting hat ceremony to this whole procedure, but Senate staff actually work assiduously to try to get everyone their first choice, or at least their second.

Senators should consult with their unit caucuses to determine the most appropriate Senate committee. And please be sure to indicate if you would be willing to serve in a leadership role. I can't tell you how
useful this was to me in late April when I took the gavel from Matthew knowing which senators were willing to serve as chairs and vice chair, and what committees. I'm sure that information will be vitally important to Nicholas as well, and we thank you for that.

Which brings me to the moment where I'd like to ask President Barron to make some comments and stand for a few questions. President Barron.

**COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY**

**Eric Barron, President, Penn State University:** Well, thank you. So, Friday, a group of us will travel to New York City to make presentations and answer questions for Moody's and Standard & Poor in order to have them assess our bond rating, which, if it's a good rating, obviously saves us a significant amount of money.

And I was looking through all of the materials and decided they made me feel really good. And so I just thought I would share feeling really good today in preparation of going to Moody's, and add some other things in there that I spend a lot of time telling our alumni when I'm trying to raise money, for which some of them you may have heard, and some of them you may not have heard.

So, the context of this for some is that Moody's and Standard & Poor do not think the higher education sector is particularly robust. And they say this in a rather simple way in saying that the outlook for higher education financially is negative for the second year in a row. That just released a couple of months ago.

And they say it very specifically as revenue is constrained and expenses are growing. And that puts a lot of universities in a negative position. So, a significant percentage of universities that go and ask for a bond rating are, in the view of Moody's, not financially sustainable. And that's only the ones that go ask. So, it makes quite a statement.

But one of the interesting things, now having done this-- this will be my fifth time to do the Moody's and Standard & Poor discussions-- is that describes something very narrow. But they actually have keen interest across the entire University and how well it's functioning. And they look at it from the viewpoint of what's in the news-- and we'll be prepared to ask questions about that-- but also all the signs of robustness of the University.

So just to give you a little bit of sense of this, there is a lot of demographic pressure on universities. You certainly hear that in the state of Pennsylvania. They pay a great deal of attention to admissions, for example, and the interest and the attendance. So obviously if it's in decline, this is a bit of a problem.

Now, Rob Pangborn has all the numbers but I just sort of looked up the last little notification that I've got. And here are undergraduate applications on the order of 100,000 compared to order of 75,000 a year ago, largely because of ‘Common App’.

But the demand to come into this University is extremely strong. We're up about a net 450 paid accepts so far for the year, and the quality is growing. And you could imagine, if your applications are in decline, and you're reaching deeper into your pool to get your students, and the quality is declining, that's quite a red flag on the health of the University. So, we're at the opposite.
They look at the research funding as a sense of how robust the institution is as well. And, so, $927 million dollars-- and I know Neal's in the room-- $927 million dollars. An all-time record. I really like the fact that we have 15 disciplines that are ranked in the top-ten of NSF total science and engineering research expenditures.

And the wonderful thing about this if you haven't heard this is no other University has more disciplines in the top 10. Not Stanford. Not MIT. This is quite a statement, not just about the depth of this University, but the incredible breadth of the University.

They look at philanthropy to see whether or not your alumni are giving back and whether or not this is a sort of safety valve on the universities in terms of finances. And they view, actually, one of the few bright spots financially is the high level of return on investments that universities have. So, they look at that as a potential resource for being able to innovate.

Because in fact, in that constrained environment, they go, “What are you giving up? What, are you giving up wage increases, potentially? You're giving up technology innovations, potentially? You're giving up construction funds to keep your physical plant in good shape”? And, so, they look at the only bright piece as good returns on what universities have invested.

We have good returns. But the other thing about it is that at $362.9 million dollars, we broke all records for fundraising commitments. We also broke all records for fundraising receipts of dollars. The only time in our history that we have done over $300 million dollars two years in a row. The other $300 million dollars one was when we had a $100 million dollar-plus gift from Kim and Terry Pegula. So, this is a solid element of the breath of Penn State, and how it looks to a Moody's.

Penn State Health is a huge issue, considering how volatile the health industry in this country is and what the growth and costs are. So, with Penn State Health having good, positive margins, having a lot of growth in what they're doing, and the strategic thinking that is going on there, it is a very positive picture for people to look at.

And state support, Moody's view is across the country is basically stable. But at least we can say that we have had multiple years of some increase after many years of nothing or cuts. And, so, this is the potential that we could make this a habit in some way in Harrisburg.

So, I look at all these different components of it, and it's hard not to feel good in the face of those negative outlooks to know that you're going to make presentations and being able to discuss how strong the University is, and to get that bond rating that enables us to do construction at a relatively modest cost.

Well, I thought, “Okay, that's nice.” That's sort of the financial underpinnings, the types of things that they look at. But there is a lot of other things that are going on for which you have a great deal of impact and roll-in. So why not add those onto my kudos, feel-good moment about how Penn State looks?

The new Economic Development Study, which suggests in much more direct, much more robust dollars, that Penn State creates $11.6 billion dollars economic impact on the state of Pennsylvania. And now you can look campus-by-campus for what that impact is. And we're starting to see the campuses put out articles on what it is their impact on the local community.
Supports 105,000 jobs across the state of Pennsylvania. The one that I like is it for every dollar the state gives us, we generate directly $1.24 dollars in tax revenue for them. I would really like that quarter back here.

[LAUGHTER]

But this is a good message when you're talking to legislators that we are creating tax revenues that exceeds what it is that the state is providing for us. We are an opportunity to generate cash for the state of Pennsylvania.

A lot of good ranking. Things: Libraries, tenth among North American research libraries; seventh among the top producers of Fulbright Scholars and students; 110-plus faculty in National Academies of Engineering, Science, & Medicine; Fellows of American Academy of Arts and Sciences; and, Fellows of American Association for the Advancement of Science. 43 percent of all Penn State ranked doctoral programs were in the top-ten percent of their respective fields. That's another-- just like that research number, that's a remarkable statement about the breadth and depth of what the faculty at this institution does.

Top ranked programs: Anthropology, Plant Biology, Kinesiology, Spanish, Astronomy and Astrophysics, Entomology, Sociology, Nutrition, Demography, English, Environmental Engineering, Geology, Meteorology, Political Science, Communications, Arts & Science, Mathematics, and Philosophy. That is, again, a sign of the strength of Penn State and the breadth of this as an institution.

Invent Penn State- you've heard me talk about a lot. But we're going to cross this boundary where we now have an innovation hub at every campus at Penn State. And in just two years, with only a partial number of those, almost 1,800 entrepreneurs were assisted; 5,000 faculty, staff, and students were engaged in the process; 170 new products; 45 new companies in Pennsylvania;107 jobs; 317 internships created. The notion that the people in the community and the faculty and the students are hiring internships is remarkable. And folks are beginning to invest in it, providing endowments for these LaunchBoxes.

Well, we can always be selective about rankings. But I don't mind, especially with the importance of a broad student body coming from across the world, that being 43rd among the best universities in the world. Last year, 58; 30 among US universities. Last year, 36. That's a very positive statement that enables that student body interest in coming to Penn State and ensuring that we have a robust University.

And we're seeing a lot of different programs grow in the rankings based on our research and quality of teaching. Grad programs in EMS and Engineering making significant jumps; Supply Chain Management, number one by Gartner; Medical Center, World Campus continuing to rise in the rankings. To have all the categories at which we provide ranking data for the World Campus to be in the top-ten is remarkable. It's also fun, if you haven't heard it, that we're number two in producing CEOs of major companies. That's a statement that that work ethic and that education and the students that are attracted here work hard, and they climb the ladder and end up being CEOs. And it's just always fun when you're ahead of Harvard and MIT and Wharton in terms of producing CEOs of major companies. The only school left to pass is Stanford, but that's a remarkable statement.
It is also a remarkable statement that many corporations are narrowing where they go to recruit students into their corporations, and many of them have narrowed it to five or six universities. Flagships tend to have a leg up in that particular process.

The *Wall Street Journal* did a survey a few years back. We've done a preliminary survey just to see where we stand, not just providing a range. And, Penn State sits there somewhere between number one and number five in terms of the places where corporations come to recruit.

That's what you do in the classroom. That's what we do, is providing opportunities for students. That's the students we attract. That's the work ethic that they have. But a rather remarkable statement there. There's only one private that is in that top five.

But for Penn State to be right up there when you consider how many state flagships there are, that's really quite remarkable. And it is part of the reason why more than 1,200 corporations come and recruit at Penn State that we know of. And there's plenty that are recruiting across the state that we aren't adding up.

Okay, so, this was a moment to just say thanks that I'm walking into the Moody's and Standard & Poor feeling like I'm armed with really good information about what this University is doing that is positive and very little that is negative. Especially when you start to think about the constraints on higher education these days, as everybody tries to control tuition but the costs are busily growing.

So, I'm just saying thanks for all the efforts that are here. And I'm happy to take any questions. And as you know, I'll take a question on any topic. I may not know the answer, but I will certainly listen.

**Chair Bérubé:** Thank you so much. And thanks for the thanks, too. Questions? Over here.

**Dennis Jett, School of International Affairs:** President Baron, I'm Dennis Jett from the School of International Affairs. Three years ago, the Penn State Values Initiative was launched. I was wondering if there's been any follow up to measure student awareness and understanding of those values, and to what extent the institution itself is inculcating those values and not only talking the talk but walking the walk— in terms of paying staff members a living wage and making sure nobody's below $15 dollars per hour, or some other kind of step that indicates we're putting not only words behind it, but actions as well.

**President Barron:** Yeah. So, there's a lot more than I know the answers to. And, so, I'm not sure in terms of students surveying or whether someone like Lance here in the room knows the answer to that particular question.

But I will say that there are many, many times we're looking at things we're doing and we map it back to the values. So that we have this sense that it's deliberate. And, so, I think that is a sign in general of health in that particular topic.

And I think this-- yeah? Go ahead. You have a microphone there.

**Lance Kennedy Phillips, Vice Provost for Planning and Assessment:** Hi, it's Lance Kennedy-Phillips. The values and culture survey did go to students as well. So those results are available for people to see.

**President Barron:** OK. Great.
Chair Bérubé: Over here first. Yes.

Sai Kakuturu, Harrisburg: President Baron. I am Sai Kakuturu from Penn State, Harrisburg.

President Barron: Yeah.

Sai Kakuturu: From 2012 or so, at the beginning of every semester, Office of the President-- that means your office-- sends an email to all the Penn State faculty staff about the resources for reporting wrongdoing.

President Barron: Yeah.

Sai Kakuturu: I want to thank you, your office, for sending those emails, because it shows our commitment to listen from people about wrongdoing and preventing wrongdoing to help grow Penn State as an ethical institution. Because it has been going on for the last six years or so, I'm just wondering if your office has collected any data about how many people have reported wrongdoing, and how many cases were investigated, and what actions were taken. I'm not asking any confidential information.

President Barron: Yeah.

Sai Kakuturu: But if you have any summary data, I believe that, if you can please share it with the Faculty Senate, that will go a long way.

President Barron: Yeah, okay. So there certainly is that data that's available- certainly no reason not to share it. We don't do it on an individual basis. We obviously do it in an aggregated basis.

But there is really a profound reason why it's important to do that reporting, from my viewpoint. That is because, over and over again, someone will say you're not going to do anything about it anyway. And but of course, we're not going to have somebody report something and then go back to an individual and work with them, or reprimand them, or anything else, and then go to someone and say, well, we just slapped so-and-so's hand. We can't do that. That would not be appropriate.

But to have a sense that there were this many cases. You know, 92 percent were investigated; 16 percent resulted in some action. Some other thing occurred. I think that data is very important so people realize that reporting does have people that are standing there, listening, paying attention, and investigating where appropriate. So, that's very important. Thanks for the comment.

Sai Kakuturu: Thanks for agreeing to share the data with the Faculty Senate.

President Barron: Yeah. No problem.

Sai Kakuturu: Thank you so much.

President Barron: Yeah.

Chair Bérubé: You have a question down in front? I'm sorry, I don't know your name.

Arthur Berg, College of Medicine: [INAUDIBLE]
Chair Bérubé: This is highly advanced technology. You don't want to--

President Barron: I thought we were going to have flying microphones.

Arthur Berg: Very simple question. I mean, you mentioned the ranking. I'm a little bit constrained here.

Chair Bérubé: Oh, I'm sorry.

Arthur Berg: You mentioned the ranking data as sounding in a very positive light. But when I simply look on US News, it seems to be fairly standard. At 59, rather low, and going the wrong direction. Do you have any comments for that?

President Barron: Yeah. So, there are several things. First of all, the privates are passing the publics. And so much less movement when you look at the ranking among publics. And second, US News & World Report favors rather strongly expenditures per student, and wealth, and the characteristics of the incoming class. And, so, this is part of the reason why the top-20 doesn't include publics because of those characteristics.

Now I will tell you I will use those rankings when they work well for us. And, so, I'll sit there and talk about the public side of the rankings. But they are not outcome based, with the exception of graduation rate. And we used to get a lot of points for exceeding the expected graduation rate- 21 percentage points.

And I believe that they decided that their formula couldn't be off that much. There was nobody that was at that level with us. There were a number that were ten, 11, a number of them that were nine points- but not 21. And, so, they changed that ranking category. We don't know how they changed the formula, but that did ding us a little bit so that in the total rankings, that became a little bit of an issue. But I tend to look at the rankings among publics because we're not going to compete with the privates in terms of the dollars spent and a selective enrollment process where you expect those students to graduate regardless. So, it is what it is.

Chair Bérubé: If I may dwell for a moment on a presentation you gave earlier. One of the ramifications of that is that the better job we do of educating students from the bottom two quintiles, the more we get dinged.

President Barron: Yep. But the simple fact of the matter is if I could raise tuition, decrease the size of the student body, and hire more faculty, you would see this University soar in the US News and World Report rankings. But I don't think we're about limiting that size in the same way. And I'd rather not increase tuition if I can help it. But that's what it would take to sit up there in the higher-level rankings.

Chair Bérubé: We have a question here. And one over here.

Gavin Robertson, College of Medicine: Gavin Robertson from Hershey. So, I was wondering-- the President is threatening to have an executive action limiting funding to universities that have any restriction on freedom of press. And I remember last year we prevented someone that had wanted to come and present on this campus from presenting to really negate the negative effects that it might have. Is there any way we're going to change our policy, or what's going to happen?
President Barron: Okay. So, first of all, I don't know what the executive action, if the President puts it together, will look like. But we are required to promote freedom of speech. There is nothing new that we would be doing as a consequence of this.

And this is a statement that AAU has put out as well, saying, “Look. The major research universities of the country that get so much federal funding-- we're already there. So, you know, what is the sense of what you're doing”? And the speaker that you're talking about-- and it probably doesn't help you so much to realize how nuanced it is. But the ‘no’ was not ‘no’ forever. It was no in the aftermath of Charlottesville, and then what we saw at Florida, for which people's lives were lost or nearly lost, and for which the level of violence was extreme and threatening. And in many cases, by outside agents to the University. Okay?

So, it presents a threat. There is a financial threat, but it's more a safety threat. And that decision was based on our police force saying whether or not they thought they could protect this campus, even by adding individuals. There was an enormous police presence at Florida, and shots were still fired into a crowd of people. Fortunately, in that case, they missed. So, what you see is an effort in place and time to make sure that we can keep our students safe. Not that your saying speakers cannot come.

The other thing about it that is sort of interesting. You know, the Reagan Building stopped the same speaker from coming into that as a federal building because of safety risks that were there. The other thing that you're seeing is that there are many, many individuals that are using universities to try to promote dissent.

And you discover when you're sitting there looking through film that the participants from two different factions are not the faculty from the university, they're not the staff from the university, and they're not the students from the university. And yet the cost is there, and the threat to the population is strong.

You know, you watched Michigan University decide to do it at an Ag school in a barn off-campus, enabling the speech, enabling everyone to attend, but attempting to prevent the threat of safety for students.

It's incredibly important that we're able to test ideas in the marketplace. It's just incredibly important. So, we're never going to back down from that. But we will look at time and place as a way to keep people safe.

The other element of it-- and I'm sorry I'm going on here-- is that the description that I gave of outside individuals attempting to use the University, and even to point, look, they don't believe in free speech. In many cases, the universities, as public, have opened their door to anyone coming.

And, so, the only thing that we've changed is to say, wait a minute. We're here for our students and for the faculty and staff. And, so, any group that comes shouldn't just be able to walk off the street and decide that they're going to give a talk.

Of course, they can certainly do that in lots of places on our campus. But to reserve an auditorium, they need to be sponsored by a department, a faculty group, a student group. And then that becomes a different story in terms of us making sure that they're there.
But then also, when we do that, the first people that are allowed inside the door have to be our students, faculty, and staff. Because that's what we're here for. Not just to be a venue for someone else.

And, so, the other thing that's a policy change is whatever speaker that comes on this campus will need to be a sponsored speaker. And if it is viewed as being something that's generating a lot of interest, our students are the first one to come in the door. And when the room is full, it's full. And, so, this is this is an attitude of how to do this and keep our students safe, and not restrict speech in any way or form.

Now it turns out we're a lot less interesting if the outsiders can't dominate the room, and create a shouting match, and start throwing things, or heaven forbid, something more serious than that. So that's less interesting. But I think if you go look at speakers that are on this campus, you'll see it's a huge variety and nothing that's restricted by politics or other views.

**Chair Bérubé:** Thank you for very comprehensive answer. It's a critical question. Thank you for asking it. One more.

**Brian Saunders, College of Medicine:** You had mentioned in your remarks some of the strategic things going on at Penn State Health. And I was wondering if you can comment on what you see as the advantages and disadvantages from the academic perspective of separating the roles of dean and CEO of the Penn State Health System and the College of Medicine.

**President Barron:** Yeah. Okay. So, I would start with the viewpoint that this is a changing landscape. And we have we have one major goal as a University. And that's to have a very healthy College of Science, and to have a facility-- Hershey-- that enables that faculty, while also providing the service of clinical care.

Now what is it going to take to make sure that high level hospital is robust? It takes-- I believe, and after having listened to many, many people-- quite a pyramid of flow of patients, and a regional focus that protects that flow of patients.

So, you watch, especially with the competition of other health systems that will come in, might buy a hospital, and their attitude is, “Okay, now you must do this, and you must do this…” That threatens the success of Penn State Health and Hershey. That means that we need a broader set of partnerships, hospitals, micro-hospitals, physician practice plans that are coupled to us that make all of this secure.

It also means that we have to make sure that the dollars as Penn State Health rose automatically flow into College of Medicine so College of Medicine can grow as well. If you start to look at that very carefully, you realize that the scope of that clinical enterprise becomes a major task and job in itself. OK?

So, will the College of Medicine lose if the clinical enterprise grows and the person that's at the top is not a real advocate for the College of Medicine just by virtue of time, just by virtue of making sure that those margins are always in the black? So, the job is more complicated. But also, from my viewpoint, is you need a leader that is clearly advocating for the College of Medicine.

And, in all of the discussions about whether there are mergers, or building, or construction, or different partnerships, there's always someone that's sitting there looking at it solely universally from the perspective of making sure the College of Medicine is strong. In my mind, both the complication and the
fact that you need that advocate and leader are the two major reasons why it makes sense for that position to be separate.

It also depends on what's behind the door. A formula that as a clinical enterprise grows, more dollars flow into College of Medicine. A security that by putting the dean of the College of Medicine as a voting trustee by virtue of position in Penn State Health also allows that individual to be in a very different place.

So, I hope we're thinking through this very, very carefully with this notion that we are an educational institution. The partnership with a clinical enterprise is incredibly important, but we have to make sure that the College of Medicine is successful. I hope that helps.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you, President Baron. And it is my pleasure to recognize Provost Jones for comments and questions.

[APPLAUSE]

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: Thank you, Michael. First, I just want to take this occasion to do something that I won't be able to do too many more times, and that is embarrass one of my colleagues by wishing Neil Sharkey a very happy birthday. Neil.

[LAUGHTER]

[APPLAUSE]

And I mean because--

Neil Sharkey, Vice President for Research: Forty-two years old!

[LAUGHTER]

Provost Jones: Right. Behaving like it. Neil, of course, is retiring this coming summer. Okay. Just very quickly some updates on a few things, and then a little stream of consciousness, perhaps, at the end.

First are searches. I think you all will have seen the announcement by now of the new dean of Dickinson Law, Danielle Conway. She'll be joining us this summer. And also, I guess just two weeks ago, we announced the new dean of the College of the Liberal Arts, Clarence Lang, who will also be coming this summer. So very pleased that those two searches are ended successfully.

The first finalist candidate for the College of Arts and Architecture dean is arriving today and will be here for the next couple of days. And, the other two candidates will be in in quick succession. So that what is moving along very well.

College of Education and Vice Provost for Global Program searches both proceeding on schedule as anticipated. And to my earlier comment with Neil's impending retirement, we have a search underway for the Vice President for Research that's being led by Frank Guadagnino.
Strategic Plan implementation. We are in the Review Phase of the Cycle-4 of the RFP process. We got a bunch, again, of really good proposals through each round of this. We've seen just more and more interesting and powerful proposals come in, many of them revised from prior submissions.

In the first three cycles, we've funded just over 30 proposals for a total of around $7 million dollars of investment, and we're now starting to see some of those investments bear fruit. In total over the four cycles, we've seen over 200 proposals come in. That's a lot.

In the end, we will be funding about 40-odd of those. That leaves a lot of really good ideas out there that were not supported or will not be supported through this process. But we are looking for ways that we can bring those ideas forward and get them embraced anyway.

There will be a Cycle-5. We're going to take a little bit of a pause as we look at what we've achieved through the first four cycles. And Cycle-5 will probably look different. We don't know what different means yet, but we're using this as an opportunity to step back, look at what has been supported through the RFP process, look at some of the signature initiatives- I'll get to in a moment- that have emerged. And probably going to target Cycle-5 a little bit more specifically to address areas where we think additional attention is warranted.

Speaking of the signature initiatives, I think, since I last spoke, maybe I had mentioned before the Consortium to Combat Substance Abuse is up and running. Doing very well. Off to a great start. And we recently announced support for the Humanities Institute, which I think is a really exciting investment by Penn State in the humanities that obviously has a strong presence here at University Park, but really intends to connect in a pretty robust way across all of our campuses. So, we're very pleased about that.

What's ahead? Well, there'll be certainly more of these signature initiatives being supported in the next couple of years. There are several proposals either in my possession or in development now. But probably most significant to share with you is we did propose to the Board of Trustees, that given the progress that we are making on implementation with this plan, given the transformational nature of many of the initiatives that are emerging, that rather than do a whole new strategic planning process starting about now, we're basically going to hit the kind of pause button, do a rigorous review and assessment of progress we've made in implementation to date, with a view of revising-- as appropriate at the unit level and the institutional level-- our Strategic Plan, and continuing to move forward for another five years.

So, the good news is you won't have to do a whole brand-new strategic planning exercise. And we'll stay focused on doing the great things that we're doing with the implementation of this plan. So that is the intention with the Strategic Plan. We'll be getting a formal communication out about this very soon.

It doesn't mean there's no work to be done, because it really is an opportunity for us to assess progress and really make careful revisions to our planning documents as we move forward. I don't think we're going to be doing a 180 at all, but we might make some slight course corrections as we move forward.

LionPATH. Not much to say about LionPATH except to just let everybody know again that there is an upgrade coming this summer to the core system. Should not be impactful. Brings new features, enhancements. Keeps us up to date. There'll be a little bit of disruption in the summer during the period that that upgrade is done, but it should be reasonably benign. Although you've heard that from me before.
The WorkLion and the HR transformation-- we are now in year two of the implementation. Year one was difficult, and probably more difficult than we had anticipated. Number of reasons for that. One of them we identified in the fall was that, in some critical areas, we believe that we had under-resourced the effort. We were short of a few full-time staff to support the transition. And that led to us getting a little bit behind in terms of being able to respond to requests and concerns.

And so, we've addressed that issue. We are in the process of hiring some additional people to support the project. And so that should help us address any backlog issues that are out there and keep us ahead of the curve moving forward.

The SIMBA implementation is making good progress. We're one year and three, four months away from go-live with SIMBA. Everything's on schedule. The team is in place. The governance structures are supporting their efforts. And we're on a pretty good vector with SIMBA so far. That will be impactful. I'm going to keep saying that at every opportunity I have, because it is big and touches every corner of the University. So, take advantage of every opportunity you may have to learn about the changes that SIMBA will bring as we distribute them.

Just a quick comment that Kathy and I, Kathy Bieschke and I are going to be working this year, after what we consider to be the pretty successful implementation of AC21, addressing promotion and career progression for Fixed-Term Faculty, we are going to turn our attention to part-time faculty, who are a very important part of our educational enterprise. We'll be, of course, working closely with the Senate on this issue.

I think it's fair to say that probably many years if not decades have passed since there was a comprehensive look, if there ever has been, at the support structures that we have in place for part-time faculty. So, we're going to try to take a look at that and come up with what we hope will be something equivalent to what we accomplished with AC21 in terms of equity across the institution in terms of conditions for part-time faculty.

Some of you may have seen in The Wall Street Journal last week, there was a discussion about IT security and attacks on US enterprises, including universities, specifically by China in this case. And Penn State was mentioned. I just wanted to assure you, reassure you, that that was old news. That referred to the breach that we had back in 2015. Somehow, The Wall Street Journal got hold of that and wrote about it as though it happened two weeks ago. And it didn't. It was the same story. They didn't call us to check before they published it. So just so you can sit easy, it wasn't a new attack that we didn't tell you about. It was an old one.

And then finally, I'll just share a couple of thoughts. Last week during spring break, I traveled to China. Spent about five-and-one-half days on the ground there. And had a few observations that kind of lead into some things for us to think about. First, it's a long way to go to China. Boy, that is one long trip.

I was able to spend time in Beijing, Shanghai, Shenzhen, and Hong Kong. So, it was a pretty busy week. I got to meet with alumni in each of those four cities. Individual alumni for one-on-one meetings. But more importantly, probably, I met with some relatively young alumni. And I define a young alumnus by somebody that has Eric and my signature on their diploma, right? So, they graduated in the last five or so years.
And I have to tell that it was energizing to meet with these young men and women. They are passionate about Penn State. They show up in the middle of Beijing in their Penn State gear. And they are absolute advocates for the University. And it is just amazing to see the impact we have had on their lives and sense that pride they feel for being Penn Staters. We estimate that we have probably at least 5,000 alumni in China-- at least 5,000. Those are the ones that we know about.

So, at one end of the spectrum, I met some of these young and exciting alumni. At the other end of the spectrum, I met an alumnus who was the first recipient of a PhD from a US university after the Cultural Revolution. And he is a Penn Stater. He's now in his 80s. A truly amazing individual.

And he just spoke, I guess I would say lovingly about his experience here in State College, and the way he was welcomed and treated by people here. And he was just a very gracious man. And we had a wonderful meeting with him.

So, Penn State, you heard from Eric a lot of the things that we do that are pretty extraordinary. There's a whole lot of those things that are just under the radar screen that you often don't hear about, but then come to realize that that's actually a pretty significant accomplishment for us as an institution-- that we provided the first ever PhD to a Chinese national after the Cultural Revolution.

I haven't been to China for at least a decade and it was really a remarkable experience. The country is on a very steep gradient. They are innovating like crazy. And it reminded me and really brought home to me the importance of us as an institution-- and as a nation, but in particular as an institution-- focusing on innovation.

And interestingly, some of you may have been at the Penn State Forum just before the Senate meeting today where Paul Perreault, who is the CEO of CSL Technologies based in Australia but with a major office here in Pennsylvania. Paul and CSL have been big supporters of Penn State-- CSL supporting the Fermentation Lab, and Paul and his wife supporting a scholarship for students here. And they are also Penn State parents.

But Paul interestingly talked about the promise and pitfalls of innovation. It was really a remarkable presentation. And I took some notes down thinking that they would be good to share here. And I felt pretty good as I listened to some of his thinking.

In terms of lead leading in innovation, he identified three key points. One, find intersections across disciplines. Two, reward and recognize innovation across the organization. And three, foster a culture of diversity and inclusion to bring forward the very best ideas. And, as I listened to him talk about that and give examples about their approach at CSL, I realized that it really mirrors, I think, a lot of the things that we're trying to achieve here as an institution. Finding those intersections. Rewarding and recognizing innovation and doing it in an inclusive manner.

Pitfalls-- and I'll close on this, but it's something for us to think about. The key pitfalls he identified. One is a failure to look ahead and be willing and able to leverage change. Second, a lack of focus on transformational innovation. And then third, neglecting to engage stakeholders early and often.

As I thought about those, I thought those are three pitfalls that I think we as an institution are doing a pretty good job of avoiding. But both in terms of promoting innovation and avoiding those pitfalls, these are things we really need to be mindful of moving forward.
I think our Strategic Plan implementation gives us a good structure to be doing this. There were a lot of intersections with Paul's remarks and our approach. So, I think we all should feel proud of what we have achieved and are achieving. And there is much more for us to do. So, with that I will close, and I'm happy to take any questions.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you. Thank you. Questions. Right here.

Dierdre Folkers, York: Dierdre Folkers from Penn State York. And I serve our campus as an Assistant Director of Academic Affairs, which is a kind of odd role that exists only on a campus. But in that role, I hire. And, in any given semester, I'm hiring and overseeing approximately 40 to 50 part-time faculty members. And I staff a fairly substantial portion of our campus's courses.

I am really glad to hear that we are looking at equity for our part-time faculty. And the only thing I'd ask is that I'm hoping that you would reach out to those of us who serve as ADAAs on campuses, because I suspect that we work with part-time faculty members more than many people within the University. And I think there's some good perspectives and input that we could provide.

Provost Jones: Thank you. And yes. Absolutely, we will be doing that.

Chair Bérubé: Anything else?

Provost Jones: It's a quiet bunch today.

Chair Bérubé: All right. Well, I just want to thank you for that also. Because as we mentioned in the meeting of another kind, one of the offshoots of what we've been doing with Fixed-Term Faculty is that the part-time faculty have been writing to me saying, what about us? So, yeah. Thank you.

Provost Jones: OK. Great. Thank you very much.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Bérubé: Next, I am pleased to welcome our fellow Senator and Academic Trustee, David Han, Professor of Surgery and Radiology at Milton S. Hershey Medical Center and College of Medicine. Dr. Han has agreed to offer some remarks and take some questions about how he sees the University's prospects from the perspective of the Board.

So, when I last spoke here in September, I gave really just a brief overview of Board governance and structure. And what I thought I'd do today is continue to build on that, and specifically go back to the Special Committee on University Governance report. Is there a slide advancer here? There it is.

So as many of you know, the Special Committee on University Governance, or SCUG, issued its first report in 2013. This special committee was charged by Senate Chair Dan Hagan to identify and recommend ways to improve and enhance interactions, including the flow of information, and to improve
and enhance the interface of the University Faculty Senate, students, staff, and administration with the Board of Trustees.

In 2015, the Board of Trustees made several structural changes, one of which was to add a student, the past president of the Penn State Alumni Association, and a faculty member to the Board. One year later, SCUG was reconvened with a charge to review changes since the initial report regarding governance structures, as well as lines of communication among the faculty, administration, and the Board; to report on the disposition of the Senate's recommendations for reform; and, with the benefit of hindsight, assess whether any of its initial recommendations should be clarified, modified, or dropped, or whether any additional recommendations are warranted.

SCUG 2 was released in 2016, and I'll go over a few elements of that report momentarily. As I mentioned, in 2018, I was invited by Michael to provide an update to the Faculty Senate. And now today, I'm pleased to provide my second report here to the Faculty Senate.

Back in September, I showed this slide to describe the composition of the Board. And, as you can see, there are many avenues through which someone comes to be a member of the Board of Trustees, including the governor's office, the alumni, agricultural societies, business and industry.

The Board itself brings in three at-large members. And along with the academic trustee, the student trustee, and the past president of the Penn State Alumni Association, they make up the 36 voting members. Dr. Barron and Governor Wolfe serve as non-voting members of the Board.

Somebody asked me the other day about Board turnover. And so, I've captured that information here on this slide. I am currently in my fourth year of service on the Board. And so, using that as a divider, these voting members with four or less years of experience currently make up just over half of the Board membership.

The other item that I would point out simply for informational purposes is that there was a three-year gap between SCUG 1 and SCUG 2. I have no obvious suggestions as to what may or may not happen in 2019. But I would suggest that if anyone has any ideas that they probably ought to notify the author of both SCUG reports, Past Senate Chair, John Nichols.

In all seriousness, Nick really deserves a lot of the credit for any progress that's been made. And I just want to take a minute to recognize all of the hard work that he put into this. Anybody who's been a part of this knows really how much heart and soul John Nichols put into this.

SCUG 2 basically summarized its follow-up findings and recommendations in three areas: Increase academic expertise and diversity in Board membership; expand and formalize faculty participation on Board committees, and in particular those groups listed below; and to increase transparency in lines of internal communication.

This is a slide I showed at my last presentation that we have formalized faculty participation on standing committees. There are seven standing committees of the Board. And all but the Committee on Compensation now have formalized faculty participation. You can see who those folks are. And I can tell you from my experience that they're all very engaged. And I think that the participation has been worthwhile.
So today, I just want to talk about some of the efforts that have been made to increase transparency and the lines of internal communication. As many of you know, the Board currently has five in-person public meetings per year. We have also held an annual retreat that this year was moved from a standalone event in January to be held in combination with our July meeting. This July meeting is typically held at a campus other than University Park. And this July's meeting is at Penn State Brandywine, I believe.

In-between, there's numerous conference calls and telephonic meetings, as well as off-cycle committee meetings-- that is, committee meetings that are not held during one of the five in-person meetings. And this year, we've been taking a new approach to our meeting time. And I want to take a few minutes to put this in perspective.

So, I think any time you pull a group of people together, there is an appropriate interest in trying to make that time together as productive as possible. We've moved to the use of a consent agenda where individual items can be pulled off for full discussion by any member of the Board.

Committees do not meet unless there is a specific purpose. And, quite frankly, I think part of the driver for this change was a sense that much of the material presented at these committee meetings could have easily been distributed and addressed without the need to meet in-person.

Over the course of several retreats, the Board was really challenged to appropriately distribute the Board's time among the three modes of governance. And if you sort of look this stuff up online if you're interested in governance, it actually makes for a pretty reasonably interesting meeting. And this is a guy who reads scientific stuff. So, it's a little bit outside of my wheelhouse, but I've actually found it fairly interesting.

So, there's three modes of governance. Fiduciary, strategic, and generative. First two kind of make sense. They're pretty self-explanatory. But generative, at least to me, was not intuitively obvious.

So, when you talk about fiduciary responsibility, the fiduciary mode of governance really is sort of described as spotting the problem. What's wrong? Asking the question, “What's wrong?” The strategic mode goes into looking to how to solve problems and asks the question, “What is the plan?” Then when you move into generative governance, you start asking about, “What's the key question? How do you frame the problem?” And you try to look to the future, as opposed to analyzing data that's come from the past.

And so, I've been asked this year to chair of the Committee on Academic Affairs and Student Life. And so we, in the interest of trying to follow along this environment where we create a generative discussion and following the recommendations from SCUG which was to improve the lines of internal communication, in November 2018, we had a discussion around One Penn State 2025. I thought I saw Renata here somewhere.

Particularly, we described and discussed the role of curricular coherence. And we had, I think, fairly good representation from faculty and staff throughout the institution. The feedback that I received from the Board was uniformly positive, helping them to understand what curricular coherence is. For many of the folks on the Board, this is new material. And I think that the amount of interest and the depth and the robustness of the discussion was quite good.
Similarly, last month at our Committee on Academic Affairs and Student Life, we held a forum on diversity and inclusion. I saw Marcus here a while ago. Marcus Whitehurst led this discussion. In fact, we had to move to a larger room, it was so well-attended, in particular by other members of the entire Board, as well as our faculty, staff, and student representation. And I think I have a second slide on that one.

So, in conclusion, I have absolutely no recommendation. I'm looking at you, Nick, about what to do around SCUG 3, other than I'm interested to see how you're going to get John Nichols to do it.

[LAUGHTER]

And while I appreciate the opportunity to deliver these prepared remarks, many of you have reached out either privately offline or formally to ask questions and provide insight. And I certainly have appreciated and welcomed that. And those are my contacts. It's not too hard. I still have email because I haven't retired yet, right?

[LAUGHTER]

**Chair Bérubé:** We'll get to that.

**David Han:** Just proving that I read my mail. And finally, I just really want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to serve in this role. I know that I've learned a lot, and hopefully I've contributed in some way to making some sort of meaningful difference. So, Mr. Chair, that concludes my remarks. Be happy to take any questions.

[LAUGHTER]

But it's really going to be Nicholas' decision. Are there any questions for David? Thank you, David. Thank you for your time.

[APPLAUSE]

**FORENSIC BUSINESS**

**Chair Bérubé:** Now for all the business. Everyone ready? We start with Forensics. We have two Forensic Reports today. They should be pretty wide-ranging. The first is from Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid in tandem with the Education Committee. And it is titled “The Future of Academic Advising at Penn State”. It appears as Appendix B.

Needless to say, this follows on the report from ARSSA and Education that you all voted on and approved in January. Fifteen minutes have been allotted for discussion, and that discussion will be led by the chairs, Mary Beth Williams and Beth Seymour.

**Elizabeth Seymour, Altoona:** And we're also being joined by David Smith who you've seen before, but he's just to remind you, the Associate Dean for Advising and the Executive Director of the Division of
Undergraduate Studies. So, we'd like to open this up for a conversation. We have our question up there. And we had a very robust discussion when we talked about this legislation recently. We passed it, and we promised to follow up with a Forensic because there was a lot of good questions that were asked.

Just to remind you, the report that we passed is aspirational, and we would like to see it realized. So, we look for your feedback.

Chair Bérubé: That was an invitation. I'm sorry. Patti, yes. Go ahead. I can't see that far. Steve.

Stephen Snyder, Berks: Snyder. Berks.

Chair Bérubé: Is this is about the word "will."

Stephen Snyder: No, it is not. No, no.

[LAUGHTER]

I didn't want to be the only one to stand up and make a comment, but it looks like that might turn out that way. I don't know. But my suggestion is, so at the campuses-- I'm from Berks, and most of us advise a modest amount of students. I think this semester I have 24, which is not really too big a load.

I advised Smeal students. Smeal students tend to be-- and this is a tribute to Smeal as a whole-- they tend to be very locked-on. And they know what's going on. They tend to be very assertive when it comes to their own advising. So really, they make my job very easy.

But we do have faculty that don't seem to enjoy advising. And so, my suggestion is I think that we should probably consider, for those faculty who do enjoy advising and actually thrive on it, maybe incentivizing a larger load of advisees, and reducing the loads of advisees for faculty who don't really have their heart in the job. And that's it.

Elizabeth Seymour: Thank you for your comments.

Chair Bérubé: Sure. Right here.

Elizabeth Seymour: We've had a recent time change, as you know. So, I think we're all suffering from a bit of jet lag. But we really would like your feedback.

Jonathan Mathews, Earth and Mineral Science: I have faculty that have close to 30 advisees who are Discovery College. We have lots of transfers in from Engineering and other programs.

I think the University could do a lot better job of providing resources to follow the student numbers. So, my department is the size of Mechanical Engineering with half the faculty. So, our advising burden or challenge is significant, and some benchmarking along these lines would be very helpful to demonstrate the inequitable distribution of advising responsibility.

Elizabeth Seymour: Thank you. I think that's a very good recommendation.

Chair Bérubé: Sorry. Raise your hand higher.
Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture: In some colleges, we have professional advisors doing much of the work there. In those cases, I think that the faculty may be suffering from a problem of use it or lose it. Whereas they're losing their ability to advise through a lack of practice, and therefore de-evolving.

So, I think we need to be careful about shifting those responsibilities entirely away from faculty. Because not only do they lose the ability to advise adequately, but they also lose the ability to understand the curriculum robustly and thoroughly. Because I think advising and understanding the curriculum come together as a yin and yang.

David Smith, Associate Dean for Advising and the Executive Director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies: If I could just respond to that. So, I think that's a really important comment in the sense that the disciplinary knowledge that faculty bring to this conversation is critical, right? And I think we need to keep that in focus.

I think, as the report spoke to, the complexity of our institution, the complexity of our rules. The other challenges that students sometimes face that we need to have some support around that, and really rely on the expertise that the faculty can bring in the sense of that disciplinary knowledge.

Chair Bérubé: Your question, Matthew, and then the person in front of Matthew. And then Carey.

Matthew Woessner, Harrisburg: I think in these discussions we should try to distinguish between advising and mentoring. Because part of advising is helping them get the right classes and to move through the process as smoothly as possible, but what faculty really do well is mentoring, where we can talk about our expertise professionally to help them move into a career.

So, I'm a little bit nervous sometimes when we conflate these two terms, because what I really want to do is spend more time mentoring. And to the extent that we can professionalize aspects of the advising to let them move through the maze that is the Penn State curriculum, that would help both the students and the faculty.

Gary Thomas, College of Medicine: Leading on-- my name's Gary Thomas. I'm from Hershey Medical Center. Adding on to what you just said, I think that-- is there any way we can mobilize students-- senior students, graduate students-- or alumni? Can we train or mobilize them to assist in the advising? Because sometimes the best advisor for your career path is somebody who's not even here anymore. And sometimes the best advice you get is from a person you know who an upper-class person in your program.

Elizabeth Seymour: I think you're helping to tease apart many of the aspects that we have in advising. From the technical, scheduling, policy-side, to the faculty, mentoring, guidance, career path, to even alumni. So, thank you. Good points.

Chair Bérubé: Carey. And we have two here.

Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: Thank you. Advising really is crucially important. And I'd like to see ways to incentivize helping advisors, whether they are faculty or professional advisors, to optimize what the University offers for students in the sense that for many students, if they're going to plan double majors, study abroad, internships, other forms of student engagement, that requires a lot more advisor time.
And I don't know that we always have caseload understandings that reward advisors for taking the extra time. I'm concerned that sometimes it seems as if an advisor's job might be done if the person has helped get the student out the door after eight semesters. But I'm looking at are there ways that we can reward advisors additionally if they spend the extra time and help students create enhanced programs?

Chair Bérubé: OK. Let me see. Wait. Yes. Two here. I'm sorry. Yes, please.

Jake Springer, Student Senator for the College of Education: We talked about this in ARSSA Student Voice and I think a great way to optimize advisor relations and advisor understanding is have the students be able to tell them what was there advising like.

And we talked about this idea of SRTE’s. I don't think that's the way to go. I think that much more informal-- if Starfish could possibly do something like send a survey to the student. How did this advising appointment go? What would you recommend? Certain questions that can pull from the student what was bad and good.

And then that can just be an informal incentive to the advisor. Like oh, wow. The student really didn't get anything out of it. Was it me? Was it that-- I don't know. I don't think that that's money, but it's something.

Elizabeth Seymour: Thank you.

Chair Bérubé: Here. Then William.

Kimberlyn Nelson, Science: I think one of the issues that I have, and I don't think anyone's really-- Kim Nelson, eco. Sorry. Mary Beth is standing up there, so I'd already written my name down. She'll talk to me after this.

All the other things that come up in advising. I can do curricular advising till the cows come home. I did not really plan as an educator to become so familiar with our Title IX Office. I did not plan to become quite so familiar with a number of other agencies on campus.

I'm old, OK? So, a lot of things have come on board, and I've tried to stay up with them. But the time to stay up with them, the time to understand those-- where do I send the student? How do I talk to a student? How do I make sure I don't send the student over the edge?

I, one time, went and banged on CAPS door until they opened up. And they said, no, you need to call the crisis line. I said no, this is your job. This is not my job. I just spent an hour and a half with a student talking them off the ledge. Right?

But I'm not equipped for that. I mean, I do my best, because I raised two kids. But that should not be my training for those kinds of issues. And I don't know how we bring that up to speed. And I think that's becoming a bigger part of advising, honestly, than curriculum.

David Smith: Right. And the range, as I was saying, the range of things that our students are coming to University with, in terms of challenges, the curriculum, and the challenges that they face in that. How do we create that intentionality for people to be prepared to manage these kinds of situations?
Where's the capacity to have those conversations? How do we ensure that that's even? That we're able to really help our students in that way to get them to the resources? Because it's expansive, right? And the need to continuously learn and to understand what resources exist, how to access them. It's something that really takes time and effort to keep it structured and to manage it so that all the people that are playing a role in that are able to do the part that they're supposed to do.

Chair Bérubé: I just wanted to add, as someone who cares very much about this report. To go back to Matthew's comment, there's also the danger here of conflating advising and counseling as under the heading of everything you might say to a student in your office. And I think we need to keep those straight as well, because we're not-- many of us are not trained counselors.

We have a MediaSite question, and then William. Sorry to put you off. But MediaSite.

Anna Butler, Faculty Senate Staff: This is from Lisa Chewning from Penn State, Abington:

"I agree with the first person who made a comment that there is a large issue with people who don't like to advise just not doing it. People who do advise well wind up doing more. It isn't valued on annual reviews, so there is no incentive for the people who shirk their responsibilities to get on board. Maybe the answer is not asking good advisors to advise more but placing more of an emphasis on advising in annual reviews, or perhaps some other incentive for good advising. The downside for students to the current model is that they seem to seek out instructors they trust for advising rather than seeing one consistent advisor. Thus, they're advising track record might be inconsistent and/or unavailable as they move from an official advisor to advisor. Also, I like the idea of professional advising for all student with faculty mentoring as a separate responsibility."

Elizabeth Seymour: Thank you. Excellent.

Chair Bérubé: We did discuss this considerably in a meeting between the report and this Forensic. It is actually the problem of service in general. I don't need to say this to a body of senators who obviously care about a service that is not always valued by your colleagues.

But it's a little weirder, because it's service and pedagogy on a hybrid of the two. And there are always going to be the people who shirked, and the teenagers who don't clean up their room. And what to do about them is a genuine question. William.

William Kenyon, Arts and Architecture: William, Department of Architecture. I have two concerns. One for large programs of the University and one for smaller programs. So, for the larger programs of the University, the University is relying more and more on adjunct professors, some of whom may have shorter contracts than the students time here.

And they may be going through a program where they meet a whole wide range of professors, but never have that one, singular mentor. So, in some respects, that professional advisor becomes that face of the University for that student instead of an academic.

I understand that that's probably the way that this is going in other universities as well, but we do have to kind of recognize that that's a fact. Because in the old days, it was a faculty member that was the face of the University for every student.
For the smaller programs here, that still is the case. I represent a fairly small program. I recruit my students from day one. And I teach them every semester that they're here. I wrote the curriculum that they follow. And now I'm being told that next year I won't be the advisor for them for their first two years here, which I have a very big issue with. It's my right as a faculty member to guide their time here, but it's also my responsibility as a faculty member to understand how to properly advise them. And I take that responsibility very seriously. And I take umbrage to having that responsibility taking away from me.

Elizabeth Seymour: Thank you. I think we're seeing the range of advising experiences across the University, which is what we wanted to see today. We wanted that information. Keep it coming.

Chair Bérubé: Yes. We're on the opposite end of the spectrum now with people who want more responsibility for advising. Yes. Here. Here. OK. Oh, we're at one minute, so one more comment.

Rajarajan Subramanian, Harrisburg: Raja Subramanian from Harrisburg. This is something that we could do and make a couple of tools for handling this. One is for administrative type of advising. Another one is for just academic advising. Just try to divide into two.

Maybe software we can try to seek help from or something. And seriously, we could be able to attack this. And if you keep this tool with us that we guys have to do it-- I would give you some example. A couple of weeks ago in our department, we were dealing with one of the transfer credits. And we were trying to figure out whether it's quite equal to the syllabus, and things like that. And it took about an hour or an hour and a half for the faculty member. So, this is going something beyond our call sometimes. So, it's better to make it administrative and academic advising and do something about it. Thank you.

Elizabeth Seymour: Thank you.

Chair Bérubé: Last word over here.

Chelsea Wood, UPUA: I'm the UPUA Academic Affairs Chair currently. As a student who has changed her major twice, I'm very excited to see academic advising is getting some attention and some improvements.

In terms of what we can do, I think it's really important to bring this question to students. And I know UPUA would be happy to collaborate with having discussions in the Paul Robeson Cultural Center with the UPUA at our meetings and presentations.

I think the most important thing is to get input from a wide variety of students. And we'd be happy to partner on something like that.

Elizabeth Seymour: Thank you.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you. We really have to-- we're done, right? We're at 15, no? Are we at time? Yeah.

Elizabeth Seymour: We have time.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you.

Elizabeth Seymour: Are we at time, or are we done?
Chair Bérubé: Thank you Beth, and Mary Beth, and David.

Our second Forensic report is from Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology. If you thought that was right wide ranging, just hold on. “Senate Policy on Open Access”. It appears as Appendix C, and Chair Roger Egolf of LIST will introduce our guests.

Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: Open access is becoming a very big issue across the country. You might have noticed just within the last couple of weeks there was very big news about the University of California discontinuing their contract with Elsevier, which makes this a very timely discussion.

Karen Estlund, who's the Associate Dean for Technology and Digital Strategies in the Libraries, and Greg Madden, who is the Senior Advisor for Research and Computing and Cyber Infrastructure, will be handling the questions.

The way we're going to do--this there are four questions. Since we have a fairly limited amount of time, we are not going to go one-by-one. You can address whichever question is most interesting, but I hope we get a range of questions and comments on all of the issues.

So, I'm going to turn over Karen. I think she has a very short introduction.

Karen Estlund, Associate Dean for Technology and Digital Strategies, University Libraries: Thank you, Roger. Yes, I want to give a little bit of context to this. So, thank you for having us today for this discussion. In 2015, the University Faculty Senate body here, all of you, passed an Open Access Resolution on Scholarly Publications.

Provost Nick Jones and Dean Barbara Dewey of the Libraries and Scholarly Communication charged a group of faculty librarians and technologists to really investigate and recommend the opportunities to promote open and free access to Penn State scholarly output that would maximize the availability of research, to draft an open access policy, and to establish Penn State as a leader in the national and international open access movements.

As Roger mentioned, we are at a crucial moment in the open access movement globally. There are a few points that I want to make sure that we cover. One is that our mission to make research publicly available is part of our Land Grant Mission and Strategic Plan to support an informed public, is crucial in the digital age, and supported by these efforts.

Open access publishing requirements from many of our funders have increased from grant agencies to governments and foundations. Some editorial boards have simply taken their journals and restarted their own OA publications, such as with the Journal of Informetrics and Qualitative Science Studies.

The costs of these large commercial subscription packages have risen as much as 19 percent annually in some cases. And strangely, Provost Jones has said, “Karen, I don't think that fits. Where's the price consumer index? That's not where we are.” So how do we actually align those? These profit margins are greater than the oil and gas industry, for perspective.
In September of 2018, Science Europe's ‘cOAlition S’ adopted a radical open access strategy, requiring their $8.8 billion dollars yearly funded research to be published and fully open access journals, and mandated immediate access starting January 1st of 2020.

And then lastly, as Roger mentions, a lot of these large subscription deals are being abandoned. Project DEAL in Germany abandoned entirely their contract with Elsevier. The Association of Universities in the Netherlands did as well. Florida State has abandoned their large package. And less than two weeks ago, the University of California system did not renew their contract, and the Faculty Senate voted to abstain as much as possible from activities with that publisher.

**Greg Madden, Senior Advisor for Research and Computing and Cyber Infrastructure:** And, I just wanted to add a couple of things to that. It's very small and sort of practical. So, the policy-- and I think you have not seen it yet-- but the policy that's being put forward is very, very similar to one adopted already by around 50 to 70 of our peers. So, it is not radical nor unusual at this point. And I think it does a good job of avoiding overreach.

The main result, as Karen said, is that the percentage of this University's output available to the public will increase, and slowly over time. Some of the main objections I have heard talking to the faculty I think are fairly easy to address. You do retain your copyright in your research. So that does not change under this. The University gets a non-exclusive right to make your research available to the public. That right is automatically waived if you are working with a journal which objects to open access. So that's easy enough. Or, you can get a delay in the publication for Penn State.

This policy in no way prevents you from working with whatever journal you choose to work with. So, you are still free to go to high-caliber journals. You are not required to publish in open access journals. Nothing like that takes place.

We do expect that as the publishing industry evolves over the next few years, we will see a higher and higher rate of public availability. And we may reach the point where all of this University's output is publicly available, but this policy in and of itself will not do that.

And then finally, I think part of the reason I was originally put on this committee- in the first place- is just to make sure this University has excellent resources on this side of research computing. Our ability to connect together our scholarly digital information is very good, and we believe we can make this policy happen with essentially no additional burden whatsoever on the faculty themselves.

You may be asked to reply to an email, but that would be essentially it. So, there's not a lot in here that is going to ask you to take a lot of time.

**Chair Bérubé:** That's it. Are there any questions and comments? Yes. Here.

**Nicholas Pyeatt, Altoona:** I wanted to comment, I guess, one question two. One of the things that strikes me is, in my discipline, in Political Science, there's a decent number of journals that offer online or open access policies.

They all cost money. And I didn't actually know until just this year that the University would actually pay the additional money to make the journal article that I would have publish for free open access. So, I
could publish it for free, or I could pay whatever it is-- $500 dollars, or something like that-- to make it open access.

I happened to ask around and found out the money was available, but I found that out, frankly, on the street. Which doesn't seem like a good policy.

Karen Estlund: Yes. So, I will clarify that the money is not available. There was a pilot program, which is probably how you missed it. And one of the reasons that we are here today is because it's not sustainable for us to pay for all these journal fees, and to then pay for the open access fees on top of that.

So, one of the economic and, I think, intellectual arguments we need to make is if we want that kind of fund available, are we okay with also cutting our subscriptions in other areas? And that's the discussion that you all need to have.

Chair Bérubé: Right here.

Kevin McDade, Shenango: I think that kind of defeats the purpose as well. I think the effort here is to crack the system. To make sure that people can get the information that we're producing as a University.

So even if we were to have some pool of money to pay, it's just shifting the money around, so to speak. I'm a big proponent of open access, but I do think it should be very pronounced in question three- that this is of greater value to publish in an open access journal. That this is something that we can shift as far as that goes.

Now in Biology, we have impact factors. So maybe one thing that you may want to consider is some type of bonus points on open access towards that impact factor, how that's evaluated. Because when you have a PNT review, they're just striking out some journals that are lower access. So, some combination of impact factor and open access in maybe some type of formula I think is valuable.

Chair Bérubé: You can just pass that mic to your right.

Greg Madden: Sorry-- and just a quick comment. Certainly, we're in favor of whatever the Faculty Senate believes is a good idea. Whatever the faculty of the departments are comfortable with. But the policy itself does not address that sort of thing. So, the policy, again, tried to avoid overreach. We're not suggesting specifics in the way that the faculty should address tenure information, and that sort of thing.

And I wrote an essay on this for Inside Higher Ed saying it's like your money being secured by the gold in Fort Knox. And of course, a commenter said your money isn't secured by the gold in Fort Knox. I said yes. That's my point.

And I think we're past that. No one's worried now about things that are simply available online. But there's still this hangover that the idea that open access publications are not peer reviewed the same way, which is not true at all.
Karen Estlund: Yeah, thank you for clarifying that. And the one other thing I will mention is in the Libraries, we are also providing support for all metrics or any sort of consultation you want at the department level so that you can demonstrate impact in an online environment that might be different from traditional impact factors.

Roger Egolf: Let me make a short comment. They are talking about a policy that will be coming out likely next month to the Senate as an Advisory/Consultative Report. I had decided with consultation from the committee that we really need to do a Forensic first, just to see if the policy needed to be tweaked somewhat before it came for a vote.

Because I'm very in favor of open access. I want to make sure we bring forward something that the faculty can really get behind. So that's the whole purpose of this. It's not like everything is an absolute done deal. It's been worked out very much, but your input is very valued here. And based on these comments, we may make a few tweaks. At least I think we're going to make a few tweaks if necessary. But they've done a lot of work already, and you will be seeing something in April to actually vote on. And we're going to take in consideration these comments today.

Chair Bérubé: One moment. We have a MediaSite question, and then you.

[LAUGHTER]

OK, two moments.

Anna Butler: This is from Ann Clements from Arts and Architecture. "I believe it will be helpful to clarify within the scholarship of research of creative accomplishment, such as in the PNT rainbow sheets and other points of information, that there be more information about how to document open source journals. I believe this would be encouraging and informational."

Karen Estlund: Thank you. We certainly could work with Dr. Bieschke on any guidance as needed.

Jennifer Sliko, Harrisburg: Hi. Jen Sliko from Harrisburg. I'm also on FT1 Faculty. So, I appreciate the comments you said earlier about the profit margins that publishers have. But there still is a cost associated with publishing, and it's either going to be the University paying it or the authors paying it.

And while I appreciate there, potentially, could be funds to support our things, there's a lot of questions that come up. Who gets those funds? Does it go to tenured, tenure track? Does it go to FT1? Who decides who gets those funds?

What if I was working at another institution, but I didn't get around to actually publishing it until I started at Penn State? Are you guys-- is Penn State going to pay the cost? Or am I burdening that, am I shouldering that responsibility myself?

So, I think that-- I'm a big proponent of OER. I use it in a lot of my classes. But we still have to pay to publish. Someone has to pay somewhere. And my concern is that it's going to fall upon the authors, and that's going to limit our limit our publishing ability, especially for those not in research intensive roles.

Thank you.

Chair Bérubé: Right here. And we're at the two-and-change minute mark.
Jacob Moore, Mont Alto: I just want to put my two cents in as strong support for putting together some really strong open access policies. There's lots of small colleges across the nation. And Elsevier has continued to extract money from libraries and institutions as much as they can.

We're fighting to keep the costs down. And at Penn State, we are probably the most important institution in this state financially to Elsevier. We need to make the stand. We're the ones with the power. If we don't do it, the smaller colleges across the nation don't have that power to do that. So, we have the power. We need to make the choice.

Karen Estlund: Thank you.

Chair Bérubé: Back here. Oh, Mark.

Mark Stephens, College of Medicine: I'm going to put in my 3,700-euro comment. Just yesterday working with the fine folks at Springer, that was the transfer fee. So, I think it's a significant cost.

But the second part of this to me is also the issue of copyright. I think that is also something to think about as we're having these conversations. So, thank you for bringing this up.

Chair Bérubé: We still have time. Yes.

Raymond Najjar, Earth and Mineral Sciences: I haven't been following this closely, but when you said that University of California has cut their relationship or package or whatever it is with Elsevier, does that mean that faculty at that university do not have access to Elsevier journals?

Karen Estlund: Except for things that were previously licensed for perpetual access, that is correct. So current publications, they do not have access to.

Raymond Najjar: I have to say that's terrifying to me. I mean, my research has been-- it's probably affected everybody in the same way. It's accelerated tremendously by Penn State's wide access to a huge range of journals.

I mean, I can access information so quickly, now do a literature review in a couple of hours, where it previously would've taken me literally weeks to do.

Karen Estlund: If I could briefly interrupt, UC has spent multiple years on this strategy. So, they passed their Open Access Policy in 2013. And so, they have a large communication effort that's been working with the faculty. Strong support in the Faculty Senate. And they also did the math and found out it was actually very few publications that weren't also available in open access venues that they could get preprints of, and the remaining few they could get through in our library alone. It was actually a very small number, surprising to them when they ran it.

Greg Madden: And if I may, I do want to re-emphasize that there is nothing in this policy that would require the University to cancel its subscription with Elsevier. So that-- it's sort of a false extinction. So, we're not suggesting, in any way, that the University run out and start canceling subscriptions. That is not part of this policy.
Chair Bérubé: Thank you. And that still all allows individual faculty members to continue to believe that Elsevier is the devil.

[LAUGHTER]

Thank you so much for this presentation.

Karen Estlund: Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

Chair Bérubé: Unfinished Business. There is no such animal, so we move to Legislative Reports.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Bérubé: This is where the clickers come into play. You should have gotten one. If you don't have one, please raise your hand. I'm not being very good at hands today, so I am doing extra diligence here. Kathy. Yes.

Okay, we got a little time here while I mention the fact that today, we have two Legislative Reports, not three. I will explain. The first one is from ARSSA. It involves “Revisions to Registration Policies” (Appendix D). This actually would put a limit on the number of credits students can sign up for and would set the GPA threshold for people taking more than-- well, I'll leave it to Mary Beth, the chair of the committee, to explain.

Mary Beth Williams, Science: Thank you. This report is brought to the floor today to make updates to registration policy in consideration of the academic expectations for acquisition of credit, and in consideration of data that was provided to us in student outcomes for students who register for more than 19 credits each semester.

[INAUDIBLE]

Chair Bérubé: To report a discussion?

Mary Beth Williams: Mm-hmm.

Chair Bérubé: Roger?

Roger Egolf: Yeah. Egolf, Lehigh Valley. I very much support this report. I think we should have gone a little bit farther, and-- 30 credits are an awful lot of credits for a student to take without prior approval.

Chair Bérubé: 29 now.

Mary Beth Williams: Yeah.
Roger Egolf: I know right now we’re doing even more. But I’d love to see something in the future that somewhat limits, maybe above 24, getting someone to actually sign off on to make sure it’s absolutely necessary. Thirty credits are, in my opinion, nuts in a semester.

Mary Beth Williams: Yep. Roger, I appreciate the point very much. The committee, and in discussions with the Committee on Education and discussions with the Student Caucus, we really debated over many meetings the difference between 19 and 30.

And one of our challenges is the data that we had didn’t have enough granularity to draw a line in a well-defined way. And so, there’s some more analysis that needs to be done there. Some more conversation really with Senate to think about what that should be.

The bottom line is the current policy doesn’t place any limit on them whatsoever.

Roger Egolf: Much better than we have now.

Mary Beth Williams: So, I agree with you. I think this is the first step. And we are recommending additional looks in the middle.

Chair Bérubé: Question here.

Brandi Robinson, Earth and Mineral Sciences: I agree. This is definitely a step in the right direction. I noticed there was language in there related to a student’s GPA and their ability to take additional credits.

I’ve served on our Academic Integrity Committee for a while. We often see cases involving students enrolled in so many courses who have earned good grades in all of those courses. And so, I don’t know that that GPA indicator is capturing everything you need it to.

Mary Beth Williams: Yeah. Absolutely. So, what you’re referring to is a change in the policy that says students who are on academic warning, whose GPA is less than 2.0, will not be allowed to register for more than 19 credits a semester.

If you look at the outcomes for students who do register for large numbers of credits, you are right that some of them have a GPA that’s quite good, and calls into question the integrity of those degrees. So, the 30-credit limit begins to address that, but there is additional conversation absolutely that needs to take place.

Chair Bérubé: Anything else? Anyone want to argue for a number higher than 30?

[LAUGHTER]

Just getting all the bases, folks. The report is brought to the floor by committee. It needs no second. Are we ready to vote? Senators joining from MediaSite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com to accept the motion, press A. To reject, press B.

Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 11 accept and one reject.

Paula Brown, Faculty Senate Administrative Coordinator: In house, we have 122 accept, ten reject.
Chair Bérubé: The motion carries. Thank you, Mary Beth. The second Legislative Report is from the Committee on Committees and Rules, “Revisions to Bylaws; Article I, Officers, Sections 2 and 6”. It appears as Appendix E in the agenda. Committee Chair, Keith Shapiro, will present the report. Keith.

Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture: Hello, everybody. The basis of this report is really to facilitate and strengthen our ability to make evidence-based decision making through the use of data that we gather, especially data gathered by OPA, the Office of Planning and Assessment. CC&R sought a more effective way to take advantage of and to apply that kind of data-- data that we collect, primarily by OPA, especially for committees to use in their reports.

And one of the mechanisms we considered and what's in this report is the development of a data advisor who's just that-- an advisor. Their job is to coordinate the efforts of the committee who needs data, the office of the Faculty Senate who provides us with a great deal of institutional knowledge, that continuing institutional knowledge, and the office of OPA, who is gathering that information and is making decisions about it and applying it and giving it to the committees for their use.

The hope is that we can begin to have a conversation between those three organizations-- the Senate, the Faculty Senate office, and OPA-- as to what kind of information we need now, what we'll need in the future, and how we can go about coordinating those efforts.

Chair Bérubé: Seems straightforward enough. Questions? Data being absolutely fundamental to every last thing we do, it seemed appropriate for the Senate to take this measure. As it changed the Bylaws, the report will be voted on at the April meeting. Remember, that would take a two-thirds majority. So, yeah. Vote in April.

Keith Shapiro: Thank you.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you, Keith. The third report was going to be a report about tweaking the membership of the Outreach Committee. Those tweaks need tweaking.

[LAUGHTER]

And so, Keith pulled this report. It's nothing major. It's nothing very newsworthy. And we can move to Advisory/Consultative Reports, of which we have five.

### ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Chair Bérubé: The first is from Educational Equity and Campus Environment. Alicia, this is your moment. “Response to the Academic Integrity Task Force's Final Report and Recommendations”. It's in your agenda as Appendix G. Committee Chair, Alicia Decker, will present the report and respond to any questions. Alicia, thank you.

Alicia Decker, Liberal Arts: Thank you. Thanks, everyone. So, this report is our committee's analysis of the report, the Educational Equity Task Force-- I'm sorry, the Academic Integrity Task Force's Final Report and Recommendations.

In a nutshell, our committee was appreciative of the work that was done, but a bit troubled by a couple of different factors, one being the way in which international students seemed to be singled out and targeted
for action in a way that was not warranted. In fact, the task force member came to meet with us and said, actually, there is no evidence that international students violate academic integrity policies more frequently than domestic students. And so, this is a very logical way for us to say, “Wait a second. We need to really rethink this idea.”

And secondly, we were really disturbed with the criminal justice type of system which seemed to be in place with the recommendations of the task force. So, this report is our kind of unpacking of that report and some changes that we would like to see addressed in the near future.


Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 12 accept and three reject.

Paula Brown: In house, we have 108 accept, 18 rejects.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you. The motion carries. The report will be forwarded to President Barron for his action. Thank you, Alicia. I want to add as a PS, this is the first response from the committee to the Academic Integrity Task Force report. I actually did give it to all 15 committees.

Not every response from every committee has to take this form. It doesn't have to be Advisory/Consultative. It can be a memo. It can be semaphore-- no, it can't be semaphore flags. But I really would like to hear from everyone in the six weeks that remain to us or thereafter. Because as I've said, this report touches the lives potentially of every single student and faculty member at Penn State.

The next reports are from Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations. The first is “Revision to AC21, Definition of Academic Ranks, Focusing on Internal Ranks”. It's your Appendix H. Faculty Affairs Chair, John Nousek, and Intra-University Relations Chair, Rose Petrilla, will present the report and respond to questions. John.

John Nousek, Science: Hello. So, I'm representing Faculty Affairs, and Rose is representing IRC. So those of you who've been on the Senate are probably well aware that for the past several years, the AC21 has undergone extensive revision, especially under the leadership of our current chair Michael Bérubé, and our incoming chair Nicholas Roland.

But in the process of making those revisions, our experience has detected some flaws in the wording of what exists. And so, we actually were charged with addressing one issue at the beginning of the year. But as we carefully read AC-21 and as experience was reported to us, we actually made three sets of suggested revisions.

One of those was stopped at the Council-level but will probably be resubmitted.

Chair Bérubé: You'll see it.

John Nousek: And you'll see it again at the next meeting. But I have two to bring forward today. So, the first one that I'd like to bring forward-- how do we do it with the text? Do I Show the text, or just describe it?
Chair Bérubé: Do we have it? Oh. It's easier to see. Because it doesn't actually involve changing words. It involves moving them.


Chair Bérubé: But moving them in a strategic way.

John Nousek: Right. Yes. This is the first one. So, as it says, the current version of AC21 is ambiguous. If you go to the bottom, the part that struck out-- you have to keep going. The very last text. It's Number 6.

The wording that currently exist was inserted at the very end of this AC21 revision process. Some units objected to the names that were being applied to the different ranks. And in a sort of quick modification at the end, this step six was added.

It was intended to only apply to the names in these units. But it has been read to say that the entirety of AC21 does not apply to these units. And so, the need is to change the wording to make it clearer that the flexibility is only intended for the naming.

And so, if you scroll up and see the boldface, which is not very large-- as Michael said, mostly this is just a matter of moving around the words and making it very clear the scope to which they pertain. You can see that in the University Libraries, the College of Medicine, Dickinson Law, and Penn State law, that the names-- and this is largely having to do with the comparison of names for Tenure-Line and Non-Tenure Line Faculty.

And so, the intent of the legislation is to make it so that these units are able to follow their own naming conventions, but they still have to follow the structure of AC21. And so that's the intent of what's going on. Rose, do you want to add anything?

Rose Petrilla, Hazleton: No.

John Nousek: OK. So, I think that's a summary of what this is about.

Chair Bérubé: Yeah, that's it. And it was very much-- you're right. And I would put the blame squarely on myself. But those revisions came in very late. And we thought we could fix that by just sticking on a clause six that says, “Okay. These units are exempt from this. Not from the entire thing, but from the nomenclature.” What we have now is if these things are defined in policies internal to the units. So, we're still not messing with the units with regard to what they call their Fixed-Term Faculty. We just want to make sure that they're incorporated to the document. Are there any questions about that? I'll defer to John and Rose.

Seeing none, I'll say the usual words. The report is brought to the floor by committee. Needs no second. And if we're ready to vote. To accept this motion, A. To reject it, B.

Anna Butler: Poll Everywhere, I have 22 accept.

Paula Brown: In house, we have 120 accepts, four rejects.
Chair Bérubé: Motion carries. The report will be forwarded to President Barron for his action.

John Nousek: OK. I'd like--

Chair Bérubé: Please.

John Nousek: OK. So, the second one is extremely brief. (Appendix I) But, yet, it does reflect considerable discussion and argument on the part of both Faculty Affairs and I believe IRC as well. And its brevity is partly because that was the compromise that everybody could accept.

So, the specifics are one sentence to be added. If you could scroll to the bold face. Okay. As background to this, part of the changes of AC-21 were to regularize the opportunity for promotions by all faculty, whether they be tenure track, research faculty, teaching faculty, or any of the other ilk.

And the concept was a three-stage process with a degree of standardization about how soon an opportunity for promotion would present itself, and that you'd be guaranteed the chance for review, and so on. So, all that went through smoothly.

But there was one snag that held up the whole AC-21 process in the past couple of years. And that was at different levels, should there be an expectation of a multi-year contract as a reward for achieving a higher level of promotion.

Some people felt very strongly that, although you could not grant for non-tenure track faculty exactly tenure, that you could try to have multi-year contracts as a proxy or an effort in the same direction. And the question became, should at each level you guarantee a multi-year of two years, a multi-year of five years, et cetera? And no satisfactory compromise that had a specific number of years could be obtained from the discussions that we had.

So, in place of having a rigorous number of years, we've had this sentence, which basically means the philosophy, if you're getting promoted to the top tier-- and of course, this is not relevant to tenure, where tenure is its own reward. But for non-tenure track tracks, at the top year, the Senate is encouraging the longest length of contract available.

This both prevents people who may already have a five-year contract from having their tenure shortened. And it also encourages administrators and the whole process to look with the spirit of trying to have longer security if it can be arranged within the funding limitations or whatever other limitations a unit would have.

So, this is I think a statement of the sense of the Senate more than a rigorous statement that such-and-such a rank has to have ‘X’ years. And so that's where we wound up. So that's what we put forward as this as this proposal.

Chair Bérubé: I have only one emendation to that is the word ‘guarantee’. You spoke of the Senate wanting to guarantee. We could never guarantee a contract. We could certainly recommend it. And then we thought, well, should all be considered for a multi-year contract was kind of potentially weak tea because they could be considered and rejected.
And then we learned this year that that's exactly what's going on. The vast majority of the people promoted did get multi-year contracts. I think 115 of 150 who did get the multi-year contracts got them over two years. So, part of the rationale of this is to correspond to what is actually happening and to say that this should be the norm for the third tier.

John Nousek: And Michael, I might add, my impression is that is an improvement over the past practices before we did these revisions.

Chair Bérubé: I certainly hope so. That's what the idea-- yeah. Are there any questions? Right here.

[INAUDIBLE]

And now, are there any microphones? Thank you.

Raja Subramanian, Harrisburg: Maybe I'm ignorant, but the third rank, he was saying it's assist-- I mean, teaching professor rank. Is that right?

John Nousek: Let me say, I mentioned that there were three modifications that are being proposed. And that is exactly the topic of the third modification. So, I will-- yes. And you will be seeing that next time.

But in general, the original point we started from was that we were trying to, the previous legislation replaced some I believe 88 different titles that were in use within the University.

Chair Bérubé: I don't even remember.

John Nousek: By essentially a matrix that was roughly either three-by-three or four-by-three. But the names associated with each tier varies depending on, is it tenure track? Is it teaching track? Is it research track? Is it non-terminal degree track? Are the sort of four dimensions.

And the flexibility that we did in the first which allows different units to use different names means that those names can vary. But the sort of functionality-- are you at the lowest rank, the middle rank, or the third ranked-- we should be uniform. I hope I'm answering your question.

Chair Bérubé: We can revisit this in April. We're still hammering that one out. And I must say, I am not apologetic about this part. AC21 will be a work in progress. It'll be patchworked as we go. And things we didn't anticipate. And this is just really an addendum to what we proposed, the proposal from last year. Just like third tier should be considered for the longest contract available, we will see what that is. Any-- oh, yes.

Gary Thomas: I just have a question. There's a tenure track or-- Gary Thomas from Hershey Medical Center. There's a tenure track, a teaching track, and a research track. Is there a clinical track?

John Nousek: Yes. Yes, there is. That has to do with the specifics. If you noticed one of the exceptions, and the first was College of Medicine, also the College of Business, also have clinical tracks. And Law.

Gary Thomas: Because by taking out step Number 6, which is still on your statement there, I feel like you've now, you know, had us meet every single criterion of AC21.
Chair Bérubé: We just erased it.

Gary Thomas: Yeah, we just erased it. But you've had us, now we meet every single criterion of AC21 except that naming titles.

John Nousek: Yes.

Gary Thomas: And then I just didn't know, then therefore there should-- is there still going to be a clinical track?

Chair Bérubé: There will.

John Nousek: Yes. The answer is yes. There will be a clinical track. And it's a little bit of a simplification when I said it's only the naming. The colleges get to define their own criteria for how you achieve those names.

Gary Thomas: Oh.

John Nousek: So that, I think, subsumes your answer.

Chair Bérubé: The thing under discussion here is only third rank. Only this contract.

John Nousek: Right. But I suspect there will be a substantive discussion in April of these issues. And that's the reason why we're not here today voting on that.

Chair Bérubé: Two out of three aren’t bad.

Gary Thomas: OK. All right.

John Nousek: But get ready for some fireworks.

Chair Bérubé: All the way in the back. And then all the way up here.

Cliff Maurer, Berks: I've been dealing with this on our campus for two years. And I can tell you I don't know how the HR Department ever allowed us to have the same title at two different levels. And it is that that is all the confusion.

An associate, if he has a ‘T’ tattooed on his head, he's got a terminal degree. So, he starts as an assistant. If he doesn't have a ‘T’ tattooed on his forehead-- and it's ridiculous.

Chair Bérubé: OK. That's actually not under discussion here, though.

Cliff Maurer: I know.

Chair Bérubé: OK.

[LAUGHTER]
In that case, you get a waiver.

**Cliff Maurer:** Thank you.

**Chair Bérubé:** But we will discuss that that is exactly what's being held up in committee. Yeah. Here.

**Dierdre Folkers, York:** And since this is a work, kind of a piece that is continuing on, I do just want to make one comment. I'm really happy that we have this in place. I'm really happy that we've provided a path that is somewhat akin to the promotion process for the tenure line faculty.

However, I'm still struggling with the notion that we can promote someone and not in any way increase their job security. When you are tenured, you have in essence job security for life. To be to be promoted in the teaching line, you have to have served at least five years. Especially in these early days, we have people who've served 15 years as Fixed-Term 1’s, for example.

Now as soon as you've served five or more years, it's hard to make the case that you're serving in a temporary position. Because clearly if you've been undergoing for five years, this is not temporary. And if you are being put forward by your campus for promotion, one presumes they wish you to continue on in your role.

So, in essence, what we're saying is we value your participation in the University so much that we want to promote you. But we don't value your participation so much that we're willing to extend a one-year contract to two years.

So while I recognize that we can't dictate per se, I'd really like to hear a coherent explanation as how to the financial stability of the University and its ability to pivot and move forward is really impacted by the number of teaching line faculty who are promoted, and whose contracts might possibly be increased from one year to two, two to three. And really, quite honestly, I'm not sure how many five-year fixed term multi-years are out there anymore. We've really devalued the meaning of a fixed term multi-year from five to three to, for many people, two. So anyway, I just think that that's something that I would like to hear a coherent explanation as to why we would value someone--

**John Nousek:** I have of thing to say, and I'd like for people to hear it. I am speaking for my own personal things, rather than speaking on behalf of either the administration or the rest. But I believe you summarize somewhat the argument why this whole lengthy and arduous process of revising AC21 has happened. Okay? And I believe there has been some definite improvements in making steps towards you.

But in trying to speak from, shall we say, perhaps, how the administration might answer you, I put myself forward as an example. I worked at this University for 23 years as a fixed term employee. I did not work as a teaching professor, or what was called at that time instructor, et cetera. But I worked as what was called a research associate and was, so basically, a research faculty member.

And essentially, my security was limited by the funding sources that paid me. And if those were not guaranteed, my salary was not guaranteed. And therefore, the length of time-- which sometimes was multi-year and sometimes not-- was as a function of the sources of funding that the University received.
So, I am sympathetic that that was a voluntary agreement that I entered into with the University to accept exactly that situation. Now you can extend that to say, “Well, any instructor, you get this offer and you choose if you want to take it or not. Or you go somewhere else if you don't like it.”

However, I believe that that is not, shall we say, the thing that inspires great teaching, especially in an environment where something like half of the credit hours at this University, I believe, are currently being delivered by Fixed-Term Faculty. So that's my answer. And all I can say is I think this is a step in the right direction. It might not be perfect, but it is a good phase thing.

And I want to compliment-- my own reading is that the administration has been receptive about doing this. And especially under Nick Jones leadership, he has made changes to the policies that existed before that has enabled us to offer more multi-year contracts than ever before. And I think that's all I have to say. Rose?

**Rose Petrilla:** And to Michael's point earlier, there is evidence that FTE-- sorry, teaching faculty are getting multi-year contracts now. From an IRC perspective, we're going to follow that every year and to see if that continues, which I suspect it will. So, it definitely should be monitored. But I agree that it looks very positive.

**Chair Bérubé:** We have a question from MediaSite, but I just want to chime in and piggyback. Your comments are very much in the spirit of everything we've done over the last three or four years. There was a snag early on where some faculty wanted to enfold the multi-year contracts into the review process, and the other faculty wanted the multi-year contracts to be contingent on seniority. And that was a discussion they went on for some time.

Now we're in a process where we have the review and promotion process. And now we want to make sure that the multi-year contracts are enfolded into it, but not in a way that ties anybody's hands or that says, for example, the funding for John's position should be continued by whatever federal agency we don't have any power over. Right?

So, the only thing here is really to recognize a third rank would be longer term than the second rank-- very much in the spirit of your comment. And to go back to Nick Jones' presentation in October, apparently 184 people were promoted. 150 with multi-year contracts. 115 with contracts longer than two years. Which I thought was such an astonishing first year record that I thought it was newsworthy.

**Dierdre Folkers:** Well, and I do feel-- I do want to make that clear. For years, I think in many campuses, people were discouraged from going out for a promotion. And I think that this [INAUDIBLE]. So, I don't want anybody [INAUDIBLE]. I do continue to say that for those who [INAUDIBLE], for example, it is a mixed message [INAUDIBLE]. I recognize [INAUDIBLE].

**Chair Bérubé:** The reason to speak to wait for the microphone is I hope that-- is there any way to get that into the record? Because it was a really important comment.

**Dierdre Folkers:** Well usually, I don't have trouble projecting.

**Chair Bérubé:** No, it's a question of what's audible. If you read the records afterwards, there's any number of bracket ‘inaudible’. And you may have just uttered one of them. But I think, if I may
paraphrase, the comment was a mixed message sent to faculty on the campuses who for many years felt there was no point going up for promotion because it didn't come with any greater job security.

May come with a change in title-- meh. And now, we want to make sure-- I'm going to actually just quote Kathy Bieschke on this, “We want to create a culture of expectation that multi-year contracts would be forthcoming, but we can't mandate it.”

MediaSite? Yes, thank you.

Anna Butler: This question is from William Wenner from the College of Medicine. "Is section 6 still even applicable in view of the changes?"

Chair Bérubé: No, it's not.

John Nousek: Well, Section 6, by virtue of the vote we just conducted, has been deleted. But some of the words from it have been moved into different portions. So, I believe, I'm not quite sure what-- it was Dr. Wenner that made those comments. I'm not quite sure how he planned that he would use that. But yes, what's been shown here, that is no longer there. That has been deleted.

Chair Bérubé: Cool. Are we all literally on the same page? Are we ready to vote? OK. Report is brought to the floor by committee, et cetera. Senators on MediaSite, cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, A. To reject it, press B. Anna.

Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 19 accept and one reject.

Paula Brown: In the house, we have 115 accept, seven reject.

Chair Bérubé: Motion passes. It will be forwarded to President Barron for his action. Thank you, John and Rose, for your hard work. See you again in April.

[LAUGHTER]

Chair Bérubé: The next Advisory/Consultative Report is from Faculty Benefits, “Clarification of Applicability of Short-Term Disability Policies to Faculty”. It's your Appendix J. And I hope you looked at it. This is really a curious one.

Chair Ira Saltz could not be with us today. His father passed away very recently. And he is sitting Shiva. We send him our regards in this time of loss. Denise and Jeff, Denise Costanzo and Jeff Laman, have really graciously agreed to stand up and answer questions in his stead. Denise.

Denise Costanzo, Arts and Architecture: Thank you. Just to summarize the essence of the report, the committee considered the seemingly simple question of whether the short-term disability benefit, which is part of our menu of benefits options that we can elect, how that would apply to faculty in practice, and thus if it's a reasonable, desirable benefit to elect.

And we found in looking at it more closely that while its applicability to University employees whose contracts specify a fixed amount of sick leave is quite clear. Once you've exhausted your sick leave, then the policy comes into effect.
The situation for faculty is absolutely undefined. We found considerable clarity in various policies on how benefits and pay relate in conditions such as sabbatical leave, family medical leave, the unpaid federal benefit that we have access, to as well as HR16-- other forms of unpaid leave of absence.

In practice, we found anecdotally through other forms of investigation that when faculty have extended periods of illness that interfere with their ability to perform their job duties, that's handled administratively in a very broad range of ways. So, the simple question-- do these policies applied to faculty; if so, when and how-- leads to a much larger question, which is that there is no University-wide policy pertaining to how extended leave for illness, other health-related forms of disability, works.

So, in identifying this situation, the report ends with a recommendation that the University Faculty Senate works with the University to do one of two things, potentially both. One is to revise the guidelines that provide information about this particular benefits election to clarify when and how this would be applicable to full time faculty. It is clear that you need to have full time employee status.

The other is that the University, again in cooperation with this University Faculty Senate, develop a University-wide policy pertaining to the issue of medical leave for faculty. And again, a sort of corollary set of recommendations is that the guidelines or new policy should specify how much time a faculty member must be unable to perform their assigned duties before they would receive less than their full pay. And in that situation, how much pay, what percentage of the salary, the faculty member might receive with and without the short-term disability insurance.

And again, just for comparison, many of us are aware of long-term disability as a benefit selection. That kicks in after six months in which you are unable to work. So, there's a greater amount of clarity for most full-time faculty. If you're not able to work for over a semester, that's a little more clear-cut.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you so much. Also, thank you to the committee for coming up with this. It certainly blindsided me. It was not part of the items I put on your agenda in the summer. And it speaks to a critically important question.

It also, by the way-- I shouldn't have to make this explicit-- but it could potentially, having just come from a meeting on mental health issues for students and faculty, it has implications for people who have life crises that involve psychosocial disability in a temporary way and can't fulfill their duties, but eventually get over them. But we need some guidance on how it's actually going to work. It's a great new benefit. In itself, it's a good thing. We just don't know what the granular details will be. So here are the recommendations. Are there any questions? Roger.

Gary Thomas: Gary Thomas, Hershey Medical Center.

Chair Bérubé: Oh, I'm sorry. We're going Roger first. OK, go ahead.

Gary Thomas: Oh, I'm sorry.

Roger Egolf: Go ahead.

Chair Bérubé: So much depends on how far someone is from the microphone.
Gary Thomas: The short-term disability only counts for full time employees. But again, like at the medical center, we may have a physician who is working 80 percent time. Generating a lot of money, working a lot of years. Very competent and skilled. They're not full time. But if they were to have an injury or a cancer and need to take two months off, they wouldn't qualify for a certain disability, because…?

Denise Costanzo: Let me be more clear. So, the information on the Benefits website is a kind of cursory overview. It then gives you access to a document with the full policy. In that full policy, it states you have to be working more than 30 hours a week. So that's the definition of full time for the purpose of the Unum policy as posted on the Benefits website.

So how the split you're talking about would work, I can't answer that. But that's the information.

Chair Bérubé: That's a matter of federal law, though, isn't it?

Denise Costanzo: I'm sorry?

Chair Bérubé: The 30 hours? That's not us.

Denise Costanzo: That is what the Unum policy document says.

Chair Bérubé: OK. Roger then Kathy.

Denise Costanzo: So, I agree that situations where people have divided appointments and involvement could become potentially quite complex.

Roger Egolf: This may clarify things for people in some units, but it actually puts a lot of clarification into question for people who have had long-standing policy. At Lehigh Valley-- and I've been there 30 years-- anyone who has had a short-term disability, or indeed, a pregnancy, has been given the semester off with pay, and they have not had to buy insurance.

So, a policy like this to units-- and I'm sure there are lots of them that have to operate under those guidelines essentially forever-- this would throw that all into disarray.

Denise Costanzo: Agreed.

Chair Bérubé: Saying from the perspective of disability studies, we're not going to be okay with any conflation of disability with pregnancy.

Denise Costanzo: That's good. But to your core point, we agree there is a wide range of practices. And I think some of the practices that are out there available potentially based on your location, your unit, your campus; even whether your tenure track or fixed-term, right?

The practice through which these decisions are made appears to be extremely variable. So yes, the implementation of some kind of consistent University-wide policy could fall anywhere within that spectrum.

Roger Egolf: It could hurt people.
Denise Costanzo: It could potentially be a worse deal for some people. It could also be a better deal for others. That would remain to be seen.

Chair Bérubé: Any other comments or questions? And again, this is very much TBD. This is basically a request for much more guidance in how this policy will actually take effect. Are we ready to vote? Senators, MediaSite. Poll Everywhere. Accept, A. Reject, B.

Anna Butler: Poll Everywhere, I have 21 accept.

Paula Brown: In house, we have 102 accept, 13 reject.

Chair Bérubé: Motion carries. The report will be forwarded to President Barron for his action. Thank you. Thank you, Denise. Thank you, Jeff.

Our final Advisory/Consultative Report comes from Global Programs, “Supporting International Students and Scholars at Penn State University”. It is your Appendix K. Committee Chair, Willie Ofosu, and Brian King will respond to questions.

Willie Ofosu, Wilkes-Barre: Good afternoon, all. When we consider globalization in a very general sense, we will find that if we couple global citizenship and global competencies, these two actually as coupled, form some sort of a central theme to globalization. And if we look at it from the institutional point of view, then of course international students-- and it's not just college-- become an important component of this scenario.

The point here therefore is that how do they feel when they come to the country of the host institution? And this is the type of thing that we're looking at in terms of some of the challenges that these individuals face.

And my colleague, Brian, is going to take us through some tracks that hopefully we can translate to actionable items that we can work on to make things a bit easier for them.

Brian King, Earth and Mineral Science: Okay, great. Thanks. Mindful of the time, so I'll adjust very quickly. So, this particular Advisory/Consultative Report was intended, as Willie was suggesting, to identify best practices that we as a University can continue to do, but potentially expand our efforts to support international students and scholars who are part of our community. We submitted an informational report in April of last year to the Faculty Senate. And so, this was intended to build upon that to move towards actually having some recommendations for consideration.

Just a quick point of order. We did a fair degree of data collection on this that extended for more than a year. That involved a lot of interviewing with key informants at University Park and also some of the Commonwealth Campuses. We wanted to as much as possible try to get a view that reflects the totality of Penn State University, and such that have the recommendations also that have positive impacts for our entire community.

The best piece of information we had was a survey that was conducted by Global Programs in 2018 that collected information from five administrators, five faculty, and two connected community members from every Penn State campus. So that informs quite a lot of what I’m going to share with you now.
Slide 1 here. What you see is basically data that's confirming-- this was in the report itself, but just underscoring the fact that we are seeing, nationally, a decline in admits from international students. This is reflecting both undergrad. This is just visa submissions. The State Department reports a 17 percent decline in F1 Visas issued in 2016, and a nearly 39 percent drop in F1 Visa issuance from the highs of 2015.

More recently, some of you may have seen this. This was a report from the Council of Graduate Schools. This got coverage, front page coverage on the Chronicle of Higher Education last month that showed a 4 percent decline of prospective international graduate students in 2018 that then adds to a 6 percent decline over the previous two years. So, we are seeing an effect of a variety of different kinds of practices coming from the State Department and elsewhere.

What we did do then was through our data collection and for the purposes of just being efficient with our time here today, three kind of buckets of categories of concern. And again, opportunities for basically improving that we think we have here that came from a number of international students in the surveys.

The first, probably not surprisingly-- and this was overwhelmingly a signal through most of the comments we got-- were challenges around visas, and then work opportunities for international students. Both undergraduates and graduate students was very much tied to visas. Students expressed anxieties about getting visas to pursue their degrees.

Even today in our meeting this morning, I had international students who serve on Global Programs Committee that shared the difficulties they face in getting sponsorship for visas as well as access to internships from employers.

International students also shared with us their oftentimes increasingly concerned to leave the country for fear that they're not going to be allowed back in, even if their visa is current and appropriate. I think any of us who've traveled across a border knows there's some arbitrariness about the border guard that we talk with at that particular moment. And so, I think some students are reporting they're not leaving to see their families.

And so, as a result, we have a series of recommendations. You'll note this report has quite a lot of recommendations, and that's because we did talk to with quite a lot of folks. And we didn't want to limit this to two or three recommendations. All of these recommendations our committee feels equally strongly about.

These involve thinking about ways that we can be even more proactive with career fairs and identifying employers to try to sponsor students. Bring them in for internships and sponsor them for visas after graduation.

We also think that Career Services could potentially work with Global Programs. I myself interviewed Matt Ishler who's doing tremendous work in University Park in working with international students. But he and I brainstorm ways that they could actually potentially bridge a bit more with Global Programs to provide some of these specific services that international students require.

We recommend that Global Programs have a hotline for international students. They can call if they have issues with campus climate. As well as if they're facing difficulties upon entry, they have someone to call at Penn State to potentially get some resources and some support.
Finally, we encourage faculty to be flexible with students who perhaps leave the country and in the short term have difficulty getting back in; to use Zoom and Skype so that they don't fall behind in terms of their degree progress.

Second concern-- but also, I should say that in some of the interviews, many of the interviews that we had with international students, they really did applaud our University for being very open and committed to them. And so, this is not a dire portrait at all. Again, but just thinking about ways that we can improve some of the services we offer.

Transitioning to campus is difficult for all students. It may be more difficult for international students, or it's differently difficult based upon climate and cultural adjustments. And so, we believe resources can be committed to help with those transitions.

Those include certain types of mentoring programs. Again, all these recommendations are at the end of that report. So, you've seen these, but I just thought I'd collapse them around these particular categories.

We recommend a global-line ambassador to be available on every campus. Many international students said to us they do have access to mentoring. We had a discussion earlier today about advising and mentoring. But they feel that having an international student is particularly advantageous. This is somebody who knows what it's like to come in, and need to find a bank, need to find where to get particular kinds of groceries, and things like that.

So, we thought of the idea of having a kind of identified individual or series of individuals who can help with early entry, and then ongoing support and mentoring. And we also think Global Programs and Career Services can do more to basically highlight the tremendous work that we're already doing with international students and scholars at Penn State.

Finally, the University environment should be made friendly, welcoming to all members of our community. Additionally, it's important to emphasize that the home community should also be supportive. It's been shared to the Global Programs Committee. In one of our meetings in the fall, we spent about half the meeting taking some testimonials from current international students at University Park. So, what I'm about to say now is specific to UP.

Students had shared with us that they are subject to increased inspection at restaurants and other establishments. Some establishments in State College will not take a passport as a valid proof of age. And they've also shared with us that there have been cases where the passports have been inspected to check on the status of the visa in the passport itself.

And so, students have said to us that they basically-- this limits their interactions to interact with students. And even in State College, I think we know that there's not so many restaurants. And so, the more that we limit people's access to these kinds of venues, it has a negative impact, obviously, on people's ability to be welcomed as a member of our community.

So, our final recommendations are that we do suggest that if this is cause for concern by administration that they reach out to us and Global Programs. We did not want to list the names of any establishments in this report. But if this is cause for concern, to contact us, and we have that information.
We suggest that specifically Student Affairs and perhaps the Borough could basically take this up as an issue to think about trying to put some pressure for change. I don't have information of the similar kinds of incidents with Commonwealth Campuses. But if those exist, please bring those to our attention.

And then finally, we suggest the next climate survey should maybe have a range of questions specific to international student, international student experience. So, we continue to collect information about that.

And then finally, we do at all of our campuses do quite a lot on town gown relations. And then the degree with which we're also articulating the diversity of our community is something that we need to think about. And so that's our recommendations and thank you for letting us share this. Happy to take any questions.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you for an excellent report. Questions. Here.

Kyle Monroe, Student Senator, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences. Last night, the UPUA hosted Show Your Country as part of the campus' World Cultural Week. And after the event, there was a panel of international students. And someone asked the question, what's your biggest struggle here at Penn State? And one of the international students expressed that they have a hard time finding visas-- an employer to sponsor a visa. Because under their education visa, they cannot work apart from the University. And even at the University, they can only work 20 hours a week.

So, they find it hard to find an employer who will sponsor a visa for them to work outside the University. And they also find it hard, at the BJC Career Fair, any employers besides a handful who are also willing to sponsor international students to work here.

Chair Bérubé: Okay. Thank you, Kyle.

Brian King: A MediaSite question.

Anna Butler: This question is from Jonathan Abel from the College of Liberal Arts. "Rather than thinking directly about international students, one of the best ways to mitigate the challenges for international students and scholars and to which a University should respond is to cultivate study abroad. If the home community is more receptive, more students with more global experience leads to a more welcoming environment. Global Programs has since 2008 concerned itself more with risk assessment than with study abroad promotion, despite renewed rhetoric about how this is a global university. Will the committee consider how global programs might return to promotion of study abroad?"

Brian King: Thank you for that question, actually. It's possible that in April there'll be a report submitted specifically-- I'm looking like he's right there; so sorry, I'll look around here-- that there will be a report in April that's specific on study abroad.

That's actually been something that Global Programs has been thinking very seriously about in recent years. There's concern. We're having discussion about trying to promote the non-traditional study abroad. There's been concern that students who leave Penn State tend to go to a select number of venues, have very specific kinds of experiences. That can be highly valuable, but at the same time, we want to think about ways of encouraging a diversity of study abroad programs.
That having been said, I think that our program recognizes that if we're really going to have an impact on the culture of the University, study abroad is a pretty limited way to do that, just because I think fewer than 40 percent of our students do study abroad.

Which is why last year you might remember that there was an Advisory/Consultative Report that was approved that went forward to President Barron that was on globalizing our curriculum. And we used very specific language in that report to suggest that we're not thinking strictly about the international experience, but the ways that we as a community, as a University, can promote global thinking, global training in our classes.

And I'm just speaking for myself-- Willie might want to weigh in-- but I think there's far more ways that that's going to create the kind of climate that you're suggesting is necessary to support international students who are here at our campus. But you are going to see plenty on study abroad soon from us.

Willie Ofosu: Another point to make in response to this question. Supposing somebody comes from Africa, some China, or some other place, to this place. Are they not studying abroad? They come to this country, they have gone abroad from their own home country, from their own home environment.

So, studying abroad has to be viewed in various forms to get to appreciate to what extent that can support globalization. And what are we talking about, at least being Penn Staters, we are talking about, what do we do here to facilitate the goodwill and the good feeling that can generate from this?

Because, trust me-- somebody comes here and gets a bad experience, they're going home. That is what they have. And when the Provost, in fact, talked about his experience in China, had any of the people that he met been here and had experience something that was negative, he would have heard about it.

Provost Jones: I did. Thank you.

[LAUGHTER]

Chair Bérubé: I want to just add that Jonathan's point is important. And I received an email about Global Programs-- not the committee; the office of-- speaking to study abroad and the things that chill incentives for study abroad.

And we're still working on it. But this is a different issue altogether. I think this is about international students here. And there's no real guarantee that domestic students going abroad leads to a necessarily more welcoming climate here. But thank you, again. Are there any other questions? Yes, Carey?

Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: I'm really very glad to see the report with the many recommendations for supporting international students on campus here all throughout the University campuses. I would like just to make sure that I understand that the recommendations, although there's is a long list of them, even though they're not boldface, that nevertheless they remain aspirational.

In other words, we can't ourselves prioritize among them. We have no cost estimates. We don't know how they might be implemented in different locations. That that would be a subsequent stage that somebody else would be looking into. So yes, this is another aspirational kind of report, yes?
Brian King: Yeah. I would say that so that's an accurate assessment. So, for example, some of these recommendations would need to be handled by, for example, the Office of Career Services or Global Programs. The Faculty Senate approving this and having administrative buy-in would allow us next year to facilitate those conversations to see what is possible, what's financially feasible.

Caroline Eckhardt: Great.

Brian King: We're not just asking for a blank check here. We're asking for the Senate to say this is important. And given the context that because of these changes that we're seeing around international students coming into the United States, we'd like to be responsive as much as possible.

Caroline Eckhardt: And in that spirit, if I could add one, and that might be to encourage interactions between international students and students who are already here. For example, one of the Arabic courses in my department includes making a website in Arabic to welcome new students coming from Arabic-speaking countries, tell them where you buy things in State College. It's whole batch of practicalities. That's an example of interactions that can help incoming students feel at home.

Brian King: Yeah. Thank you very much.

Chair Bérubé: I have one follow up suggestion as well pertaining to our interactions with the Senate, and I want to second the suggestion that this is aspirational. But for the question of restaurant employees or owners who think they're border security, that might well be a charge for Student Life next year as well- the Student Life Committee.

So, think of-- where did Nicholas go? Oh, he went to his seat.

[LAUGHTER]

Yeah, that might be something worth putting on their plate.

Willie Ofosu: To add a comment following what you just said, what we are thinking of is as that Global Programs can work together with other committees and different units, or however it comes out-- Admissions, or whatever-- to resolve some of these problems. Because quite frankly, it's that important.

Chair Bérubé: Yeah. I just know it's not on their agenda now. And since you've placed it on our agenda, I'd like to suggest to my successor that maybe Student Life make this part of their agenda next year. And I wanted that to be part of the public records, which is why I said it.

Any other questions? Are we ready to vote? I think we are. By MediaSite as well. To accept the motion, A. To reject it, B.

Anna Butler: Poll Everywhere, I have 18 accept and three reject.

Paula Brown: In house, we have 106 accept, five reject.

Chair Bérubé: Motion carries. The report will be forwarded to President Barron for his action. Thank you again for all your work on this.
Willie Ofosu: Thank you.

Chair Bérubé: Informational Reports. It's kind of the homestretch. There are only five. At its February 19 meeting, Senate Council voted to place the following Informational Reports on the Senate agenda as website only. These would be two reports from ARSSA, “Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program”, Appendix N, and “Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded to Undergraduates”, Appendix O. These reports will not be discussed today. But if you all have questions or comments on them, email senate@psu.edu. Your questions will be forwarded to Committee Chair, Mary Beth Williams, for a response.

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

Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program.* (Appendix N) This report summarizes “Reserved Spaces” and are admission spaces reserved at University Park for eligible first-year students with special needs or talents that cannot be met at Commonwealth Campus locations and whose evaluation indices (EI) do not meet the applicable University Park admission criteria. These students contribute to the educational and cultural life and diversity of the University Park campus.

Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded to Undergraduates.* (Appendix O) This report provides information about how the Office of Student Aid, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, facilitates the awarding of University Scholarships designated as ‘Faculty Senate Scholarships.’

Chair Bérubé: The remaining three reports will be discussed, and the first two have to do with voting for people for things.

We will begin with the “Committee on Committee and Rules Nominating Report for 2019-2020”, which is your Appendix L. Keith. Committees and Rules Chair, Keith Shapiro, will present the names of those who have accepted the nomination to one of three extra-senatorial committees: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, and the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee.

Senators may make additional nominations from the floor—like, right now—provided that you have first received permission from the person whom you'd like to nominate. Because that's crucial. Keith.

Keith Shapiro: Thank you, Chair Bérubé. The nominees for Faculty Rights and Responsibilities are presented to you in Appendix L, and we will deal with each section separately. We need to elect two University Park faculty. Two will serve as members, and one will be the alternate for three-year terms.

Chair Bérubé: And here they are.

Keith Shapiro: Chair Bérubé, are there any additional nominations?

Chair Bérubé: That's my line.

Keith Shapiro: Oh, I'm sorry.
Chair Bérubé: What was rehearsal for?

[LAUGHTER]

Keith Shapiro: I didn't take my theater course seriously, obviously.

Chair Bérubé: You're the guy from A & A.

[INAUDIBLE]

William, I hope you're lighting this properly. Are there any additional nominations? In that case, back to you.

Keith Shapiro: OK. You're supposed to say, let's move on. That's what it says.

Chair Bérubé: I am ad-libbing.

[LAUGHTER]

They have me say "let's move on" 18 times.

[LAUGHTER]

Keith Shapiro: Chair Shapiro-- we need to-- you're not supposed to read that-- we need to elect two faculty from locations other than University Park. One will serve as a member, and one will be an alternate.

Chair Bérubé: A good lineup. Are there any additional nominations? See, we got that right this time. Chair Bérubé-- let's move on.

[LAUGHTER]

Keith Shapiro: We need to elect three deans or chancellors. One will serve as a member and two will serve as alternates.

Chair Bérubé: This one looks fairly easy. Are there any additional nominations to make it more complicated?

**EDITORIAL NOTE: Dr. Francis Achampong, Chancellor, Penn State Mont Alto, withdrew his name for consideration.**

I think we're good. We can move on to the University and Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Keith Shapiro: For the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, we need to elect five-- three members and two alternates, each serving a two-year term.

Chair Bérubé: Are there any additional nominations?
Keith Shapiro: That's my fault, because I, even though--

Chair Bérubé: Yeah, we've corrected that, like, three times.

Keith Shapiro: --our Chair told me to correct it, I clearly didn't do it.

Chair Bérubé: OK. With that emendation, let's move on to the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure.

Keith Shapiro: Our last committee is the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure. We will elect two-- one member and one alternate.

Chair Bérubé: Are there any additions? So, is there a motion to close nominations and approve the entire slate of nominees?

Unidentified Senator: So moved.

Chair Bérubé: Is there a second?

Unidentified Senator: Second.

Chair Bérubé: Great. So, it has been moved and seconded that we approve this entire slate of nominees. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

Unidentified Senators: Aye.

Chair Bérubé: Opposed say nay quietly.

[LAUGHTER]

The ayes have it. That was finger on the-- that was definitely in the script. The ayes have it. The motion passes. The slate of nominees for these three committees have been approved, and the slate is closed. Thank you, Chair Shapiro.

Keith Shapiro: Thank you, Chair Bérubé.

Chair Bérubé: And thanks to the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules.

The next Informational Report, your Appendix M, is from the Senate Council Nominating Committee, which reports nominations for Chair Elect and Secretary of the Senate, and people to serve on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. Once again, you may make additional nominations from the floor as long as you have the person's permission.

Matthew Woessner, chair of the Senate Council Nominating Committee and Immediate Past Chair of the Faculty Senate-- as you know-- will present the nominations.
Matthew Woessner, Harrisburg: Thank you. As a reminder to those who are new to the Senate, the Senate uses the Hare Voting System which ranks the voter selection to ensure that each candidate receives a minimum number of votes to win an election. Elected senators will rank their order preferences, selecting the first, second, third, fourth, and so on.

So where five candidates are seeking a single office, if no individual secures an outright majority, the individuals with the least number of votes is eliminated. Anyone who voted for the excluded candidate will have his or her second choices added to the vote total of the remaining candidates. The process of eliminating the bottom candidates is repeated until one candidate secures an outright majority.

This is important, as it ensures that candidates are elected with a broad electoral support. Please be certain to indicate your rank preferences for each office in the event that a favored candidate is eliminated during the course of the balloting, the exception being when there's only two candidates for one office.

And this is just a real quick visual representation of how the system works. So, if this is the first round of balloting and no one has a majority, the last person is eliminated and their second choices are redistributed. And the process continues until someone has secured an outright majority of all the votes.

So, this is the Hare Voting System, and it's why we wanted to reiterate this, because it prevents ballot-splitting. You don't want a situation where the third-party candidates are breaking up majorities. But as importantly, you have to specify your rank order preferences.

Some people actually have only been specifying their top choice. And in the process, if your candidate is eliminated, your vote doesn't count.

So that's a summary. So, we have three nominees for chair elect of the Senate, listed Appendix M. And all nominees have given permission to have their names placed on the ballot.

Chair Bérubé: Are there any additional nominations from the floor? Let's move on to secretary.

Matthew Woessner: For the Office of Secretary of the Senate, we have two nominees, listed in Appendix M. And both nominees have given their permission to have their names placed on the ballot.

Chair Bérubé: Are there any additional nominations from the floor? Faculty Advisory Committee.

Matthew Woessner: For the Faculty Advisory Committee to the president, one will be elected for a three-year term expiring in 2022. The six nominees are listed in Appendix M and have given their permission to have their names listed on the ballot.

Chair Bérubé: Any additional nominations from the floor? So, is there a motion to close the nominations and approve this entire slate of nominees?

Unidentified Senators: So moved.

Chair Bérubé: Second?

Unidentified Senator: Second.
Chair Bérubé: It has been moved and seconded to approve the entire slate. All those in favor, say aye.

Unidentified Senators: Aye.

Chair Bérubé: All opposed? Motion carries. The election slate is adopted. These are your choices. Thank you, Matthew, and the Senate Council Nominating Committee.

Now write this down. The Senate online elections will take place from March 27 to April 5th. The election results will be reported after the results are certified by the tellers.

I'm debating whether to add "and the winner is la-la-land." But no.

[LAUGHTER]

This is a secure process. And thank you, Matthew, also, for the explanation of the Hare system, which I don't think everyone in the room knew.

The next and final report-- nope-- the next and penultimate report, seen in the Appendix P, is from Intra-University Relations and Faculty Affairs, and is titled “Promotion to the Rank of Professor”. Fifteen minutes have been allotted for presentation and discussion. Committee Chairs, Rose Petrilla and John Nousek are back up to present the report.

Rose Petrilla: Good afternoon, everyone. This is the second year IRC and Faculty Affairs has-- the second year that we've been charged to take a look at promotion of rank to the rank of professor. I need my glasses. Sorry.

Okay. For those of you who remember who may have been here last year, and for those of you who are new, we presented this graph last year. It actually came from, it was based on the Associate Professor Time and Rank 2016/2017 Report. What it was demonstrating was the associate professor time and rank. And it was a snapshot from 2016.

What you'll notice from the chart and what the conclusion we drew at that time was that there was a 25-point difference in the rates of promotion of rank to professor. And that was comparing promotion from associate professor to full professor of University Park and Commonwealth Campuses.

There was a sharp drop of associate professors at UP at the seven to ten-year mark, which is indicative of promotion in a timely manner. But we didn't see that drop, or this graph didn't demonstrate that drop, for the campuses.

Promotion to professor within six years at UP was 22.4 percent compared to 2.6 percent was what we reported last year. What we also noticed from this graph was that it leveled out. And that level-out really was not, with further investigation, a function of improvements of rates in the commonwealth college, but rather a result from natural attrition of the faculty in the middle ranks.

So, what happened since then? Well, that graph certainly sparked a tremendous amount of dialogue afterwards, which is always a good thing. And that's what prompted the Senate leadership this year to have Faculty Affairs and IRC take a look at it.
So, what happened since then? When we brought it up-- and IRC took the lead on this-- when we brought it up in committee, we looked at that charge again. And the Senators on that committee said, “We need more information before we go forward. We need to know, what was the discrepancy? What were people concerned about when we brought that graph forward?”

So, the committee asked, when we discussed and we reached out-- and a special thanks to Dr. Brazier, who's the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty and Research for the University College. We invited him to IRC. And it was a great discussion which helped us to understand what the concerns were initially with that first presentation of the data.

And one of the things we learned was that not all the people were captured in that report. And a very important lesson-- so we had those discussions. And it was clear after those discussions that there was a need for collaboration among the Senate, among administration, and also, we included the Office of Planning and Assessment. Because if we're going to make any change moving forward, we needed to be able to agree on how to monitor any change that we make going forward.

So, what we did from that point was that we did- we did that exactly. We held a meeting. And I think the takeaway from that meeting and what we learned from this original report was that we really need to, before we publish something of this magnitude, that we really need to vet it among all the parties.

Because very quickly, it was noted that there was something that didn't make sense with the data shown. And one of the things we learned that came out of that was that faculty who were on sabbatical were not captured in the original data.

So, when Dr. Brazier came to IRC, he was able to show us his analysis. And this was figure 2 in the report, that it did omit faculty. What we learned through the discussion from the meeting in IRC, and then when Senate leadership and Lori-- I want to acknowledge Lori Hancock as well-- it did omit faculty at the rank of assistant professor.

While this graph did show a trend moving upward, it did not include assistant professors. So, Figure 2 here indicated at around 12 years, there was some improvement in the rates of faculty earning professor on the campuses, moving from 26 percent to 30 percent. But to put this in perspective using the unit of measure, approximately 60 percent of UP tenured faculty hold the rank of professor.

Additionally, in part of the discussion after the original report, there was a conversation that it was 6.7 years, and in our discussion in this meeting, versus it takes 8.7 years for faculty at the Commonwealth Campuses. But what we needed to realize then, and it really took the discussion of the group, that it only really represented those faculty who were put forward and that success rate.

So where do we go from here? I think as a Senate body-- well, before I even go there, I think what was really important was the fact that it was a great example of shared governance where faculty-- and I'd like to acknowledge a lot of work of the Subcommittee of Faculty Affairs and IRC, the Senate leadership, Dr. Brazier -we really worked hard on this. We even further went and, God bless him, he came to the commonwealth caucus meeting.

And we had the opportunity there and I think what was really important to show that this is a shared governance moment. We had Dr. Bieschke there. We had Dr. Madlyn Hanes there. And how important
that was to the faculty who, they had the opportunity-- and the Senators-- to represent their faculty at their units, come forward with what are the current barriers?

We have developed a list of all those important topics that were brought to that meeting. Some of them are some easy fixes. Others are really going to take a shared governance approach. But we're also going to have to decide as an institution, what are the challenges? What can we really change?

Can we change the resources? Can we change teaching loads? Can we change the more difficult things? Or do we have to take a look at the criteria? They are the discussions-- where is Nicholas; where did he go-- for next year. There he is.

But what we do know is that lower rates have important implications long term on morale, on retention, and success of the unit. From my personal corner of the world, I've been very supported over my career.

I have had success and my students have success because of the support I've received. And my campus has success because of how I was supported throughout my career. So, I don't think anybody-- I think we all can agree on the importance of that.

Another thing you might not know about me is I'm part of an accredited program, and I'm an accreditor. And there's always a song playing in the background of your head. It's part of the post-traumatic stress syndrome of going through the accreditation process.

But what I always look to-- and I went to Middle States-- is-- and more so, it's Standard 3, Section 2. And I've highlighted the really important parts. But we have to answer this. Does Penn State provide faculty with and utilize sufficient opportunities, resource, and support for professional growth and innovation when we look forward to this process and mitigating that gap? And then, are we reviewed regularly, equitably, based on written, disseminated, clear, and fair criteria, expectations, and policies, and procedures?

I think the concerns that came out of committee, that came out of the caucus, are great examples and a great place to start to improve and mitigate this gap. And again, I can't emphasize how important it was that administration was there to hear it. It meant and went a long way. And I felt there was a relief of the faculty to have that moment to bring concerns forward.

So where do we go from here? Improvement and minimizing the gap is definitely going to take a shared government approach. Next year, Senate leadership must review the thoughtful and ground roots feedback we received from the Senators and the faculty they represent to shape the priorities for the upcoming year.

We need to have all parties review data before release so we have the most accurate data. And as we go forward, we need to closely monitor the impact. We have to know exactly how we're going to measure it so that we can measure the impact, the changes we have made, and if they had a positive effect.

So, with that, I'll end the report there. John, would you like the same anything before we open it up for discussion?

John Nousek: Just very briefly, I want to commend Rose and especially the IRC. I'm sorry. I want to commend Rose and especially the IRC for the very large amount of work that was put in. I would say that
this report is more heavily based on IRC work than FA, but we do have some significant components that were contributed from FA.

My takeaway is I believe that-- I've been at this University for 38 years, and I believe it is a better University than when I arrived in every, pretty much, measurable and intangible dimension. And one of the biggest things that is true today is that the majority of Penn State is not located in University Park.

It is located across the commonwealth in all these campuses, all the faculty, all the students. And we really need to justify, if there really are discrepancies as was shown up by this report, I think it's very important to understand how those discrepancies arise.

And Rose is right that we have to be careful to not jump to quick conclusions. But I think we also must not sweep anything under the rug. And that that's all I would say.

Rose Petrilla: And one final comment. I think it was so refreshing to hear today. In IRC, we actually brought up the conversation of part-time faculty. So, it was kind of neat to hear the provost raise that concern today.

And there's definitely been a cultural change in regard to teaching faculty. So, this is just an extension that we want to take a look at and help support our associate professors to move forward to full professor. We do have two minutes for discussion. Matthew.

Matthew Woessner: I want to thank the committees. A lot of hard work went into this report. But I want to highlight this as a success story in the collaboration with the administration and the Faculty Senate. Because we started last year with a disagreement over how to define our terms and a disagreement over data. And what we did this year is we worked together to kind of come to some agreement upon what are good metrics. And I think there is a consensus now that there are real challenges to getting faculty on the campuses through the full professor process. The next step, of course, is to talk about solutions.

So, this is why, hopefully, we'll have a data liaison at some point, because our ability to talk the same language about the data and to come to an agreement that there was a gap that needs to be addressed I think is a part of the success story which your committee did and what we'll do in the future. So, thank you.


Chair Bérubé: Brian? Roger?

Brian King: It's more of a comment than an-- thank you also for this report. I think it's really valuable. And going through the data the way you are I think is necessary. We talked yesterday in my caucus, and so I just had a question. Have you begun to look at those data in terms of gender discrepancies?

We see trends nationally in terms of time and rank being differentiated by gender. If you've not yet done that, I just encourage you to consider that. Because if you're thinking about recommendations of best practices, there might be some additional layers there that are necessary to consider.
**Rose Petrilla:** If I'm not mistaken-- maybe somebody else can correct me-- that's part of the Promotion Flow Report.

**Chair Bérubé:** It is, but I would also put in a pitch for the Modern Language Association Report, the Associate Professor Project, Standing Still. That actually, it's about ten-years old now, but strangely still relevant today, about the gender disparity in the associate professor ranks. So that's one of the resources you could go to. Again, it's just the MLA, but it's work that's already been done. Roger.

**Roger Egolf:** Egolf, Lehigh Valley. I want to commend both of you for a really nice report. I do have a suggestion of one additional metric that could show fairly starkly the difference. And that would be, our University is large enough that a substantial number of people retire every year, both from the campuses and University Park. Every year, the committees could do a report showing the percentage of faculty at each rank upon retirement.

**Rose Petrilla:** OK. Thank you.

**Chair Bérubé:** Jennifer. You got in just under the buzzer. Please feel free.

**Jennifer Nesbitt, York:** I'm going to introduce a completely different idea. In the third paragraph of the report, there is an indication that Directors of Academic Affairs or Chief Academic Officers, who are associate professors, may not be sufficiently equipped to mentor faculty through the promotion process.

And I believe that we should take that statement with a grain of salt. I think there are lots of people out there who are associate professors who would have no trouble mentoring a fellow faculty member through the promotion process, although I realize that not everybody is the same. Thank you.

**Rose Petrilla:** Thank you for your comment.

**Chair Bérubé:** I actually have a grain of salt with me. I will pass it to committee. Thank you both, but especially Rose, for your work on this. It is a huge one. And the work will be ongoing.

The next and last report is from LIST, “Courseware FERPA Agreement” Report is your Appendix Q. Five minutes have an allocated for presentation. Roger Egolf may introduce the speaker. Now he will. Thank you, Roger.

**Roger Egolf:** Okay. Thank you for sticking around this long. Today, you'll hear very briefly, with some time for questions-- but once again, very briefly-- a report on the ‘Courseware FERPA Agreement’, which is a new website that you can now use to find out what software has been approved to use within the University.

Often this is things that you can use in conjunction with Canvas, but not always. And it'll make it a lot easier figuring out what there is out there. And just to stress, approved doesn't mean that you can go out and buy it. It means that risk has checked off on it, and you can now go to your budget offer to see if they will pay for it.

And Terry O'Heron, the director of operations with Teaching and Learning with Technology, will stand for questions, and also talk a little bit.
Terry O'Heron, Director of Operations for Teaching and Learning with Technology: Thank you, Roger. Hello. Well, thank you for having me. I also want to introduce two other individuals that have been very instrumental in actually getting this process and this agreement approved by the University.

Richel Peretti. She's from the Office of Risk Management, and Jen Jacobs is from the Office of General Counsel. Without their support and input, we wouldn't be here today.

Just a quick story. About 2013, we noticed that there are about 60 to 75 courses using a product called Piazza, a Q&A tool. It was a free product. However, there was no formal agreement with the University.

So, we actually prompted the vendor, “Hey, are you willing to enter into an agreement with the university to make this contractually acceptable to the university in regard to risk, security, and things like that, and liability?” And the vendor said, “Well, let me look at your document.”

And we showed it to them. It's the Hosted Sensitive Data Addendum. It actually is an addendum to their original agreement. And they said, “No. Why would I spend money to get additional liability insurance? This product is free. We don't want to spend additional money.”

Hence, the process gets started. Because now we have a quandrum here. Do we take the tool away from the 60 to 75 courses, or do we try to get to ‘yes’? We chose to get to ‘yes’. So, this is actually-- nope. Great. All right. Last time I gave a presentation, I was on slide 6. But I really wasn't on slide six, I was still on slide two. So, you know, that does matter. But anyway, the document I mentioned, again, is the Hosted Sensitive Data Addendum.

And of course, that was-- and it's still in use today. However, that's a very comprehensive contractual document. It goes into security. Goes into liability insurance. Privacy. Indemnification, yes, yes. So again, we had this free tool. Why would we pay that kind of money?

So, actually, it was also a rigorous process for Courseware. Courseware, of course, is primarily for instruction, student data, student materials, instructor materials. So, I didn't really need to be as stringent. However, just to get that document approved by the various vendors, and, actually, their suggested changes through Penn State, was a laborious process.

Hence, we wanted to streamline the solution. And of course, a group went to provost Jones with a recommendation. It was representing from TOT, Risk, General Counsel. And they said, we want to actually reduce the requirements associated with a HSDA. And he agreed to that suggestion. Hence, we actually came up with a Courseware FERPA Agreement.

Now what allow us to do that is there is was new information security policy, AD95, that actually categorizes the various levels of data. Which FERPA is one for Courseware, and that's moderate risk.

So now we're able to be less strictive, if you will, than our requirements for Courseware. Actually, there's four levels of data categorization: Restricted, high, moderate, and low. And FERPA falls under moderate.

So hence, we created this Courseware FERPA Agreement. But of course, what is Courseware? And I'm just going to have to read this. I want to make sure I--
Courseware is any digital application or software used by students or educators for a class. Courseware provides online learning tools such as lessons, homework lessons, and quizzes or tests. And it could be actually used strictly in the classroom, physical classroom, or actually with the course management system, Canvas, today.

So, we actually, as a product of this Courseware FERPA Agreement, it actually addresses a few items. One, of course, is FERPA requirements to be in line with those requirements contractually by the vendor.

Also, accessibility. We have an obligation, and by law, to provide accessible content to those with their vision and hearing impaired. So that requirement is addressed in the FERPA agreement. Also, there is a section that addresses integration with the Enterprise Learning Management System- Canvas, if a unit or a faculty member requires or requests that it be integrated.

Another artifact as result of the Courseware FERPA Agreement, going through this process, actually, we developed a new request form for faculty to fill out, or units, when they request software. And they can also identify if they want to integrate with the learning management system.

Another artifact, actually, was also this list that I'm going to show you. A combined list of all the software that Roger mentioned that's been through the review process, whether or not the vendors have agreed to sign the Courseware FERPA Agreement. Or whether, actually, it was authorized by the University, because they might change some of the stipulations in the agreement.

So, this list identifies those products, Courseware tools, that have been through the process, and whether or not they are authorized or not. So, it's all encompassing, because we don't want individuals to actually submit another request when the tool has already been through the review process and not authorized.

Another artifact is the Courseware website. And it actually goes in extensive detail to explain to faculty and students and staff actually the process to get the request, what Courseware is, and actually things to know and understand.

I want to real quick go to the list. This is actually the website, the home page. The definition. And of course, there is the Request Courseware Campus Integration. Those are links that takes you to the request form and things you need to know, as well as a reviewed course list.

This is the list currently today. It's just one page. There's about-- oh, Lord. We up to how many?

[INAUDIBLE]

Yeah. Yeah, There's a lot. About ten pages. But anyway, this on the left is the supplier. Of course, the products covered. And that is a URL. It's a link. It takes you to the actual website of the vendor.

And actually, we have various categories associated with these products that you can search. Whether it's quizzing, proctoring exams, discussion forums. So, it's an easier way for you to actually find what you are actually looking for.

And of course, permitted use. And a link in Canvas. A lot of people would say I just want to put a link in Canvas to this product, which is different than an actual integration with Canvas that requires an exchange of roster information, and grades, and things like that.
These are the categories that are listed. Actually, they are searchable. And we review these products as they come in and actually try to categorize them. And, there might even be a new category that we actually add to the list.

And I just want to add to the folks that we actually involved in this whole process, they're on the left. We actually engaged many, many units and many organizations on campus. And I am remiss, because the Registrar was very huge in this effort. And I didn't actually include them.

But this is the group that actually helped us put this all together, and it is where it is today. We're not done. We're on Phase 1. We know there's going to be other things. For example, there is a component if these items-- they might cost money. A suggestion was, annotate those items that would cost money. And if it does cost money, then you have to go through the acquisition purchasing process. There are separate rules for that. And of course, we actually link to that.

And also, another suggestion was, who is using these products at the University? Because someone might ask you questions. How are you using it in your class? What's the pedagogy? And things like that. So those are some of the suggestions that we've been asked to actually add to the website. Any questions? Did I make in five minutes?

Chair Bérubé: Nope, not even close. But thank you so much, because this is--

[LAUGHTER]

We turned off the timer. No, thank you so much. This is really, really informative. And I think for further information-- hey, wait a minute.

Terry O'Heron: Actually, yeah. On the website, there's actually contact information. Yes. But there's the website.

Chair Bérubé: There is one question. Renata.

Renata Engel, Vice Provost for Online Education: So, you have that table there. You list the level of what the approval is, whether it's in process or it's completed. But you didn't list a duration, or how long whatever will be in effect is in effect. And I'm wondering if you could comment on that.

Jennifer Jacobs, Associate General Counsel: So, the agreement doesn't have a term. And so--

Unidentified Senator: By design.

Jennifer Jacobs: By design. That's for that exact reason. And we just have the right to terminate any agreement within 90 days by providing notice to the vendor. So, if it turns out that we for any reason decide that it's no longer a vendor we want to work with on a University-wide basis, then we would just terminate the agreement, and that would be it. Yep.

Terry O'Her on: But it is also recommended that the units that actually require or suggest that the product be reviewed every year. And we review the terms and conditions just in case.
Jennifer Jacobs: I just want to add one minor, clarifying point. You'll see on the table that Terry showed you guys earlier that a lot of the items, they actually needed for authorization. It's not because we don't have an agreement in place, but it may be because there is an alternate accessibility plan where the software itself is not fully accessible.

And so, we work with the IT Accessibility Team at the University to make sure that any students with disabilities are able to either use the software as it's intended, or we develop an alternate plan for them to be able to use it. So that's a really important note it's not that it's not authorized. It's just that there may be an additional step that we need to take in order to make sure that it's an appropriate use in a particular environment.

Chair Bérubé: Cool. Thank you again.

Terry O'Heron: Thank you.

Chair Bérubé: [INAUDIBLE]

[APPLAUSE]

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Bérubé: Since it's not 5 o'clock yet, is there any new business? None.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

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

ADJOURNMENT

Unidentified Senators: So moved.

Chair Bérubé: All in favor?

Unidentified Senators: Aye.

[BANGS GAVEL]

Chair Bérubé: Motion carries. The Senate is adjourned until April 23rd. See you all then.
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