THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
The University Faculty Senate
AGENDA
Tuesday, January 24, 2017 – 1:30 p.m.
112 Kern Graduate Building

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

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

A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Minutes of the December 6, 2016, Meeting in The Senate Record 50:3

B. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report of January 10, 2017 Appendix A

C. REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – Meeting of January 10, 2017

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

E. COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

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

G. FORENSIC BUSINESS

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

Recommendation for Standardizing Fixed Term Titles across Units Appendix B
[20 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]
Senate Committee on Outreach

Faculty Preparation for Online Teaching  
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]  
Appendix C

Senate Committee on Student Life

Counseling and Psychological Services for Students  
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]  
Appendix D

H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (Motion to be voted on at the January 24, 2017 meeting)

Abington Resolution  
(Introduced by Judy Ozment at the December 6, 2016 meeting)  
Appendix E

I. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules

Establishment of the Standing Joint Committee for General Education Assessment  
Appendix F

Revisions to Senate Bylaws Article II Section 1  
Appendix G

Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article I Section 11  
Appendix H

Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article I Section 12  
Appendix I

J. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

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

Endowed Scholarships  
Appendix J

Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment

Addressing Issues of Classroom Climate and Bias in the Classroom  
Appendix K

Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits

The Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits, the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits, and the Health Care Advisory Committee: Coordination of Duties  
Appendix L
Recommendations for Third Party Administrator (TPA) Choice for Penn State Medical and Prescription Drug Coverage

Senate Committee on Intra-University Relations

Disciplinary Communities Revisited

Equivalence of Courses Across the University

K. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Senate Committee on Global Programs

Program Goals for Global Penn State; Student Participation, Diversity, and Comparison to Peer Institutions
[20 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

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

Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program*

Senate Committees on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid and Educational Equity and Campus Environment

Penn State Veterans – Historical Perspectives
[5 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs

Update on Assessment and Accreditation
[5 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Elections Commission

University Faculty Census Report 2017-2018*

Senate Committee on Research

Report on the Penn State Facilities and Administration Rate
[5 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]
L. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, March 14, 2017, 1:30 p.m., Room 112 Kern Graduate Building.

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

DATE: January 11, 2017

TO: James A. Strauss, Chair, University Faculty Senate

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

The Senate Curriculum Report dated January 10, 2017 has been circulated throughout the University. Objections to any of the items in the report must be submitted to Kadi Corter, Curriculum Coordinator, 101 Kern Graduate Building, 814-863-0996, kkw2@psu.edu, on or before February 9, 2017.

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

Recommendation for Standardizing Fixed Term Titles across Units

(Forensic)

Question for Forensic discussion

Do we, the Faculty Senate, wish to have uniform titles for fixed-term faculty across our University, or will each college independently define these titles?

Introduction

In March 2016, the University Faculty Senate endorsed an advisory/consultative report that included a recommendation to expand the existing promotion pathway for fixed-term faculty from two ranks to three (Appendix B). While at that time the report suggested allowing units to determine titles for those ranks, 2016-17 Senate Chair James Strauss charged the Committee on Faculty Affairs with recommending titles that might be widely used across units. Inconsistent titles frequently lead to such confusion as what difference might exist between a “lecturer” and an “instructor”—when in reality, units use such titles interchangeably for essentially equivalent positions. Should each unit develop its own titles for a new, additional rank, such confusion is likely to be compounded. The purpose of this report, then, is to recommend standard titles for correlative positions and avoid compounding existing confusion. In addition, and to provide still more clarity on various fixed-term positions in the university, this report recommends that HR 21 be revised so that, insofar as is practical, rank and title share the same nomenclature.

Background

Suggestions to develop a three-tier promotion system for fixed term faculty and to adopt new titles are not new. In 2007, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs recommended adopting the titles of Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, and Professor of Practice for fixed-term faculty who either have exceptional professional experience or who hold a terminal degree and bring “valuable academic expertise” (Appendix C, p. 3). While then-President Spanier accepted the title of Professor of Practice for individuals with exceptional professional experience, he rejected professorial titles for other fixed-term faculty (Appendix D, p. 2) in order to avoid potential confusion about responsibilities of fixed-term and tenure line professors and to avoid devaluing the terminal degree credential and tenure process.

In 2013, the Executive Subcommittee for Outstanding Online Teaching and Learning (chartered by the university’s Online Steering Committee) acknowledged a cadre of fixed-term faculty focused on teaching as a valuable and necessary component of the World Campus effort. The Subcommittee recommended that professorial titles be standardized across units to the extent

---

1 Some units already have three-tier systems and standard titles unique to their units. These include, for example, the library, the Applied Research Laboratory (ARL), and the Hershey College of Medicine.
practical and “should include the full hierarchy from assistant through equivalent professorial levels” (Appendix E, p. 7), perhaps using three versions of titles to illuminate different roles: one for faculty whose primary responsibility is research, one for faculty whose primary responsibility is teaching, and one for faculty whose primary responsibility is clinical. (Appendix E, p. 6).

A 2014 Senate White Paper reviewed these earlier reports, catalogued the variety of titles employed across units, surveyed practices at other institutions, and detailed not only the critical role that fixed-term faculty play but also their steadily increasing numbers (Appendix F). The White Paper cites a 2012 report of the Senate Committee on Intra-University Relations indicating that the number of fixed-term faculty grew from 4,695 in 2004 to 6,012 in 2010, reflecting the national trend toward increasing reliance on fixed-term rather than standing appointments within higher education generally. After reviewing earlier reports, and in recognition of the important contributions fixed-term faculty make to the university, the White Paper recommended that the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs author a new Advisory and Consultative Report that recommends to the University leadership a new model that addresses the 2007 concerns of some of the tenure line faculty that the creation of non-tenure-line teaching ranks would “de-value the efforts they have made in working through the tenure process and the academic ranks, accumulating strong records in multiple dimensions of teaching, research, and service” (Spanier to Floros, p. 2) while recognizing the growing need to attract and retain highly qualified individuals to teach in our professional programs and courses. Without the ability to effectively “recognize the high professional achievements of colleagues whose main activities do not merit tenure under our current tenure system but whose contributions are absolutely essential to the success of the school” (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2000, p. 1), we will continue to struggle as an institution to meet our strategic goals, including providing academic programs that meet the needs of new and emerging markets. (Appendix F, p. 14).

As illustrated in Appendix B, the Senate has taken steps to move toward an expanded career path for fixed-term faculty. This report intends to further efforts to both strengthen and better differentiate among career paths for fixed-term faculty. It also reflects the committee’s effort to avoid the danger of de-valuing of tenure that concerned then-President Spanier (Appendix D).

Rationale

As earlier reports detail, both rank and title matter—and not simply to the individuals involved. For example, in an informal survey conducted by the Faculty Affairs Subcommittee on Faculty Development, one respondent indicated s/he would never have accepted a position with Penn State if it hadn’t come with a professorship title, and another pointed out that the lack of professorial titles hinders faculty ability to secure grants and form partnerships. Recruiting the best possible faculty and supporting their efforts to help maintain the university’s visibility on a national and global scale is imperative. Appropriate titles are a critical step in this direction.
Moreover, this is a need other universities have long since acknowledged and acted upon. For example, the quote from the University of Wisconsin-Madison is from 2000; the 2012 White Paper survey of comparable institutions indicates that many models are already in place at other prestigious institutions, and as last year’s Senate report on HR21 noted, similar titles and ranks exist at Northwestern University, the University of Minnesota, the University of Iowa, Rutgers University, Purdue University, and the University of Nebraska.²

While many institutions have adopted differentiated titles for fixed-term faculty, models vary considerably and there appears to be no widespread agreement on nomenclature. An informal poll of fixed-term faculty in the units of subcommittee members indicated that there are substantial differences of opinion among Penn State fixed-term faculty about the most desirable title for various positions. Likewise, extended deliberations within the full Faculty Affairs committee also reveal a wide variety of preferences, amply illustrating the complexity of the issue at hand. It is apparent that unanimity on this, as on other Senate issues, cannot be expected. As a result, the committee offers the recommendation below as the one most committee members believe addresses key objections to various possibilities.

While there is widespread appreciation of fixed-term faculty’s crucial contributions to the university as well as strong support for efforts to recruit the best possible candidates for faculty positions, there is also concern about the possibility of new titles conflating roles and responsibilities between fixed-term and tenure line faculty in new and undesirable ways. We note with alarm that some fixed-term faculty hired to teach high course loads are sometimes encouraged or even expected to conduct research as well, even though they are not provided with the time and resources necessary for research. We also note that these expectations vary widely and incoherently from campus to campus, such that fixed-term faculty on one campus are evaluated on a 60-30-10 system (for teaching, research and/or scholarship, and service), fixed-term faculty on another campus are evaluated on a 1/3-1/3-1/3 system, and fixed-term faculty on another campus are not evaluated for research at all (as indeed they should not be, if they are not given time and resources for research).

We want to make it very clear that our recommendations here are attempts to help clarify and strengthen the titles of fixed-term faculty positions without conflating significant differences among primary responsibilities of various types of appointments. In other words, changes in job titles should not entail changes in job description. Fixed-term faculty whose positions involve high teaching loads should not be expected to develop research agendas simply because their title becomes “assistant teaching professor.” As we point out below, it will be imperative for every unit to ensure that its criteria for appointments and promotions be clear and appropriately differentiated in order to guard against fixed-term faculty being expected to take on substantive responsibilities typically characteristic of tenure-line faculty.

Specifically, the committee recommends differentiating between fixed-term faculty who hold terminal degrees and those who don’t, and between faculty whose primary responsibility is teaching and those whose primary responsibilities are clinical.

Since the many units of Penn State University have, over the years, settled on a dizzying variety of

---

approaches to titling their fixed-term faculty, we propose implementing the new shared titling system over three to five years. Gradual implementation will allow colleagues and unit administrators to develop fair procedures for assessing who among the existing fixed-term faculty might be eligible for a change in rank and title, how job descriptions and advertising language need to be adjusted throughout the unit, and how to minimize negative impacts on valued colleagues. Gradual implementation will also enable the Faculty Senate to receive and react to feedback about the new program in timely ways. Allowing five years for full implementation does risk some erosion of institutional memory over the long period of transition. But allowing five years also permits existing fixed-term faculty to achieve new credentials, if they wish, and permits administrators to introduce the changes smoothly as existing contracts expire.

Finally, to ensure that inappropriate expectations do not creep into fixed-term appointments, it will be essential for every unit to develop clear criteria for the responsibilities associated with a particular rank and for promotions. Some units have begun work in this area. Attached as Appendix G is a document detailing expectations for various ranks in the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, which units may find a helpful model.

**Recommendation**

We recommend the following system of ranks and titles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Track Faculty</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty with Terminal Degree</th>
<th>Clinical Faculty with Terminal Degree</th>
<th>Research Faculty with a Terminal Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Assistant Teaching Professor</td>
<td>Assistant Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Assistant Research Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Associate Teaching Professor</td>
<td>Associate Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Associate Research Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>Teaching Professor</td>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Research Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, the committee recommends the attached revision to HR21 (see Appendix A). Rank and title share the same designation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Faculty without Terminal Degree</th>
<th>Clinical Faculty without Terminal Degree</th>
<th>Researchers without a Terminal Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Clinical Lecturer</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Senior Clinical Lecturer</td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Lecturer</td>
<td>Master Clinical Lecturer</td>
<td>Master Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty preparation for online teaching at Penn State University assumes that, while good teaching is good teaching, unique skills, competencies, and understandings are required to teach online. These are not always intuitive; they must be taught. Online teaching preparation is implemented through various entities across the University, including college or campus-level units and resource personnel, the World Campus, and the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence. While preparation varies, cross-university committee structures and informal collaborations promote communication, coordination, and commitment to research-based best practices for effective online instruction. For example, The Penn State Online Coordinating Council and two of its three subcommittees, Faculty Engagement and Digital Media and Technology, collaborate around online faculty development programming and resource development across colleges and campuses.

Increasingly, academic units are requiring faculty to receive initial preparation by enrolling in one or more of the courses offered by World Campus Online Faculty Development, such as "OL 2000: Essentials of Effective Online Teaching" and the four-course Faculty Online Teaching Certificate. Over a dozen online training courses are available through World Campus. Additionally, colleges and departments provide their own online faculty development opportunities. That said, there is no University-wide training requirement for faculty to teach online. Similarly, peer review procedures for evaluating the quality of online teaching vary from college to college and campus to campus. Some colleges have a formalized peer review system while others rely on more informal processes.

The trend in preparing faculty to teach online is evolving. Initially, it focused on introducing faculty to best practices such as improving student engagement, enhancing instructor presence, managing online discussions, managing courses and using technology meaningfully, designing courses according to learning theory, understanding pedagogical affordances and limitations in the asynchronous digital learning space, aligning student learning outcomes with assignments and assessments, and understanding the unique qualities of adult learners. Recently, the online faculty development community at Penn State has been reviewing unit practices related to online teaching preparation and development. Given Penn State’s position of leadership in online teaching, we are coalescing around the idea of preparing and supporting master online teachers across their careers.

Questions for the consideration and discussion of the Senate:
1. How can the university assure high quality online teaching? What do we mean by “high quality online teaching”? We have several measures, such as Quality Matters\(^1\) for online course design and research-based instruction competencies that comprise best practices for effective online instruction. But, do we have other notions of quality unique to Penn State?

2. Should there be a university-wide, specific training recommendation or requirement for all faculty who teach online? Many programs use the World Campus OL 2000 course (and additional courses), but others implement their own training. Should training be consistent across colleges, campuses and programs? Should this training be ongoing or is "one-and-done" sufficient?

3. Are current procedures and practices for evaluating the quality of online teaching, such as the SRTE and faculty peer review processes, like the one used by Earth and Mineral Sciences\(^2\), sufficient? What additional SRTE questions are needed to adequately address the online classroom?

4. How can we support faculty to effectively teach an increasingly diverse online student population?

---

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON OUTREACH**

Richard Brown  
Dennis Calvin  
Anne Douds  
Jill Eckert  
Renata Engel  
Brad Garrett  
Terry Harrison  
Alex Hristov  
Beth King, Vice Chair  
Lisa Mangel  
John Potochny  
Rama Radhakrishna  
Elizabeth Seymour, Chair  
Cristina Truica  
Craig Weidemann

---

\(^1\) Originally funded by a FIPSE grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Quality Matters provides a research-based rubric of online course design standards and trains faculty reviewers to evaluate courses against these standards. Penn State is currently in the first year of a three-year pilot program to perform reviews of 90 online Penn State courses.

\(^2\) The Peer Review Guide for Online Teaching, developed by the Dutton Institute in the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, is based on the “Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education,” and provides a faculty reviewer with a useful framework for evaluating a peer’s online teaching effectiveness.
Counseling and Psychological Services for Students

(Forensic)

Senior Director of Counseling and Psychological Services Dr. Benjamin Locke began his work with CAPS in 2003 as the assistant director of research and technology. He transitioned to the role of senior director in August of 2016. Dr. Locke has 19 years of clinical experience in a variety of settings, including wilderness therapy programs, community mental health centers, group homes, college counseling centers, and psychiatric hospitals. During his time at Penn State, Dr. Locke has accomplished a number of objectives, from the creation of the Center for Collegiate Mental Health (CCMH) to the development of data standards for electronic medical record software.

Based upon Dr. Locke's presentation, the Faculty Senate will consider the following questions:

1. Do Penn State students have adequate access to counselors, sessions, creative solutions, and resources to address their mental health needs?

2. How can Penn State Faculty and our Faculty Senate foster a climate that best promotes Student Mental Health and access to support resources on campus?
RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY PENN STATE ABINGTON

Judy Ozment, Penn State Abington

(Legislative)

The following resolution was introduced as New Business by the Abington Campus Faculty at the December 6, 2016 University Faculty Senate Meeting, through a motion made by Judy Ozment.

As directed in the Senate Rules, this resolution will be discussed and may be voted on at the January 24, 2017 meeting.

Be It Resolved that:

We, the University Faculty Senate of Penn State, hereby declare that our university has been and will continue to be a refuge of justice for and acceptance of students, employees, and community members of all backgrounds, beliefs, and orientations.

We reject the divisive, racist, sexist, and bigoted language and policies expressed during the recent presidential election campaign and the violence and hate crimes carried out since that time.

We reaffirm our commitment to pluralism, inclusivity, and equity as core values of our institution and declare that we will vigorously defend these values against hatred and bigotry – coming from inside or outside our community.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Establishment of the Standing Joint Committee for General Education Assessment

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

BACKGROUND

On April 19, 2016 the University Faculty Senate approved a legislative report entitled “Recommendations for General Education Assessment,” which was brought forward by the Special Joint Senate Committee on General Education Assessment. This report included three recommendations for the establishment of a new committee entitled “Standing Joint Committee on General Education Assessment.” This committee will guide regular curricular review and the on-going assessment of student learning as it pertains to General Education.

Standing Joint Committee for General Education Assessment

SCOPE

The new standing joint committee should recommend the development of datasets to inform general education assessment. Such datasets should include, but not be limited to:

1. A General Education Curricular Inventory that shows patterns of course offerings, student enrollment, and student grades by major and location.

2. General Education curriculum mapping that shows the relationship between General Education and undergraduate majors.

3. General Education course objective mapping that shows the relationship to General Education learning objectives.

4. The new standing joint committee should collect and use data in an ongoing way to examine student outcomes, such as (1) student success (e.g., time-to-degree, graduation rate, and other institutional data) and (2) student learning (e.g., course work, engaged scholarship projects, and other factors that provide evidence of learning). The data should also be used to inform curricular improvement, including but not limited to: (1) decisions about the General Education curriculum, including questions about the efficacy of pathways to support integrative thinking; (2) effective assessment practices and processes, especially those that can be shared across disciplines; and (3) decisions about availability
of General Education curricular components across the University, including gaps and trends. The goal should be to develop an analytic assessment plan, supported by data, that informs curricular improvement and evolves over time.

MEMBERSHIP

i. Associate Vice Provost for Learning Outcomes Assessment; Co-Chair

ii. Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee; Co-Chair

iii. An associate vice president and associate dean for Undergraduate Education, appointed by the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education

iv. Director and Assistant Dean of the Office for General Education

v. A member of the Graduate Council, appointed by the Vice Provost for Graduate Education and the Dean of the Graduate School

vi. An associate dean from Penn State Libraries, appointed by the Dean of Libraries and Scholarly Communications

vii. A student government representative (either UPUA or CCSG), appointed by the Committee on Committees and Rules

viii. Six University Faculty Senators, to represent Commonwealth Campuses and University Park Colleges, appointed by the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules. Faculty Senators will serve rotating three-year, renewable terms.

SELECTION

i. The University Faculty Senate, the Office of Undergraduate Education and the Office of Planning and Assessment shall jointly appoint the committee.

DUTIES

i. The committee shall work in cooperation with the University-wide assessment working group chaired by the Vice Provost for Planning and Assessment and any subsequently formed University-assessment coordinating body to ensure that assessment efforts are coordinated across General Education, baccalaureate degree programs, and other assessments of academic areas (such as engaged scholarship, minors, certificate programs, etc.).

ii. The committee shall develop data sets to be used for general education assessment, such as curricular inventories that show patterns of course offerings, student enrollment, and student grades by major and location; curriculum mapping that shows the relationship
between General Education and undergraduate majors; and course objective mapping that shows the relationship to General Education learning objectives.

iii. The committee shall collect and use data to examine student learning outcomes and to develop analytic assessment plan, which evolves over time and informs curricular improvement.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

- Jonathan Abel
- Mohamad Ansari
- Larry Backer
- Dawn Blasko, Chair
- Mark Casteel
- Pamela Hufnagel
- William Kelly, Vice Chair
- Richard Robinett
- Keith Shapiro
- James Strauss
- Jane Sutton
- Ann Taylor
- Kent Vrana
- Matthew Woessner
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Senate Bylaws Article II Section 1

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate

Rationale

Senate Councilors represent their unit(s) in the performance of their duties in Senate Council. Effective representation includes two-way communication between the unit(s) and the Senate Council. The proposed revision would codify the expectation of Senate Councilors to communicate effectively with their unit(s). Effective communication should increase units’ awareness of the actions and activities of Senate Council and improve understanding across this very complex university.

Proposed new wording is in bold.

Section 1

Duties:

(a) It shall ensure that the Senate addresses issues of major concern to the faculty voting units and the faculty as a whole.
(b) It may initiate Senate legislation in the same manner as a standing committee. In addition, it may charge a standing committee of the Senate to investigate matters deemed appropriate by the Council.
(c) It shall provide a mechanism for Council members’ review of all legislative, forensic, advisory/consultative, and informational reports submitted for the Senate Agenda. If Council determines the report is adequately prepared, it will be submitted to the Senate Agenda with the following options:
   1. Place an informational report, mandated or otherwise, on the Senate Agenda for presentation and discussion.
   2. Place an informational report, mandated or otherwise, on the Senate Agenda only for the purposes of dissemination to the Senate and University community.
   Decision on whether an item is to be placed on the Agenda for full Senate discussion is to be based on whether a report is adequately prepared and documented.
(d) It shall advise, upon consultation with appropriate Senate committees, the President and Executive Vice President and Provost of the University on the establishment, reorganization, or discontinuation of organizational units and areas of the University that involve two or more teaching, research, and continuing education functions (whether or not delegation of authority exists). Such advice should be given before official action is taken.
(e) It shall maintain a standing Constitution Subcommittee with authority and responsibility to carry out specific legislative, advisory and consultative functions relative to properly organized faculty organizations. These functions include review of Unit Constitutions, Bylaws and Standing Rules. The subcommittee will consist of two Council members.
appointed by the Senate Chair and the Senate Parliamentarian, and will be chaired by the Senate Secretary.

(f) In coordination with the University administration, it shall represent the Senate in seeking information from officials and agencies external to the University especially those who establish policies and control resources affecting University academic programs. It shall advise the University administration on external government legislation and other external issues that may have impact on the University. It shall advise the Senate on the preparation of statements on such matters. It shall be the Senate advisory body to the University on public and alumni relations, public information, general publications and private fundraising. The Chair shall be the spokesperson for the Council in these matters. The External Matters Subcommittee is a standing subcommittee of Senate Council that will be charged to deal with issues external to the University. The subcommittee will consist of at least five Council members together with appropriate additional elected faculty senators and resource personnel and will be chaired by the Immediate Past Chair of the Senate. A majority of the subcommittee will be councilors with at least two members from locations other than University Park. The members of the External Matters Subcommittee will serve terms of two years, and may complete the second year of the term even in cases where they are no longer a member of Senate Council.

(g) It shall serve as an advisory body to the Senate officers and the Senate as a whole.

(h) In the event that the Chair of the Senate declares existence of a situation of special Senate concern, the Senate Council shall be empowered to act for the Senate in all matters until this authority is terminated by actions of the Senate.

(i) Individual Senate Council members play a critical role in communicating Faculty Senate issues and legislative decisions back to their units of origin. To facilitate these important communications, best practices for Senate Councilors include organizing caucuses with their unit membership, creating regular electronic communications of Senate activities and sending these communications to their Academic Unit Faculty Leaders, Senators and Administrators, and speaking about Faculty Senate activities at unit governance meetings. It is expected that Senate Councilors will embrace their leadership role and actively serve as a communication conduit back to the academic unit they represent.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article I Section 11

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate

Rationale

The current rule restricts reporting of Senate election results to the tellers, who are responsible for certifying the results, the Senate Chair, and the chair of the Committee on Committees and Rules. This is an awkward situation for the Chair-elect, who is responsible for identifying leadership of standing committees for Senate Council approval. The proposed change stipulates that the election results are to be reported to all Senate officers. New wording is indicated in bold; deleted wording is indicated by strike-throughs.

Section 11

(a) The elective year of the Senate and Senate Council shall begin with the installation of the new officers at the last regularly scheduled meeting, before which meeting the Senate shall elect a Chair, if necessary, a Chair-Elect, and a Secretary. The terms of Senate officers, Council members, and members shall be from this time until the corresponding time at the last regularly scheduled meeting the following Senate year. Names of newly elected senators shall be reported to the Senate office no later than four weeks prior to the next-to-last regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate year.

(b) At any meeting of Senate Council, a petition may be presented to the Chair requesting that any Senate officer be removed from office for neglect of duty or misconduct in office. The petition must be signed by at least two elected Senate Council members. Senate Council after appropriate investigation and discussion shall vote whether the Senate shall be polled to consider the removal of the officer. A majority vote of the total number of elected councilors shall be required. If the Council vote is to poll the Senate, a ballot or e-mail notification of the election website will be sent to all senators allowing at least ten working days for voting. A two-thirds majority vote shall be required for removal of the officer. In the case of the removal of the Senate Chair, the Chair-Elect shall succeed immediately to the Chair. If the Chair-Elect is removed, a new election will be held using regular procedures. If the Secretary is removed, the Senate Council shall elect a replacement.

(c) The Nominating Committee of the Senate shall develop the slate of nominees for the offices of Chair-Elect and Secretary, as well as for a member of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. It shall also be responsible for developing the slate of nominees for the Committee on Committees and Rules. The Nominating Committee shall consist of the elected members of Senate Council and the Immediate Past Chair of the Senate, who shall chair the committee. The
Chair of the Senate shall activate the Nominating Committee at least four weeks prior to the second regularly scheduled meeting of the spring semester. The committee shall meet at the call of the Secretary, who shall charge the committee. The committee shall present at least two nominees for the offices of Chair-Elect and Secretary. In addition, in the event that the Chair-Elect received a vote of no-confidence or that the Secretary is serving as interim Chair-Elect, the committee shall report a slate of at least two nominees for the office of Chair. The committee shall also report a slate of at least two nominees for a member of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President (three-year term). Nominations shall reflect the variety of disciplines, functions, and geographic locations of University units. A report of all the nominations for Senate offices and the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President shall be submitted to the Chair of the Senate at least fourteen calendar days before the next-to-last regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate year, and the slate shall be published in the agenda for the next-to-last meeting. These nominations shall be announced to the Senate at the next-to-last meeting by the Chair of the Nominating Committee. At this time additional nominations may be made from the floor of the Senate. Nominations for the Committee on Committees and Rules shall be presented to the Senate Council at their next-to-last regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate year. Senate Council shall then elect the members of the Committee on Committees and Rules in accordance with Article II, section 6 of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(d) Elections will be conducted by mail or electronically by secret preferential ballot. Ballots or e-mail notification of the election website will be sent to all current senators at least 21 days before the date of the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate.

(e) Votes shall be counted or verified by three tellers, appointed by the Chair of the Senate from among the members of the Senate who are not members of the Nominating Committee [see (c)]. The tellers will report the results of the election to the Chair-Executive Director of the Senate Office than 12:00 noon of the sixth day prior to the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate year, who will immediately inform the Senate officers, candidates, and the chair of the Committee on Committees and Rules of these results. The full senate will be notified of the results in a timely fashion.

(f) The Chair of the Senate for the previous elected year shall preside at the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate year until a successor shall have been duly installed.

(g) At the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate year, announcement shall be made of the results of elections of Senate officers, of the member of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, of the Committee on Committees and Rules, and the Senate Council, and their installation shall be placed on the agenda between Items “j” (informational reports) and “k” (new legislative business). The results of Senate elections, including the number of votes received by each candidate for Chair-Elect, Secretary, Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee, University Promotion and Tenure Committee, and Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, will be posted on the Senate website immediately after the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate year.
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COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article I Section 12

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate

Rationale

The members of the Committee on Committees and Rules is elected by Senate Council and its chair and vice chair are elected by the committee members at the end of the Senate year. In contrast, the members of the other Standing Committees are appointed by Committees and Rules and their chairs and vice chairs are appointed by the incoming Senate Chair, in consultation with Committees and Rules. The current rule calls for the chair and vice chair of Committees and Rules to be elected by the new committee members when they convene at the end of the final regular committee meeting for the Senate year. Often, some of the new committee members are unable to attend that meeting, due to responsibilities on other standing committees that are meeting on the same day at the same time. Consequently, the committee leadership is often elected by only a portion of its members. To solve this issue, it is proposed that the incoming Senate Chair be responsible for calling a meeting of Committees and Rules within one week of the beginning of the new Senate year. As with all Senate meetings, committee members would have the option to participate either in person or via technology.

Proposed new wording is indicated in bold; deleted wording is indicated by strike-throughs.

Section 12

(a) Prior to the next-to-last regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate year, the Senate Council shall select the members of the Committee on Committees and Rules. The Committee on Committees and Rules shall consist of ten members serving two-year terms, five members to be selected each year. Appointments shall reflect the variety of disciplines, functions, and geographic locations of University units. If a committee member is no longer an elected senator at the end of the first year of the term on the committee, a vacancy shall occur in that position and a selection shall be made to fill the unexpired term.

(b) Following formal release of election results to the full Faculty Senate, the New Faculty Senate Chair shall convene the new membership of the Committee on Committees and Rules, within one week of the last regularly scheduled Senate meeting. In that new CC&R membership meeting, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee on Committees and Rules shall be determined by election, whose names shall be released and reported to Senate in a timely fashion.

The newly selected Committee on Committees and Rules shall be convened immediately following the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee on Committees and Rules. In response to the call of the outgoing Chair of Committees and Rules, the incoming Committee
shall elect a new Chair and Vice Chair, whose names shall be reported to the Senate at the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate year.

(c) The Committee on Committees and Rules shall complete selection of the roster of all committees, including Chairs and Vice Chairs, for the coming Senate year within three weeks of the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate year. The membership of each committee will be reported in writing to the Standing Committee Chairs within four weeks of the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate year. This roster will be listed in The Senate Record for the last regular meeting of the Senate year.

(d) The terms of the Committee on Committees and Rules shall be from the conclusion of the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee on Committees and Rules of one year until the conclusion of the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee on Committees and Rules of the next year.

(e) When a member of a Senate committee resigns before the expiration of the appointment, the Chair of that committee shall notify the Chair of the Committee on Committees and Rules of this circumstance, and the latter group shall name a replacement.
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Introduction
This report to the Senate provides an overview of endowed scholarships at Penn State with data from the University Development Office and the Office of Student Aid. The importance of endowed scholarships at Penn State is best understood in the context of the overall financial aid available to Penn State undergraduates. In other words, how do students pay for the cost of attendance? Last year, 63,913 undergraduates received a total of $1 billion from all funding sources tracked through the Office of Student Aid. Not included in this figure are students who received Veterans benefits or students who received third-party payments to cover the cost of tuition. The chart below shows the sources of funding tracked through the student aid system at Penn State.

It is important to note that 66 percent of all funding comes from state and federal government student aid programs. These funds are largely prescribed and not distributed in a discretionary manner. Penn State funds accounts for 17 percent of all assistance to students; and another 17 percent of funds are from private sources outside the University. These are scholarships and private (non-Federal) education loans that students secure independently. Penn State does not select the student recipients; however, the Office of Student Aid and the University Bursar may be responsible for the certification and disbursement of these funds as required by the providers.
The chart below shows the forms of financial assistance received by undergraduates.

As noted here, 62 percent of all financial aid is in the form of education loans, primarily federal student loans. Grants represent 25 percent and include programs such as the Federal Pell Grant and the Pennsylvania State Grant programs. These are need-based programs primarily determined by a need analysis formula. Thirteen percent of all funds are in the form of scholarships and less than one percent is from the Federal Work-Study program.

Federal and state student aid funding has not kept pace with increases in tuition and other related education costs at Penn State and at many peer institutions. The table in Appendix A shows the essential costs students are paying this year. The chart in Appendix B shows costs as a percent of median family incomes of Penn State students who applied for Financial Aid. This chart represents just one way to think about the issue of affordability. Appendix D provides a glossary of terms used in this report.

Discussion

History of Fundraising Campaigns at Penn State

As a public Land Grant institution, Penn State’s entry into private philanthropy is relatively recent compared to most private colleges and universities that are heavily dependent on tuition revenue. As state support in Pennsylvania began to deteriorate over the past two decades and tuition has necessarily increased, it has become essential for the University to seek private support. Here is a brief history of private fundraising at Penn State. As noted, the first campaign was early on; but the first major campaign did not occur until 60 years later.

1922 - Penn State’s first fundraising campaign: $1.7 million raised
Goal: to expand Penn State’s physical plant to accommodate the growing interest in students seeking to enroll. Together with state funding, this resulted in the construction of the ‘new’ Old Main, Rec Hall, and West Halls and added new classrooms and laboratories.
1984-1990 - The Campaign for Penn State: $352 million raised
Goals: included scholarship support for students

1996-2014 – Two major campaigns:
For the Future – The Campaign for Penn State Students (2007-2014) Goal: $2 billion
Raised: $2.158 billion

Both of these campaigns focused on increasing scholarships for students. The table below shows the portion of total funding raised for each campaign - the amounts received as gifts to undergraduate scholarships and gifts received in the form of endowments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dollars Raised</th>
<th>Grand Destiny</th>
<th>For the Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Raised</td>
<td>$ 1.371 Billion</td>
<td>$ 2.158 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gifts to Any Undergraduate</td>
<td>$ 327,939,100 (24% of total)</td>
<td>$ 530,847,110 (25% of total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Giving to Endowed Undergrad</td>
<td>$ 217,829,591</td>
<td>$ 360,381,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Review of Current Endowments
The current value of Penn State’s active endowment is $1.6 billion. Of this total, 31 percent or $506 million is for undergraduate scholarships. The tables below provide detail about the scholarship endowments for the 2015-2016 year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship Spending (Pay out)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Scholarship Endowment (Book Value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings on Endowment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Awarded to Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At University Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At University Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Scholarships Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At University Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Campuses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that Penn State disbursed 93 percent of available scholarship spending. This is due to spending allocations that become available late in the year; or available funding
that it earmarked for program support. Some endowments permit departments to use funds for both student scholarship and program support to enhance student experience. Funds used for program support are not captured here.

### Scope of Endowed Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Scholarship Endowment (Book Value)</td>
<td>$506,673,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Endowed Funds</td>
<td>4,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Funds across all Academic Colleges</td>
<td>2,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Funds across all Commonwealth Campuses</td>
<td>1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Funds in other University Units – not academic colleges</td>
<td>1,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest Single Donor Endowed Scholarship</td>
<td>$9.6M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Growth in Scholarship Support for Students

In addition to Penn State’s success with fundraising for student scholarships, the university’s own commitment of funding has grown over the years. The graph below shows growth in endowed scholarships and annual gifts from $33.9 million to $48.3 million since the start of the “For the Future Campaign” in 2007 through the end of that campaign in 2014. The blue bar in this graph shows Penn State’s increasing commitment to student assistance during this same period from $59.5 million in 2007 to $112.8 million in 2014. The green line is simply to show the trajectory of increases in resident tuition from about $13,000 in 2007 to just under $18,000 in 2014. Clearly, Penn State’s commitment of central funds, and that of private gifts is helping to narrow the gap between cost and the needs of students.
Penn State centrally funded assistance includes programs such as tuition waivers, grants such as tuition assistance grants, scholarships, such as Provost and Chancellor awards, and Bunton-Waller scholarships and Fellowships.

**Benchmarks**

A comparison of total endowments across the Big Ten universities was not immediately available for this report. However, a survey of our peers is shown in the following table. Scholarships that are awarded from endowments at each institution are compared to undergraduate enrollments. Available scholarships per student show the relationship of scholarships funds to student enrollments.

### Endowed Scholarship Spending – Big 10 Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Scholarship Endowment Spending</th>
<th>Undergraduate Enrollment</th>
<th>Available Scholarships per student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36,419</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois*</td>
<td>$28.8M</td>
<td>32,659</td>
<td>$882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland*</td>
<td>$8.1M</td>
<td>28,472</td>
<td>$284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$39M</td>
<td>28,983</td>
<td>$1,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State*</td>
<td>$9.2M</td>
<td>39,143</td>
<td>$235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,351</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska*</td>
<td>$13M</td>
<td>19,979</td>
<td>$651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>$31M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State*</td>
<td>$11.6M</td>
<td>52,349</td>
<td>$222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State*</td>
<td>$39.9M</td>
<td>77,922</td>
<td>$512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue*</td>
<td>$14.1M</td>
<td>30,043</td>
<td>$469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers*</td>
<td>$21.3M</td>
<td>34,544</td>
<td>$617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,684</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: above amounts are most recent available to report as of November 2016 and may include amounts for 2014-2015 or 2015-2016. A blank in the table represents no data available. * = land grant universities*

**The Trustee Matching Scholarship Program**

The Trustee Matching Scholarship Program, launched in 2002, has proved to be a most successful fundraising tool leveraging institutional funds. This ‘campaign within the campaign’ exceeded its initial goal of $100 million in endowments and raised $120 million since first introduced in 2002. This program helps fund some of Penn State’s students with the greatest financial need. Appendix C provides an overview of this successful program and the table below provides details of the success of this initiative.
## Trustee Matching Scholarship Program
### 2015-2016 Financial Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Endowments activated by June 30, 2016</td>
<td>1,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income and Matching dollars available for awarding</td>
<td>$15,867,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Endowed Funds – College Endowments</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Endowed Funds – Campus Endowments</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Endowed Funds – Administrative Unit Endowments</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Endowed University-wide Funds – Student Aid</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest Commitment (Pledge)</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Commitment (Pledge)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Award Value</td>
<td>$1,250-$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Award Value</td>
<td>$2,870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations:
- ARSSA recommends the University continue with the fundraising strategies for student scholarship support comparable to the success of the last two campaigns.
- ARSSA recommends the University continue to increase the percentage of students receiving endowed scholarships without diluting the overall size of the award.
- The past two campaigns raised scholarship funds represented 24 percent and 25 percent, respectively, of the total endowment for each campaign. ARSSA recommends the University set as a goal for the next campaign, the portion of scholarship fundraising to be at least 25 percent.
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Appendix A

This table shows Penn State costs for Tuition, Fees, Room and Board for first year students in 2016-17. As shown, the total of these essential costs for resident students at University Park is $29,130 and for non-residents, $46,612. Resident students at the Commonwealth Campuses pay $24,842 and non-residents, $31,722.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Non-Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition/Fees</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>32,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room/Board or Housing</td>
<td>11,230</td>
<td>11,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>29,130</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,612</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Campuses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition/Fees</td>
<td>13,612</td>
<td>20,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room/Board or Housing</td>
<td>11,230</td>
<td>11,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>24,842</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,722</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

The need for institutional support is great if Penn State is to remain affordable. This chart shows the essential costs as a percent of median family income of resident and non-resident students at University Park and the Commonwealth Campuses. At University Park, essential costs for resident students requires 31 percent of median family income without come financial assistance; for non-resident students at University Park, costs require 41 percent of median income of applicants. At the Commonwealth Campuses, resident student costs require 40 percent of median family income and non-resident students at the campuses requires 52 percent of median incomes.
FUNDRAISING STATUS

On July 11, 2002, the Board of Trustees approved the creation of the Trustee Matching Scholarship Program, a $100 million matching scholarship endowment program to assist Penn State’s most financially needy students. A unique feature of the Trustee Matching Scholarship Program is the use of institutional funds to match the private funds raised in support of qualified Penn State students who need financial assistance to support their educational goals.

From 2002-2003 to 2011-2012, the University committed a total of $6 million to the matching program. Matching funds allow 5 percent of the value of individual donors’ gifts to be available for immediate awarding to students. The University match literally doubles the amount of funds available to assist students with demonstrated financial need. Trustee Scholarship endowments differ from traditional scholarship endowments in that interest from realized gifts moves immediately into the spending account; University matching funds also move immediately into the spending account; and spending occurs as soon as the University receives a donor pledge form and signed guidelines. With a traditional endowment, interest returns to the principal of a gift until the gift itself reaches an endowment level sufficient for scholarship awarding.

In 2012-2013, the University increased the Trustee Match Scholarship Program (TMS) goal from $100 million to $120 million. In addition, any TMS guidelines signed on or after March 1, 2013, through June 30, 2014, or until the goal of $120 million was reached, were matched at 10 percent. The University committed a total of $7 million in matching funds to support the $120 million goal and 10 percent match. In 2013-14, the University continued development efforts toward meeting the $120 million goal, which was ultimately well exceeded. As of July 1, 2014, the minimum financial commitment to establish a Trustee Scholarship endowment increased from $50,000 to $100,000 with a Trustee match of 5 percent.

From 2002-2003 to 2015-2016, the number of Trustee Scholarship endowments grew from 37 to 1,333. Private commitments (pledges) increased from $5.3 million to well over $120 million, thus exceeding the original goal of $100M and the 2012-2013 increased goal of $120M. There are also approximately 1,100 different donors, many of whom have made their first major philanthropic gifts to Penn State. Over the last fourteen years, the Trustee Matching Scholarship Program has been a major fundraising focus, resulting in a noteworthy impact on undergraduate scholarship support.
Appendix D

Terms and Definitions

Grants: A form of student financial assistance that does not have to be repaid by the student. Grants are typically awarded on the basis of documented need of the student. Examples of grants include the Federal Pell Grant and the PA State Grant.

Scholarships: Student assistance that does not have to be repaid. Scholarships are typically awarded on the basis of academic achievement or talent. Some scholarships may take into consideration the student’s documented financial need. Examples include the Trustee Matching Scholarship Program which requires that the student have documented financial need and the Academic Excellence Scholarship which is based on merit.

Endowed Scholarships: Scholarships that are made possible from earnings on the investment of a donor’s gift to the University. The minimum scholarship endowment is $50,000 at Penn State. The gift is given under a contractual agreement between donor and the University.

Loans: A form of financial assistance available to students and parents of students. The largest loan program is the Federal Direct Loans. All students are eligible to receive this loan. For students with documented financial need, the loan is interest free which the student is enrolled. For students without documented need, interest accrues which the student is enrolled. Loans must be repaid with repayment beginning six months following a student’s graduation or when enrollment ceases. Most loans are low interest with several difference repayment options. For students who return to schools for further study, at least half-time, monthly repayments on the loan may be deferred. Loans are also deferred for military service and for medical and hardship events that a student borrower may encounter.
Introduction and Rationale

A climate of implicit bias and stereotype threat in classroom situations can have a negative impact on both students and instructors (Steele and Aronson, 1995; Sue, 2010; Suarez-Orozco et al. 2015). Specifically, students who identify with an underrepresented racial/ethnic/gendered group are more likely to perform poorly in classrooms where stereotype threat is present (Steele, 2010), whether the source of bias is another student or the instructor. At the same time, minority instructors’ teaching effectiveness can be greatly impaired if they feel discriminated against by students. When instructors fail to acknowledge or manage bias in the classroom, which studies suggest is frequently the case (e.g., Suarez-Orozco et al., 2015), the morale of the classroom can be dragged down, and can lead to serious performance and/or legal issues in the future if not addressed.

Implicit bias manifests through microaggressions, which are verbal, nonverbal, and environmental slights that are often unintentional, but communicate negative messages to individuals in the target group based on their group membership (Sue, 2010). As an example, this can happen in the classroom if an instructor singles out a student in class because of their background or engages students of one gender, class, or race more frequently than others (Portman, Bui, Ogaz and Treviño, 2013). A common microaggression between students occurs when students are forming teams for a class project and do not choose students from underrepresented groups to join or do not include them in the work of the team.

Stereotype threat refers to being at risk of confirming, as self-characteristic, a negative stereotype about one’s group (Steele, 2010). For example, high-achieving women in math classes may do more poorly than men as a result of their fear of confirming the stereotype that women cannot do math. The impact of stereotype threat has been confirmed in hundreds of studies over the past 20 years (see http://www.reducingstereotypethreat.org)

Concern over implicit bias and stereotype threat in the classroom at Penn State, both from students and faculty, has been brought to the attention of members of the Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity (CORED) repeatedly. Furthermore, in our conversations with President Barron in spring 2016, he indicated that he has heard similar concerns consistently from multiple student groups with whom he has spoken. In our 2016 annual meeting with President Barron he suggested that CORED work with the Faculty Senate to address this issue so all students and faculty can feel respected in Penn State classrooms.

Data from Penn State’s Office of Educational Equity’s Report Bias website indicate that in the years 2013–2015 inclusive, ninety reports of bias at the University were made. See Figures 1 through 5 (attached) for data on the targets, perpetrators, the targeted issue, and the type of
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offense. Sixty-six of these were reported on the University Park campus, with the remaining twenty-four reports from the Commonwealth campuses. Seventy-three of the ninety reports came from students. As indicated in Figure 3, the largest group of perpetrators of reported bias was faculty members (27 reports). These data do not indicate whether these actually occurred in the classroom, but since most students interact with faculty in classes, we can safely assume some of these occurred within the context of a class.

Reports of bias have increased since Election Day, as has fear in students of many races and ethnicities. The Report Bias website received eleven reports of bias in the first week after the election, as compared to ninety reports over a three year period. During that same one week period, staff in the Office of Educational Equity had over twenty-five separate conversations with students encouraging them to complete the Report Bias incident form so an actual record of the incident can be created. This indicates that the number of reported cases of bias is unlikely to represent the number of actual occurrences of bias.

To provide an illustration of these concerns, we point to a recent incident that occurred with a Latina student at Suffolk University, where a faculty member responded to her use of the word “hence” in a paper with the comment “These aren’t your words.” The student snapped a picture and posted it on Facebook, which went viral, and resulted in mandatory microaggression training for all faculty at Suffolk University. (see https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/11/02/suffolk-responding-controversy-over-treatment-latina-student-require-microaggression?utm_content=buffereea9e&utm_medium=social&utm_source=twitter&utm_campaign=IHEbuffer). It may only be a matter of time before this occurs with a Penn State student if classroom microaggression is not addressed in the Penn State community. We hope that the implementation of all of the recommendations below may help to change the Penn State climate.

Strategies for managing the classroom environment may vary depending on the sources and targets. Sources and targets of implicit bias in the classroom include; from instructor to student; from student to student; and from student to instructor. Fortunately, documented strategies already exist to address these concerns. For instance, Penn State’s Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence conducts workshops on this topic; Penn State’s Affirmative Action Office’s Charleon Jeffries, coordinator for Diversity Education, offers trainings for faculty; and Melissa Walker, associate director, Talent Search, Office of Educational Equity, is available for trainings with faculty, staff, and students. Other organizations in the U.S. offer trainings as well (e.g., Social Justice Training Institute, Race Forward, and Dynamics & Racism on Today’s Campus: Engaging the Community to Reduce Acts of Hate and Improve Cultural Competency). Additionally, there exists a plethora of private consultants (e.g., Jamie Washington, Kathy O’Bear). Considering these resources, we provide the following recommendation.

Recommendation

1. Ask the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence to post on their website a checklist of best practices for creating a welcoming climate for diversity in the classroom, including strategies for managing disruptions in the classroom environment by students. See Appendix 1 for an example supplied from the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence.
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Figure 1.

From The Pennsylvania State University Bias Report Executive Summary 2013-2016.
Figure 2.

GENDER OF ALLEGED PERPETRATOR

From The Pennsylvania State University Bias Report Executive Summary 2013-2016.

Figure 3.

STATUS OF ALLEGED PERPETRATOR
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Appendix 1. Penn State University’s Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence’s Strategies for Inclusive Classrooms.
Linse & Weinstein, Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence, Penn State, 2016

The strategies below have been collected from a variety of resources. They serve as a key component of a workshop on inclusive teaching developed by the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence. They are most effective when coupled with the opportunity for faculty members to understand why these are considered inclusive, discuss specific implementations, and place them in a larger context. Contact the Schreyer Institute at site@psu.edu to schedule a workshop on inclusive teaching.

Motivate Learning/Establish Relevance
- Situate the course in a broader global and/or societal context.
- Connect the course to other courses within or outside of the major.
- Discuss how the course will help students function more effectively with a diversity of people.
- Relate specific topics within a course to previous and future topics.
- Provide students opportunities to make connections inside and outside of the course.
  - Use personal anecdotes to create interest among students.

Get to know your students as individuals and create opportunities for students to do the same.
- Examine your background and experiences (so that you understand how your students see you).
- Consider your academic traditions and the biases that they may inadvertently reinforce.
- Learn students’ names.
- Ask about students’ interests.
- Ask about students’ experiences with and concerns about the subject matter.
- Provide opportunities for students to learn about each other and from each other.

Design an inclusive course curriculum
- Use visuals that do not reinforce stereotypes, but do include diverse participants.
- Choose readings that consciously reflect the diversity of contributors to your field; consider whether tradition-based reading lists represent past stereotypes (or present ones).
- Use varied names and socio-cultural contexts in test questions, assignments, and case studies.
- Analyze the content of your examples, analogies, and humor; too narrow a perspective may ostracize students who have differences.
- Invite guest speakers and ensure that they have varied backgrounds and experiences.
- Recognize how your choices of materials, readings, and content organization reflect your perspectives, interests, and possible biases.
- Teach the conflicts of your field to incorporate diverse perspectives.

Create an inclusive course environment
- Set high standards and communicate your confidence that each student can achieve them.
• Let your students know that you believe each has important contributions to make.
• Applaud creative solutions and sincere efforts to learn.
• Help students understand that intelligence is not a fixed ability, not all academic challenges are a result of personal inadequacies, and many academic challenges can be overcome.
• Talk to students about how they learn best and how to adopt compensatory strategies.
• Do not ask or expect students to represent an entire group, either by look or by request.
• Encourage multiple perspectives (as opposed to consensus) in discussions.
• Establish ground rules.
• Use a variety of strategies to encourage contributions and to reduce over-participation by verbally assertive students.
• Create a culture of shared purpose by periodically collecting feedback to learn how students are experiencing your course.
• Avoid assuming that a student needs assistance, which can convey that you have low expectations and further hinder their learning.
• Do not ignore or change the subject when students voice negative comments about a group.
• Make diversity and the free exchange of ideas an early discussion topic.
• Do your best to correctly pronounce the names of your students.
• Avoid religious holidays when scheduling tests.
• Avoid expressing racially charged political opinions.
• Do not ask individuals with hidden disabilities to identify themselves in class.
• Avoid assuming the gender of any student.
• Do not assume all students speak English fluently.
• Ensure that the physical classroom space is inclusive for all students (e.g., are students who are alternately-abled marginalized in some way?).

Teach inclusively
• Use a variety of teaching methods; do not rely solely on lectures and didactic questions.
• Use pictures, schematics, graphs, simple sketches, films, and demonstrations.
• Provide a balance of concrete information (facts, data, real or hypothetical experiments) and abstract concepts (principles, theories, models).
• Balance material that emphasizes practical problem-solving methods with that emphasizing fundamental understanding.
• Provide brief intervals during class for students to think about what they have heard, seen, and learned.
• Provide opportunities for students to use or apply the course material/content.
• Have students work on class activities in pairs, triads, or small groups.
• Assign group membership randomly. Do not allow students to choose their own groups.
• Allow students to work on projects that explore their own social identities.

Provide varied opportunities for success/achievement
• Allow students to accumulate grade points in a variety of ways.
• Allow students to select the weighting of different aspects of the course.
• Provide explicit information about your grading criteria using matrices or rubrics.
• Allow students to collaborate/cooperate on homework and class assignments.
• Offer a variety of ways for students to participate in class other than speaking aloud.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS

The Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits, the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits, and the Health Care Advisory Committee: Coordination of Duties

(Advisory/Consultative)

Introduction and Rationale

The size and complexity of Penn State University are factors that necessitate the involvement of many parties in making decisions regarding the benefits plans, programs and services provided to employees. In particular, decisions regarding health care affect faculty and staff and their families on a very direct and personal level. Representation from many different stakeholders and experts is essential in providing guidance to senior administration in making decisions regarding health care and prescription drug benefits that will be acceptable to the employees and to the University.

Three different committees are charged with exploring questions, concerns, and opportunities regarding employee benefits and providing direction and recommendations to senior administration. Two of these committees are composed on the principle of shared governance with representation from university wide stakeholders. One committee is composed on the principle of strategic expertise and implementation of benefits decisions with linkages to the two shared governance committees. This report should help to clarify the function of each committee and the collaborative relationships between the three committees. In addition, recommendations associated with the ongoing functions and collaboration of the committees will be included.

University Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits

The University Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits is responsible for advancing consultation to the University through the shared governance body of the University Faculty Senate. Reports from this committee have the benefit of full Faculty Senate deliberation and approval, and recommendations on benefits are forwarded to the President with the weight of this full Faculty Senate approval. This committee represents the breadth of the Faculty Senate, including one retired senator and key administrative members of the Office of Human Resources.

According to the duties described by the Senate for the committee, the Committee on Faculty Benefits shall investigate and be the faculty’s voice on the adequacy and other attributes of the University’s provisions for total compensation (salaries and benefits), and any other associated perquisites affecting conditions of faculty employment. It shall maintain liaison with the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits (JCIB) and the Health Care Advisory Committee (HCAC).

Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits (JCIB)

The Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits is a representative committee of all University employee constituencies. JCIB includes appointed members, representing the University Faculty Senate, the Staff Advisory Council, Retirees, Nurses' collective bargaining unit, and the Teamsters' collective bargaining unit, in addition to key administrative members of the Office of Human Resources. As a broadly representative unit, JCIB provides the opportunity for diverse
views from across the entire employee group. JCIB can refer action items and reports on issues that they believe require shared governance deliberation to their parent committee of the University Faculty Benefits who can choose to support the presentation of those reports to the full University Faculty Senate.

The duties of the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits include reviewing and making recommendations to the Senate through the Faculty Benefits Committee on policies relating to the University’s insurance programs including life, medical, dental, and vision, as well as other areas normally defined as fringe benefits, including, but not limited to retirement and tuition remission. It shall be an advisory body to the Office of Human Resources and other appropriate administrative units in the formulation of all policies affecting insurance and benefits.

**Health Care Advisory Committee**

The Health Care Advisory Committee (HCAC) was formed following the Health Care Task Force report released in April 2014. The task force was formed in late 2013 and was charged with examining health care at Penn State. It provided a framework of strategies for keeping University health insurance costs down, improving employee health, and better communicating changes about employee health and health care.

The committee is comprised of faculty, staff and administrators who have expertise in the healthcare field or who have direct responsibility for health-care related work for the University. Original members included health care practitioners; academic experts in the disciplines of healthcare and insurance; and administrative representatives for human resources, budget and finance. In fall, 2015, the Chairs of the University Faculty Senate Faculty Benefits committee and the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits were added to the membership.

The Health Care Advisory Committee is an administrative committee with members who have relevant expertise in health care policy and practices and serve the administration in key positions of the Office of Human Resources and Finance & Business. HCAC is not a representative committee, but solely an administrative advisory committee. Specific issues and items of importance for University health care benefits can be referred to the JCIB for broad University wide representative consultation, and/or to the FB committee for advancement through the shared governance consultative route of the full University Faculty Senate.

**Summary**

Any of these three committees might originate ideas regarding benefits and health care insurance in particular; however, integration and a few key shared memberships across the three committees provides greater strength in the unique character of what each committee brings to the overall consultative process on any specific issue. Varied perspectives are inherent in the particular focus and membership of each separate committee. In order to support the essential need for integration, the Chair of the University Faculty Benefits and the Chair of the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits serve on the Health Care Advisory Committee. These individuals provide oral reports on the work of the JCIB and HCAC to the Faculty Benefits committee at regular meetings. Communication between the committees is achieved through common memberships of the committee chairs on more than one committee and through representation from the Office of Human Resources on each committee.
Recommendations

1. The Chair of the University Faculty Benefits and the Chair of the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits will continue to serve on the Health Care Advisory Committee.
2. Each October, the Committee on Faculty Benefits will sponsor an annual report from JCIB to provide a summary of benefit changes, changes under consideration, costs to the University and employee, and other issues discussed during the previous calendar year.
3. Ad hoc committees regarding benefits, such as the steering committee recently created to evaluate and make recommendations regarding a new third party administrator for health care and prescription drug benefits will include representation from the three committees.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS
Recommendations for Third Party Administrator (TPA) Choice for Penn State Medical and
Prescription Drug Coverage
(Advisory/Consultative)

Introduction and Rationale:
As the University moves forward in its engagement with prospective third party administrators (TPAs) for the administration of its medical and prescription drug benefit plans, it is important that innovative contractual agreements and creative opportunities be explored to ensure the best possible and most efficient outcomes for Penn State, its employees and their dependents. As reported in the Faculty Benefits Committee’s informational report of December 6, 2016 titled, “Third Party Administrative Services for Penn State’s Medical and Prescription Drug Plan,” a steering committee has been created to review and make recommendations regarding new contractual agreements for TPAs to be effective January 1, 2018. This committee is comprised of faculty and administrative personnel, representing the Health Care Advisory Committee, Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits, Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits, University Staff Advisory Council, Human Resources, Finance, and Procurement. The steering committee is working with Willis Towers Watson to obtain information from and evaluate the merits of prospective TPAs.

As the request for proposal (RFP) process moves forward, it is important that the steering committee remain informed and mindful of both qualitative and quantitative measures in choosing one or more new TPAs. Health care costs continue to rise and it is essential that Penn State chooses to work with a TPA that is willing to consider all options in order to contain costs, while at the same time, maintaining and improving quality care for employees and families across the Commonwealth.

Even though it may not be possible to engage in any or all of the innovative strategies described below by the implementation of the new contract date of January 1, 2018, Penn State should seek to partner with a TPA that is willing to consider these strategies to improve the patient experience while at the same time eliminating unnecessary spending that could drive up the cost of health care. Some strategies that might be considered include:

1. Explore the creation of High Performing Networks and Steerage: this involves negotiating with specific groups of health care providers who are proven to deliver high quality services at a lower cost (e.g., Quest Diagnostics, Penn State Health, Mt. Nittany Health).
2. Create custom networks with appropriate steerage mechanisms that would encourage Penn State employees to utilize “Centers of Excellence” for specific services; e.g., hip replacement surgeries performed at designated provider sites that would cost the employee and employer less than those performed at other sites.
3. Pursue TPAs who are forming accountable care organizations: these are groups of doctors, hospitals, and other health care providers, who come together voluntarily to give coordinated high quality care to their patients, and are incentivized to eliminate duplication of services and medical errors.
4. Partner with TPAs who contract with providers who operate patient centered medical homes: treatment and care are coordinated through one physician (often primary care physician) to create efficiency and delivery of services and improve communication with the patient.

5. Create bundled care models: a specific payment for a diagnosis or condition, rather than for each piece of the care (i.e., single payment for management of a total hip replacement instead of paying a separate price for diagnostic procedures, surgical interventions, and physical therapy).

6. Develop referenced based pricing models: setting a maximally allowed amount to be paid for a specific intervention.

7. Seek health care management programs that would allow Penn State University the flexibility to collaborate directly with third parties, such as Penn State Health Care Partners.

8. Obtain performance guarantees that hold the TPA accountable to meet predetermined levels of performance in the administration and handling of claims, provider networks, prescription drug rebates, member services, etc.

**Recommendations:**

The University Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits is seeking endorsement from the full senate on the following recommendations regarding the work of the steering committee and the senior administration that are ultimately responsible for the final decision.

The steering committee and senior administration should:

1. Consider new and innovative opportunities for the pricing and delivery of health care, including but not limited to, those described above.

2. Insist upon a TPA that is able to provide quality health care coverage to all Penn State employees across the Commonwealth, with broad, in-network access to physicians and facilities.

3. Remain committed to the guiding principles outlined in the Principles for the Design of Penn State Health Care Plans Advisory and Consultative report that was endorsed by the Senate and accepted by the President in spring of 2016.

4. Seek contractual agreements with TPAs to specify terms of commitment of no longer than 5 years in order to retain flexibility in administrative options in the context of a rapidly changing healthcare environment.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

Disciplinary Communities Revisited

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the President

BACKGROUND

At the April 25, 2006 meeting of the University Faculty Senate, an Advisory/Consultative Report entitled “Disciplinary Communities” submitted by the Intra-University Relations Committee was passed in response to a charge to “recommend the creation of organizational processes and structures needed to implement promotion and tenure, and curricular recommendations of other committees; to identify strategies to support faculty collaboration on course offerings; to develop recommendations for discipline-based coordination councils; and to develop recommendations to support discipline based conferences and communications.” While this report was accepted by then President, it was never completely implemented. A few units took the recommendations of the report seriously, but many other units ignored it, and effective disciplinary communities are operating in only some of the disciplines.

RATIONALE

Fundamentally, the need for disciplinary communities arises out of the philosophy that we are “one university geographically distributed.” For this to be meaningful it is necessary that courses across all locations be similar, which is one of the reasons that the Senate passed Legislative Report, Policy 42-10, Course Uniformity last March. This policy requires that courses offered by multiple units must be substantially similar in that they include a minimum of 80% of the course content and learning objectives described in the most current course proposal approved by the Senate. Many of the currently approved course proposals on the books do not have this course content or learning objectives adequately stated, and in the next few years many of them will need to be redone. In order to carry this out effectively for courses that are offered at multiple locations, the disciplinary communities will be critical. There is an additional imperative, based on the recommendations of our accrediting agency, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, to develop effective assessment methods for our degree programs and to truly act as “one university geographically distributed.” Since all of our campuses are jointly accredited as one university, it is more critical than ever that these organizational processes and structures are completely implemented.

The Committee is deeply concerned that the disciplinary communities report was accepted by the administration 10 years ago, but little has been done to implement the recommendations. Due to the size and geographic distribution of the university, disciplinary communities will not happen spontaneously unless there is a strong driving force. Instances where these communities are currently functioning are due either to specific accreditation needs or the historical recognition of the importance of curricular coherence dating back to the days of the Commonwealth
Educational System (CES). However, there has been no systematic effort to create disciplinary communities across all disciplines. Without such an effort, which is best led by the administration, we cannot claim to be one university, and in fact, could be putting our Middle States accreditation at risk. The Committee admonishes the administration to not only execute the recommendations listed below, but report back to the Senate on how effective the implementation has been.

The rest of this report is taken practically verbatim from the 2006 IRC Disciplinary Communities Report. The recommendations made then are as appropriate as they were in 2006, possibly even more appropriate, given the recent recommendations of our accrediting agency. Part of the Rationale Section of that report has been removed in the interest of conciseness. Secondly, a section proposing how disciplinary communities meetings would be held, but that was not stated as a recommendation, has now been explicitly listed as a recommendation (Recommendation 3). Thirdly, a specific recommendation (Recommendation 4) regarding a report back to the Senate has been added.

DISCIPLINARY COMMUNITIES AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Definition

The word “community” is typically used to refer to the form and function of a wide variety of political, economic, and social collectives. The word, “discipline” is used to refer to a branch of learning or education, or system of rules for proper conduct. In this report, IRC defines a disciplinary community as:

A behavioral system composed of persons having extensive education and training in practice of an art or science using similar processes and resources. These persons are linked by means of positions, groups and associations in professional organizations that control entrance to the community and regulate its members’ behavior through shared norms, policies, rules, standards and codes.

When referring to a branch of learning or body of knowledge, we use the term discipline. When referring to the collective of persons who practice that branch of learning, we use the term disciplinary community.

Characteristics of Disciplinary Communities

The broad function of a disciplinary community is to provide ways and means for the interaction, development, evaluation, reward, and sanctioning of its members. IRC members believe that critical structures and processes necessary for the development and functioning of disciplinary communities include:

1. Periodic meetings of the community with a focus on collegiality, open discussion, fairness, equal treatment, ethical behavior, full participation in rule making, and the opportunity to exercise authority and responsibility.
2. Ongoing opportunities for fostering personal growth, challenge, responsibility, and professional achievement through engagement of different points of view, higher stage logical and ethical reasoning, and research collaboration.

3. Ongoing and appropriate exchange of information with discussions revolving around responsibilities, course offerings, curricular development, and other issues affecting the educational interests of the University.

4. Opportunities to participate in the development and application of policies, standards, and structures for the coordination of academic and administrative processes such as curricular development and integration.

Identifying Faculty Disciplines

Faculty disciplines are taken to be the primary field of study in which a faculty member engages in teaching, research, and service, and are most often identified by the individual’s position title. Disciplinary Communities arise informally through the interaction of faculty members sharing common disciplinary interests, or may be formally structured by appropriate authority to carry out a specific purpose or function. Well-functioning and mature disciplinary communities exhibit the structures and processes noted in the preceding section.

Defining Organizational Structure

In this report, we define organizational structure, operationally, as the way we organize our behavior to carry out our work. More formally, we define structure as the repetitive and identifiable patterns of behavior used to coordinate and carry out the tasks and functions of an organization.

Steps in Developing Organizational Structure

Form follows function. That is, an organization’s structure should follow from, and be developed to carry out its work. The design of structure typically follows the following steps:

1. The process begins with an assessment of the critical tasks and functions that must be carried out if the organization is to exist as a viable entity. For example, faculty has to be interviewed, hired, mentored, evaluated, tenured, promoted, and provided with sabbaticals. Curriculum has to be developed, kept current, and coordinated across the University. Students have to be attracted, admitted, registered, taught, advised, and certified for graduation.

2. After the critical tasks have been identified, they are clustered together for efficiency and for coordination. The responsibility for their accomplishment is assigned to individuals, positions, groups, and communities. For example, the teaching of English composition might be assigned to five individuals, or election of a promotion and tenure committee might be assigned to the campus faculty governance organization; hiring of faculty might be assigned to the DAA with input from a disciplinary community.
3. These critical tasks must now be coordinated and controlled to provide for an efficient, lean, and agile structural form. Precisely where, and by what means this coordination is provided is a central focus of this report.

**Practices of Effective Disciplinary Communities**

University-wide disciplinary communities appear to work best in cases where Associate Deans for Undergraduate Education, and the Department or Division Heads in the Colleges put in place and support the organizational culture and critical structures and processes necessary for the development and functioning of disciplinary communities. (See Characteristics of Disciplinary Communities above) The examples highlight how these individuals and others have made it part of their job responsibility to facilitate communication among disciplinary faculty across the University, bring faculty with common curricular and research interests together, and ensure curricular consultation and periodic review of courses and programs.

Multiple forms of electronic communication are evident in the more successful disciplinary communities. All University faculty in a discipline are listed on department/division websites. A listserv exists to facilitate communication among the faculty in the discipline. The Associate Dean or Department/Division Head within a discipline distribute regular communications and newsletters. Face to face meetings are often used to bring small groups or the entire disciplinary faculty together so they can gain and maintain familiarity with each other as the members of the community change over time. Colleges work together to support these communication and meeting activities.

Commitment and hard work by faculty and administrators in coordinating courses and programs underlies the successful stories of curricular integration that have been achieved by some disciplinary communities. Characteristics and values of disciplinary communities noted earlier such as mutual respect, equity, participation, fairness, collegiality, and collaboration as the basis for improvement seem to underlie the activities of successful disciplinary communities in the University.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Recommendation 1**

The Provost’s office, the deans of each University Park college, and those administrators designated to act as deans for the campus colleges and the University College, are responsible for ensuring that effective disciplinary communities are established and sustained. To accomplish this, administrators will, in consultation with the faculty, identify new and continuing disciplinary community leaders in each campus and academic unit, and form multi-campus disciplinary teams. These teams will organize themselves and, with the support of their respective college deans, collaboratively plan ongoing activities for their University-wide disciplinary communities. The multi-campus teams should seek the assistance of campus
administration, faculty governance, and faculty at each campus in developing disciplinary structures aligned, to the extent possible, with existing disciplinary communities (i.e., programs, schools, departments, majors, minors and options) at the University Park colleges, Campus colleges, and the University College. Multiple solutions for constructing and sustaining each University-wide disciplinary community will be successful, depending on the particular units, faculties, students, and programs involved.

**Recommendation 2**

The Committee recommends that the disciplinary communities identified in Recommendation 1 utilize many of the following procedures, if appropriate, to construct and sustain their University-wide activities.

a. Ensure that adequate two-way communication essential for the maintenance of curricular integrity is carried out with all categories of faculty (including fixed-term and instructors) at every location where discipline courses are offered.

b. Develop documentation such as course objectives and expected learning outcomes, giving due consideration to the needs of students at all locations in the adoption of course standards.

c. Recognize, develop, and consolidate the accomplishments of distinctive academic programs at all Penn State locations.

d. Assess periodically all courses at all locations, including World Campus, to determine the extent to which delivered courses are meeting objectives and expected outcomes.

e. Evaluate other institutions’ courses related to requests for incoming transfers of credit, and periodically re-evaluate articulation agreements and related credit-transfer agreements with other institutions by benchmarking course components such as credit assignment, syllabus content, texts used, and rigor of courses offered.

f. Post on a secure website available to faculty, information such as original course proposals, long and short course descriptions, current course content, a “model” course syllabus, sample exams, and any teaching hints or suggestions for new faculty.

g. Provide consultation to the Associate Deans and Department Heads within their discipline in the development of new curricula, and the revision of current curricula, giving due consideration to the needs of students at all locations;

h. File a yearly report on community activities to all appropriate college deans, to the Provost, and Vice-Presidents for Undergraduate Education, Graduate Education, and Commonwealth Campuses. These Vice-Presidents make a yearly report to the University Faculty Senate (mandatory).
Recommendation 3

University-wide disciplinary faculty meetings must be held at least once per year to share course, program, and advising information, pedagogical methods, classroom technology, and current research. The responsibility for convening and hosting the meetings would be rotated among the units with faculty in the discipline. Costs for the meetings would be shared by all units on an equitable basis. For efficiency in the use of travel funds, meetings could be “breakout” sessions of wider disciplinary meetings. Technology such as video conferencing would be used as appropriate to minimize expense and travel time.

Recommendation 4

The administration report back to the Senate within two years on progress that has been made regarding implementation of these recommendations, including a summary of how many disciplinary communities exist, how often they meet, and how many courses have been reviewed by the communities.
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Equivalence of Courses Across the University

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the President

BACKGROUND

It has come to the attention of the Intra-University Relations Committee that several degree-granting units of the University have been requiring students who have taken certain courses at a different location than the one where that unit is located to retake them in order to count them towards graduation requirements. These requirements are contrary to both the spirit and the letter of University policies; therefore IRC is submitting this Advisory/Consultative Report requesting the University to enforce existing policies with respect to course equivalence across the University.

RATIONALE

Penn State functions as a single university with multiple, jointly accredited campuses. In order to maintain joint accreditation, we must truly function as a single institution. If units of a university do not accept credits for the identically numbered course offered by another unit of the same university, how could they argue that they were truly a single institution? The Senate has taken the issue of course uniformity very seriously, passing Senate Policy 42-10 last year, which stated “courses offered within Penn State must include a minimum of 80% of the core content and learning objectives described in the most current course proposal as approved by the Faculty Senate.” Policy P-11 of the Academic Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual states, “A course offered at multiple locations should carry a common course number at all locations and will meet degree requirements at all locations.”

The Senate recognizes that there is an exception to Policy P-11, often described as the “90 credit rule” found in Senate Policy 83-80 – Limitations on Source and Time for Credit Acquisition. This policy states “As a degree-completion requirement, the college dean or campus chancellor and program faculty may require up to 24 credits of course work in the major to be taken at the location or in the college or program where the degree is earned. Particular courses within the 24 credits are not to be specified, except for a senior seminar or capstone course required for the given major.

The Senate asks that the senior administration of the University enforce these policies as stated in the recommendation below.

RECOMMENDATION

The senior administration of the University should enforce AAPPM Policy P-11 and Senate
Policy 83-80. All units must accept for credit towards graduation requirements, all courses completed at other units and campuses of the University, except for senior seminars and capstone courses, as long as the student has met the 24-credit requirement at the degree-granting unit for work in the major.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

- Aurand, Harold
- Babu, Jogesh
- Boyle, James
- Brown, Claudia
- Cusumano, Joseph
- Egolf, Roger, Chair
- Funk, Raymond
- Harte, Federico
- Healy, Michael
- Lasher, William
- Lopez, Hector
- McMillan, Steven
- Novikov, Alexei
- Petrilla, Rosemarie, ice Chair
- Rowland, Nicholas
- Ruggiero, Francesca
- Schmiedekamp, Ann
- Shurgalla, Richard
- Subramanian, Rajarajan
- Thomas, Darryl
- Wagner, Johanna
- Welsh, Nancy
- Wenner, William
- Zomorodi, Naseem
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GLOBAL PROGRAMS

Program Goals for Global Penn State; Student Participation, Diversity, and Comparison to Peer Institutions

(Informational)

Michael Adewumi, the Vice Provost for Global Programs, will present an informational report discussing the goals of Global Penn State, outlining the student participation and diversity in these programs, and comparing Global Penn State to similar programs at peer institutions.
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“If you don’t have a world view, if you don’t understand other cultures, if you’re not experiencing everything that this world has to offer, you’re actually at a disadvantage.”

“There’s no doubt about it. It doesn’t matter which facet of university life you have – research, teaching, service – it’s enriched by an international experience.”

(Eric Barron, President, as stated in the Global Penn State video)
“An enhanced focus on global engagement is central to our mission in the 21st century, reinforcing our mission to offer students opportunities to become global citizens and providing a vehicle for Penn State’s impact to be extended around the world.”

(Nicholas P. Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost, as stated in the Penn State Strategic Plan, 2016-2020)
Towards the Global Penn State:
The 3-sided Coin Approach

**GO**
- Increase study-abroad participation
- Diversify destinations
- Provide transformative experiences

**COME**
- Attract best global talent
- Diversify population
- Provide indelible experience

**Global Citizenship & Global Leadership**

**Partner**
- Partner w/select institutions globally
- Diversify partner locations
- Foster transformational collaborations

GLOBAL Penn State
GO:

- Increase study-abroad participation
- Diversify destinations
- Provide transformative experiences
Study-Abroad Participation (AY 1993-2016)

- **1993**: 581 (Traditional Programs: 0, Embedded Programs: 0)
- **1998**: 796 (Traditional Programs: 0, Embedded Programs: 0)
- **2003**: 995 (Traditional Programs: 0, Embedded Programs: 0)
- **2008**: 1,458 (Traditional Programs: 793, Embedded Programs: 665)
- **2013**: 1,371 (Traditional Programs: 1,000, Embedded Programs: 371)
- **2016**: 1,592 (Traditional Programs: 1,492, Embedded Programs: 100)

**TOTALS**: 2,251 (Traditional Programs: 3,186, Embedded Programs: 988)

**TOTAL**: 2,580 (Traditional Programs: 4,186, Embedded Programs: 988)
### Study-Abroad Rankings (2013-14)

#### Institutions by Total Number of Study Abroad Students: Top 40 Doctorate-Granting Universities, 2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total Study Abroad Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>4,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of Texas - Austin</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>3,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>College Station</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Michigan - Ann Arbor</td>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>2,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Minnesota - Twin Cities</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>2,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ohio State University - Columbus</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>2,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>East Lansing</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>2,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>2,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin - Madison</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>2,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>2,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>2,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>University of California - Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Indiana University - Bloomington</td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>2,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>2,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>2,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Miami University - Oxford</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>2,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Penn State University - University Park</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>1,971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PSU Total: 2,590 (7th)**
Ethnic Disparity in Study-Abroad

**2010-2011**

- White: 1962 (73%)
- Asian American: 133 (5%)
- African American: 80 (3%)
- Hispanic/Latino: 66 (2%)
- Native American/Alaskan: 3 (0.11%)
- Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 2 (0.07%)
- Multiple races: 228 (9%)
- Unknown: 203 (8%)

**2015-2016**

- White: 1868 (72%)
- African American: 120 (5%)
- Asian American: 79 (3%)
- Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 3 (0.11%)
- Native American/Alaskan: 2 (0.07%)
- International: 198 (8%)
- Multiple Races: 81 (3%)
- Unknown: 56 (2%)
Regional Disparity in Study-Abroad

2010-2011

Europe: 1704 (64%)
Latin America: 379 (14%)
Asia: 194 (7%)
Africa: 120 (4%)
Middle East: 66 (2%)
Multiple Destinations: 16 (1%)

2015-2016

Europe: 1646 (64%)
Latin America: 346 (13%)
Asia: 257 (10%)
Africa: 159 (6%)
Australia/Pacific Islands: 110 (4%)
Middle East: 25 (1%)
North America: 15 (1%)
Multiple Destinations: 22 (1%)
Campus Gap in study-abroad

Total = 2,667

- Other Penn State Campuses: 533 (20%)
- University Park: 2134 (80%)

Total = 2,580

- Other Penn State Campuses: 533 (21%)
- University Park: 2047 (79%)

2010-2011

2015-2016
Bridging the Campus Gap (2015-2016)

Traditional Programs

University Park
928
88%

Other Penn State Campuses
121
12%

Embedded Programs

University Park
596
60%

Other Penn State Campuses
228
23%

Behrend, 42, 4%

Altoona, 31, 3%

Berks, 23, 3%

Abington, 12, 1%

Harrisburg, 56, 6%
Bridging the *Campus Gap*
Embedded Scholarship Awards

- **2011-2012**
  - University Park: 48%
  - Other Penn State Campuses: 52%

- **2015-2016**
  - University Park: 32%
  - Other Penn State Campuses: 68%
Questions?
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING,
AND STUDENT AID

Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program

(Informational)

Introduction
"Reserved Spaces" 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.

Information
Table 1 shows the distribution of admissions through the Reserved Spaces program by each EI category. The spaces are organized into three types: Senate Approved, Other Academic, and Administrative. The Glossary at the end of the report describes the groups under each type.

In the past, including students entering up to 2012, the limits or targets approved by the Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid applied to fall admissions only. Because of the increased use of spring and summer as the initial term for many of the new incoming students, the allocated reserved spaces apply to and are reported from 2013 on over a full calendar year.

Table 2 provides limits for each type and group of students and the number of reserved spaces actually used. The graph that follows compares the number of reserved spaces to the total first-year admissions at University Park. On both the chart and graph, for the years 2009-2012, the data refer to fall admissions only. For 2013-2016, actual reserved space use for both fall and for the full calendar year are shown. In 2016, 232 spaces were used in the spring, summer and fall, constituting 2.62 percent of the calendar year admissions.

Table 3 shows the proposed reserved space limits for 2016. The spaces utilized by EOP/CAMP have been lower in recent years due to expiration of funding for the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP). However, we recommend keeping the current limit in place, as it is anticipated that we will apply for restored funding in the next cycle.
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## TABLE 1
### RESERVED SPACES BY ADMISSION CATEGORY - SPRING, SUMMER, FALL 2016
### UNIVERSITY PARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>CAT. 1 (4.00-3.50)</th>
<th>CAT. 2 (3.49-3.00)</th>
<th>CAT. 3 (2.99-2.75)</th>
<th>CAT. 4 (2.74-2.50)</th>
<th>CAT. 5 (2.49-2.25)</th>
<th>CAT. 6 (2.24-2.00)</th>
<th>CAT. 1-6 (4.00-2.00)</th>
<th>CAT. 7-10 (1.99-.01)</th>
<th>NO CAT.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SENATE APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Arch Talent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Educ Opp Prog/CAMP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER ACADEMIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC Scholars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Adm Review Comm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Sports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Band</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President &amp; Dean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENTAGE</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>43.97%</td>
<td>29.74%</td>
<td>14.66%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>96.98%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FRESHMEN</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>6197</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8273</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>8861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENTAGE</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
<td>69.94%</td>
<td>10.55%</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>93.36%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.64%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EOP/CAMP = Educational Opportunity Program/College Assistance Migrant Program

**Adm Review Comm = Admissions Review Committee

Source: Office of Undergraduate Admissions, 11/28/16
Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education
## TABLE 2
RESERVED SPACES - 9 YEAR COMPARISON
UNIVERSITY PARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limit</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Limit</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Limit</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Limit</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATE APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Arch Talent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EOP/CAMP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER ACADEMIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC Scholars</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Adm Review Comm</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Sports</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Band</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP &amp; Dean</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW FRESHMEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EOP/CAMP = Educational Opportunity Program/College Assistance Migrant Program
**Adm Review Comm = Admissions Review Committee

Source: Office of Undergraduate Admissions, 11/28/16
Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education
Bar chart showing the number of reserved spaces used compared to total first-year admission to University Park by year from 2009 to 2016.

The years 2009 to 2012 reflect fall only, with 214 of the 5,298 first-year admissions in 2009; and 240 of the 6,020 first-year admissions in 2012 admitted via reserved spaces.

The years 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 reflect full-year (spring, summer, fall) admissions, with 295 of 8,382; 259 of 8,663; 279 of 8,013; and 232 of 8,861 first-year admissions in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 respectively, admitted via reserved spaces.
# TABLE 3
**Proposed Reserved Spaces Limits for 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senate Approved</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;A Talent (Architecture/Landscape Architecture)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Opportunity Program/College Assistance Migrant Program</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Academic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC Scholars</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Review Committee</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsity Sports</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Sports</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Band</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP&amp;D</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary of Terms for the Reserved Spaces Report

**Arts and Architecture Talent Review:**
The College of Arts and Architecture recommends up to ten exceptionally talented freshman applications for admission to the Architecture and Landscape Architecture programs each year. Applicants interested in pursuing special talent admission are required to submit a representative portfolio of their creative art work relevant to architectural studies, which will be reviewed by the appropriate faculty. Portfolios are being accepted between January 1 and February 15.

**Admissions Review Committee:**
Individual student appeal of an admissions decision based upon additional information, credentials, or extenuating situations that were not considered in the initial decision.

**Educational Opportunity Program (EOP):**
Spaces reserved to provide access and retention to low-income Pennsylvania students. Student may not meet regular admission criteria for his or her selected campus. Student must meet financial guidelines established by the Pennsylvania Department of Education for low income families. Decisions are made in the Undergraduate Admissions Office in collaboration with the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity.

**College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP):**
Reserved spaces for students accessing Penn State through the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP), a federally funded program designed to assist first-year college students from migrant and seasonal farm worker families pursue higher education. Decisions are made in the Undergraduate Admissions Office in collaboration with the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity.

**Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education:**
Final level of appeal for an admission decision based upon extenuating circumstances, additional information, changes in credentials, etc. not considered in prior decisions.
Introduction
The following information provides the history and background of the G.I. Bill and programs offered through Penn State. The goal is to provide a better understanding of how active-duty military and veterans pay for their schooling as well as inform members of the Faculty Senate about other programs offered to support them while they attend school.

Discussion

The G.I. Bill
At the end of World War II, returning veterans were provided with training and education benefits to assist in their transition to civilian life. This came to be known as the G.I. Bill of Rights or the G.I. Bill. Those who attended colleges and universities using this benefit had their entire tuition paid by the Veterans Administration (VA), and received a monthly living allowance. It is estimated that at least one million veterans were able to get a college education. In spite of the economic benefit a college education provided, many felt the G.I. Bill was too generous. It was not continued for veterans who served after World War II.

Korean and Vietnam War veterans had G.I. Bills of their own, but in both cases, the veterans received only a monthly subsistence allowance and no funds for tuition. Veterans who were seriously disabled as a result of their service were eligible to participate in the VA’s Vocational Rehabilitation Program, which pays the school for all tuition and mandatory fees. However, relatively few veterans qualified as seriously disabled, so for most veterans of the Korean and Vietnam War eras, they had to figure out a way to cover the costs through work or personal loans.

People entering the military service after 1976 were not eligible for the Vietnam Era G.I. Bill. Their only option for educational benefits was to participate in the Veterans Educational Assistance Program (VEAP). Under this program a service member could contribute up to $2,700 that would be matched two to one by the VA for a maximum entitlement of $8,100. The veteran could then receive this money in monthly payments of subsistence allowance while attending college.

In 1985, the Montgomery G.I. Bill was passed into law. This created separate G.I. Bills – one for National Guard and Reservists and one for active duty military. Like VEAP, there was a contribution required by the active-duty service people of $1,200. However, the Montgomery legislation contained a provision for an annual Cost of Living Adjustment. Thus, by 2000, the full-time monthly rate had reached $650 for the Active Duty participants and $253 for the National Guard and Reservists. To create more incentive to enlist, and to channel enlistees to
those military occupations that were difficult to recruit to (combat arms, for example) all branches were allowed to offer “College Funds” which are referred to as “kickers.”

**Post 9/11 G.I. Bill**

On August 1, 2009, the Post 9/11 G.I. Bill began. The ongoing conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the tremendous sacrifices this required of service personnel, led Congress to conclude a better G. I. bill was necessary. Any veteran with qualifying service after 9/11/2001 was eligible to participate. Because of the relatively small size of the active military, many National Guard and Reservists had been activated and sent to Iraq and/or Afghanistan. In order to recognize this fact, a sliding scale of eligibility was established. Those with at least 90 days of qualifying service are eligible for 40 percent of the benefit, increasing incrementally until 100 percent eligibility is reached for those with at least 36 months.

This program has three separate payment components: a tuition payment made directly to the university the member is enrolled at, a book allowance, and a monthly Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) payment paid to the student. All three components are scaled according to percentage of eligibility.

For those with maximum eligibility, it covers 100 percent of the in-state tuition. For non-resident students and those attending private institutions, a provision called the “Yellow Ribbon Program” enabled the institution to split the difference with the Department of Veterans Affairs. Effective August 1, 2016, new legislation called the “Choice Act” went into effect. This requires public institutions treat all VA benefit recipients as residents for tuition purposes.

The book allowance is a fixed amount of up to $1,000 per year for 24 credits taken. So, for a student with 100 percent eligibility, they receive $41.66 per credit until the money is exhausted or the academic year ends.

The BAH the student receives at the end of each month of enrollment. The payment rate is based on the location of the institution and the amount varies. The formula is an attempt to estimate the actual cost of housing for that area. The BAH payment is only paid when school is in session. So, where there are partial months of enrollment (i.e. August, December, January, May), a prorated amount is paid.

There were two additional features of the Post 9/11 G.I. Bill that were new to VA educational programs. The first was transferability. This feature was aimed at retaining people in the military and encouraging them to make it their career. Under the transferability option, an active duty service member who has served for ten years and agrees to remain on active duty can transfer their entitlement to their spouse and dependent children. The service member only has a maximum of 36 months of benefits to transfer, but can adjust the amount transferred to a dependent whenever he/she wishes. Transferred entitlement does not affect the recipient’s eligibility for any other VA educational benefit.

The second new feature was the lengthening of the time a veteran has in which to use his/her G.I. Bill. Under the most recent G.I. Bills (Vietnam Era, VEAP and Montgomery) veterans had ten years from their date of discharge to use all of their G.I. Bill benefits. Under the Post 9/11 G.I.
Bill, veterans have fifteen years to do so. This additional time recognizes that fact that many veterans have personal, family and vocational issues to resolve before pursuing their education. Veterans get no additional entitlement, just the additional time to use their G.I Bill.

In 2009, along with the enactment of the Post 9/11 G.I. Bill, an important change was made that affected all VA educational benefit recipients. A new law specified all VA benefits must be ignored when calculating and awarding any other form of student financial aid. Beginning that year, all VA benefits recipients had their aid calculated on the basis of their merit and need and that’s how it currently stands.

**Veterans Population at Penn State**

The veteran population at Penn State has more than doubled since 2008, totaling 4,257 for the Fall 2015 semester, representing over 4 percent of total population enrolled during that time. The term “veteran” in this regard refers to discharged military veterans as well as all active duty military, reserve/national guard, and dependents currently enrolled in both graduate and undergraduate programs. This increase is largely due to the advent of the Post 9/11 GI Bill as well as increased eligibility for the VA’s Vocational Rehabilitation Program.

**To be considered as an independent student, based on veteran status, the Department of Education uses the following definition:**
A veteran is a former member of the Armed Forces of the United States (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard) who served on active duty and was discharged under conditions, which were other than dishonorable. There is no minimum number of days a student must have served on active duty to be considered a veteran. However, periods of active duty for training, pursuant to an enlistment in the National Guard or Reserves, do not qualify a student as
a veteran. Thus former or current members of the National Guard or Reserves are not considered to be veterans unless they had prior or subsequent service with an active component of the Armed Forces. (Reservists called to active duty by Executive Order qualify as veterans.) Since the DD Form 214 is issued to those leaving the active military as well as to members of the National Guard and Reserves completing their initial active duty for training, possession of this document does not necessarily mean the student is a veteran. Persons who attended military academies are now considered veterans for financial aid purposes.

Office of Veterans Programs - Penn State University Park (974 students)
- Director: Dr. Brian Clark, Veteran, US Army
- Associate Director: Renee Thornton-Roop, Veteran, US Air Force
- Outreach Coordinator: Mary Fisk, First Sergeant (Ret.), US Marine Corps
- Certifying Official: Lauren Fend, US Air Force Dependent
- Office Manager: Christine Evans, US Navy Dependent

The Office of Veterans Programs provides the certification of all GI Bill benefits for the UP population. The Certifying Official Staff are also trained counselors (two are licensed mental health providers) that assist in delivery of holistic, case management based services to veterans and dependents using GI Bill benefits.

Current Services/Initiatives:
- Certification of GI Bill Benefits
- General and Academic Counseling
- Administration of the VA Vocational Rehab & Employment Program
- Advocacy for Veterans’ Issues on Campus
- Outreach to Prospective and Current Students at all campuses
- Veterans/Dependent Specific Programming (Orientation/First Year Seminar/Psycho-Educational Groups)
- Processing of Priority Registration and Military Honor Cord for all Campuses
- A Student Sponsor Program for Newly Incoming Veteran Students
- A Veterans Mentor/Tutor program marrying veteran/veteran friendly staff and faculty members with veteran students
- Office Space for Veterans Fraternity and Student Veterans Organization
- Supervision of Twenty-Five VA Work-Study Students
- Ongoing Assessment of Veteran Needs/Programming Opportunities
- Training and Assistance for School Certifying Officials/Veterans’ Advocates at all Campuses
- Representation of Penn State for all Veterans Issues in the Community, Regionally, and Nationally
Military Scholarships Awarded at University Park:
The office awarded 11 military specific scholarships in 2016 including:

* Jerry and Jacquelyn Grossman Scholarship for U.S. Military Veterans (3 recipients) $4,672
* George W. and Joanne T. Rauchfuss Scholarship for Veterans (1 recipient) $2,500
* Veterans Special Needs Endowed Scholarship (2 recipients) $5,278
* Betty H. Gofus Trustee Scholarship in Educational Equity (2 recipients) $7,213
* Marvin and Lillian Perelman Scholarship (1 recipient) $500
* The Rehab Club Memorial Scholarship (2 recipients) $3138

Total: $23,301

Penn State World Campus Military Services/Initiatives for Students (2,235 students)
Penn State World Campus was ranked "Best Online Bachelor's Programs for Veterans" 2016, “Best for Vets” by Military Times 2016, Military Friendly School 2016, Military Advanced Education and Transition -- Guide to Top Colleges and Universities 2016.

Penn State World Campus has a staff dedicated to military prospects and students including:
- Cross-functional military team with representatives from all Penn State World Campus units including Admissions, Bursar, Financial Aid, Registrar, Advising, Disability Services, Program Planning and Management and support services.
- Director of Military Education focused on developing relationships nationwide with military and Penn State World Campus.
- Southern California Outreach Director focused on developing relationships in Southern California and Western USA with military and Penn State World Campus.
- Three full-time Military Admissions Counselors as of November 2016. One Counselor working at Marine Corp Recruit Depot (MCRD) San Diego.
- Six full-time undergraduate Military Academic Advisers as of November 2016 with one of these serving as a liaison to the Disability Services team who helps train academic advisers on how best to coach, support and refer students to this team. Two of these six are full-time GI Bill Certifying Officials that are also trained to work with military education portals as required by the military.
- One full-time Disability Specialist specific for military students who is also a GI Bill Certifying Official.

Penn State World Campus--Scholarships Dedicated to Military Students
- Seven scholarships specific for military Penn State World Campus students with the potential for an additional four to be activated in the next year.
- Penn State World Campus Military Grant-in-Aid for undergraduates serving on active duty or guard/reserve and military spouses which reduces Penn State World Campus tuition closer to the Tuition Assistance cap of $250/credit hour. As of Fall 2016, this reduces Penn State
World Campus cost-per-credit hour tuition from $582/credit hour (upper division courses) or $542/credit hour (lower division courses) to $328/credit hour.

Penn State World Campus--Other Initiatives
There is a partnership between the United States Sergeant Major Academy and the Master of Adult Education degree program offered online through Penn State World Campus. The first cohort graduated August 2016. Second cohort currently enrolled, third cohort preparing to apply.

Commonwealth Campuses
Who is assisting veterans at the campuses?
Each campus has at least one VA School Certifying Official who certifies the VA educational benefits of veterans/military/dependents. Most certifying officials at the commonwealth campuses fulfill multiple roles (e.g., financial aid, registration, etc.).

In 2015, the Military and Veterans Support Services Subcommittee of the Commission for Adult Learners surveyed the VA School Certifying Officials throughout the Penn State system to determine the services offered by the various campuses to veteran/military/dependent students. Results are as follows:

**Abington (105 students):** Study lounge, workshops with County Veterans Services Officer

**Altoona (143 students):** Referrals for health care, financial assistance, social interaction through ODS fraternity and off-campus organizations

**Behrend/Erie (154 students):** Social media/military specific website, and staff solely dedicated to veterans, and military specific programming/activities

**Berks (137 students):** Offer support with the transition from military to college, peer mentoring, a student Veterans of America (SVA) chapter, and veterans and dependents information workshops

**DuBois (36 students):** Offer a lounge, veterans club, workshops, and a Veterans’ Day program

**Mont Alto (51 students):** Offer a Student Veterans of America (SVA) chapter, a new student veterans welcome, veteran peer mentors, a VA work-study program, on-campus student success support services, and veterans training as Lion Ambassadors

**Fayette (31 students):** Admissions counselor for adults/veterans, a VA work study positions, “Got Your 6” PSFE Community Group, a VA Center Counselor, a campus veteran mentor group

**Harrisburg (286 students):** Veterans’ club, a list-serv, and occasional veteran specific programming

**Hazelton (27 students):** Veterans’ Club

**Lehigh Valley (41 students):** Veterans Connect is offered during the first week of class, and they have a Veterans Fraternity
New Kensington (42 students): a Veterans’ Open House, a veterans’ club

Schuylkill (29 students): Offer a Veterans’ Lounge

Worthington-Scranton (33 students): Offer counseling services two days a week, informational sessions with VA staff, a veterans’ club, and a Veterans’ Day ceremony

Commonwealth Campuses with Certifying Official Services Only:
Beaver: (26 students)
Brandywine: (53 students)
Greater Allegheny: (16 students)
Great Valley: (31 students)
Shenango: (26 students)
Wilkes-Barre: (31 students)
York: (51 students)

Summary
The veteran population at Penn State has more than doubled since 2008. The Office of Veterans Programs at University Park, and staff at other Penn State work to certify the VA educational benefits of veterans/military/dependents. There are a variety of programs available at the campuses for veterans and their families. A number of scholarships are available for this group of students.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Update on Assessment and Accreditation

(Informational)

Lance Kennedy-Phillips, Vice Provost for Planning and Assessment and Barbara Masi, Associate Vice Provost for Learning Outcomes Assessment, both representing the Office of Planning and Assessment, will present an update on assessment and accreditation.
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In March 2011, the Senate voted to change the representation ratio for electing senators from one senator for each 25 members of the electorate, to a representation model of a maximum number of 200 elected faculty seats. The legislative report and table showing the calculation for achieving a Senate of 200 elected faculty seats is available here.

In 2017-2018, the University Faculty Senate will be a fixed size of 200 elected faculty seats.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTING UNITS</th>
<th>Total Faculty as of 10/31/16</th>
<th>2017-18 Senate Seats Allotted</th>
<th>Total Faculty as of 10/31/15</th>
<th>2016-17 Senate Seats Allotted</th>
<th>Net Change in Senate Seats</th>
<th># of Senate Seats Expiring SP17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth &amp; Mineral Sciences</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (ENGR 382, ARL 123)</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Valley</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sciences &amp; Tech.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Law</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson Law</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (HMC 857, COM 292)</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Sciences</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuBois</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Allegheny</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont Alto</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuykill</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Scranton</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6314</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>6314</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Report on the Penn State Facilities and Administration Rate

(Informational)

THE CHARGE

The Senate charged the Committee on Research with creating an information report benchmarking Penn State’s overhead rate (currently 57%) with peer institutions. Questions to be addressed include:

- At what point do these overhead costs become a limiting factor on research productivity and our competitiveness to secure grant funding?
- Are there ways these overhead costs could be reduced, especially for young investigators?

BENCHMARKING

For FY 2017, facilities and administration (F&A) rates on federally funded grants across the Big 10 Academic Alliance (according to agreements posted on university websites) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Expiration Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>expires on 6/30/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penn State</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.2%</strong></td>
<td>expires on 6/30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>becomes 58% on 7/1/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>becomes 57.5% for 7/1/17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>becomes 56% for 7/1/18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>expires 6/30/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>(2015 rate; presumably still in effect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>expires 6/30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>(increases to 54.5% in FY 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>(expired 6/30/16; presumably still in effect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>expires on 6/30/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>expires 6/30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>becomes 54% in FY 2018 and 54% in FY 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>expired 6/30/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the University of Cincinnati, in FY 2015 the average F&A rate among all research universities was around 53%, with private universities averaging about 7% higher and public universities around 3% lower than the average. FY 2017 rates for selected private universities who rank in the top 20 nationally in research expenditures are as follows: MIT 54.7%, Stanford 57%, Duke 59%, and Johns Hopkins 63%.
DEFINITIONS

As at every university, sponsored research projects conducted at Penn State have both “direct” and “indirect” costs. “Direct costs” are those that can specifically and easily be identified with a particular project or activity and are allowable under the guidelines of the sponsoring organization. “Indirect costs” (also known as “overhead” or “facilities and administration costs” [F&A]) are those incurred for common or joint objectives, or that cannot be specifically and easily identified with a particular sponsored project. Such costs include building and equipment depreciation and use allowance; general administration; departmental administration; interest; operation and maintenance expenses; library expenses; and student administration and services expenses. An example of an administrative cost might be a portion of the salary for a payroll clerk who processes biweekly and monthly payroll for an employee being paid from a grant, since a portion of that clerk’s time is indirectly benefiting the grant. Most federal agencies and other sponsoring agencies pay the university for indirect costs in addition to the direct costs of a grant or contract award.

Indirect cost recovery is not income, but rather a reflection of the real cost of using the University’s facilities and administrative support that cannot be claimed as direct costs. By collecting F&A from sponsors, Penn State recovers those costs. Under guidelines established by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the federal government has established what costs may be charged as direct costs, and what is allowable as indirect costs. (The guidelines are contained in 2 CFR 200, Appendix III.)

It is important to note that under these guidelines administrative costs are capped at 26%. According to the OVPR this is several percentage points lower than actual administrative costs, particularly in light of increasing costs for compliance and reporting mandated by federal regulations. As a result, Penn State and most (if not all) research university under-recover in the area of administrative costs.

THE F&A RATE SETTING PROCESS

F&A rates on federally funded grants and contracts are set for each university by a designated “cognizant agency.” The cognizant agency is the entity that provides the largest share of federal dollars toward a given university’s sponsored research. That agency represents all others in establishing the university’s F&A rate. Although the National Institutes of Health serves in this role for many of our peer institutions, for Penn State the cognizant agency is the Office of Naval Research (ONR). (Among our Big 10 peers, Illinois is under the purview of ONR.) Penn State provides data and recommendations based on those data, which ONR considers in setting the rate. Although rate setting is often described as a “negotiation,” it is ONR that establishes the rate.

THE RECENT SIGNIFICANT F&A RATE INCREASE AT PENN STATE

In 2016, Penn State experienced a substantial F&A rate increase from 51.9% to 57.2%, causing concern among faculty and staff engaged in funded research. This significant jump was caused
by a change in 2011 in the implementation of policy at ONR to address over or under recovery. Prior to that time, ONR established a series of pre-determined rates for Penn State that were in place for three-year periods, after which data were re-examined and a new set of rates were established for the next three-year period. Since these rates were based on estimates of future activity, over recovery was absorbed by the federal government and under recovery by the university. In 2012, ONR shifted to a “fixed with carry forward” approach for Penn State. This means that a rate is set annually for the upcoming year and, once determined, any over- or under-recovery is incorporated and carried forward into the following year’s rate. In 2014, ONR questioned Penn State’s projection for a flat/shrinking “base” and increasing facility costs and held the rates at 49.5%, in spite of objections. The agency was then slow to determine the 2015 rate, establishing at first a “provisional” rate of 50.7% and then finally fixing it in June 2015 at 51.9%. At that time, our rate was the second lowest in the Big 10 Academic Alliance. In late August 2015, ONR established a provisional rate of 57.2% for FY 2016, making it the second highest among our Big 10 peers. This rate includes a substantial carry forward from under-recovery that would not have been necessary had ONR accepted Penn State’s 2014 projections.

**DISTRIBUTION OF F&A RECOVERY AT PENN STATE**

Of the F&A dollars received by Penn State, 12% are allocated to colleges based on who is involved with a sponsored project as measured by the assignment of credit submitted by the primary investigator(s). (That allocation percentage has been in place for some time, and it is unknown how closely it corresponds to actual costs at the college level.) This allocation is known as “Research Incentive Funds” (RIF). Each college follows its own procedure for keeping some RIF funds cover centralized costs and distributing some funds to units, who in turn have their own policies for keeping some funds at the unit level and distributing some to investigators engaged in sponsored research. The University Planning Committee undertakes a periodic report detailing how each college handles RIF funds.

Another part of RIF is the 1.5% allocation to the OVPR, which uses these funds for interdisciplinary initiatives.* The remaining 86.5% of F&A dollars recovered are kept centrally to defray indirect costs incurred by the university-wide research enterprise. At present, the university provides no public information regarding the breakdown of how these funds are spent.

*Note: The university-wide interdisciplinary institutes that report to the OVPR [Huck, MRI, ICS, IEE, and SSRI] do not receive budget allocations from F&A recovery, but rather are supported by general funds.

**IS THE CURRENT PENN STATE RATE AN IMPEDIMENT TO RESEARCH?**

The short answer is, “No.” While on the high end for top-tier public research universities, the current Penn State F&A rate is in line with that of peer institutions. As noted above, university administrators state that the current rate creates a situation in which the university under-recovers indirect costs incurred by the university’s research enterprise.
It is important to acknowledge that any increase in the F&A rate proportionally reduces direct costs that can be budgeted into capped funding opportunities. At the same time, a higher F&A rate equates to an increase in the funds available to cover indirect costs, creating and supporting services and infrastructure that serves investigators.

Faculty who have served on review panels acknowledge that funding won or lost on the quality of the proposal, not on the F&A rate.

**RECOMMENDATION: GREATER TRANSPARENCY**

At present, the OVPR has a “PSU F&A FAQ” available on its website (research.psu.edu/sites/default/files/FA%20FAQ%20%282016-11-22%29.pdf). Additional information is contained in Penn State Policy RA-30: “Facilities and Administrative (F&A) Costs” (guru.psu.edu/policies/RA30.html). Although these are important and necessary resources aimed at the research community—and grants administrators in particular—the Committee on Research urges the OVPR to consider additional communication tools that would help broadly disseminate information to the Penn State community with the aim of dispelling misperceptions about F&A, including how the rate is set and how that money is used. Making such resources available, and updating them regularly, would alleviate the current necessity of explaining these issues on an annual basis to the University Senate and others.

The model that the committee recommends is one based on the University of Minnesota’s “Facilities & Administrative Costs: What Faculty and Staff Need to Know,” (ospa.umn.edu/forms/rates/documents/FA_Brochure_2016.pdf) and (ospa.umn.edu/forms/documents/F&A_factsheet.pdf). The Minnesota document includes a detailed breakdown of actual and negotiated F&A costs. The Penn State OVPR and Office of the Controller have agreed to take a similar approach, and work is well underway on creating a similar document with the Committee’s input.

The Committee urges the OVPR to make public its process for spending the 1.5% of F&A returns allocated for interdisciplinary initiatives, as well as an annual list of initiatives supported in this manner.

In a similar vein, the Committee urges colleges and departments to communicate detailed information to faculty and staff regarding the allocation of RIF funds. Moreover, we urge colleges and departments to examine their current practices and to consider ways that the “incentive” in RIF can be best actualized in light of their respective research cultures and budgetary climates.

**LOOKING AHEAD**

Although the Committee concluded that the current F&A rate is not a significant impediment to research productivity, it did discuss other possible impediments. One issue that emerged as an
item of potential future study was graduate tuition as a significant cost in relation to funded research. The Committee would be happy to examine this issue, should the Senate wish it do so.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Summary of Petitions by College, Campus, and Unit 2015-2016

(Informational)

The Senate permits students to petition for exceptions to the Senate academic rules found in the *Policies and Rules for Undergraduate Students*. Exceptions to these policies are the responsibility of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education. The committee reports annually to the Senate on student petition actions. This report provides a summary of petitions by colleges and campuses.

The petition provides an opportunity for the student to receive consideration on extenuating circumstances affecting his/her progress. A petition typically contains a letter and transcript from the student, and supporting documents from advisers, instructors, physicians, or other appropriate professionals. The final decision by the Subcommittee on Academic Standards represents an effort to weigh the personal circumstances of the individual while maintaining the academic standards of the University.

Note that there was an increase in the number of retroactive late drop petitions for 2015-2016, partly due to Senate approval of the elimination of the late drop credit limit, effective Fall 2016 semester. The Faculty Senate, in collaboration with the Division of Undergraduate Studies, and the Office of Undergraduate Education developed an expedited approval process for retroactive late drop petitions with the following guidelines:

Petitions that requested to exceed the late drop credit limit for a semester/session no earlier than Fall 2015 and where the students provided clear evidence that they intended to late drop within the proper deadline for doing so should be allowed to exceed the former credit limit as the legislation intends (16 for undergraduates in baccalaureate programs and 10 for non-degree, degree-seeking provisional, or undergraduates in an associate degree program).
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## COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF PETITIONS
### 2014-2015; 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Architecture</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div. of Undergrad. Studies</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Mineral Sciences</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Dev.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sci. &amp; Tech.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuBois</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Allegheny</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont Alto</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Scranton</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1533</strong></td>
<td><strong>1219</strong></td>
<td><strong>273</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>1294</strong></td>
<td><strong>18%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data for the 2014-2015 academic year may be slightly different than in previous reports due to ongoing process updates and subsequent data entry corrections.

**There was an increase in the number of petitions for 2015-2016 partly due to Senate approval of the elimination of the late drop credit limit on October 27, 2015.

**NOTE:** Data represents the total number of petitions submitted for each academic unit. These numbers include specialized petitions where applicable (i.e., World Campus, eLion, Trauma, and Appeal petitions).
## PETITIONS BY UNIT AND CASE TYPE
### 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College or Campus</th>
<th>Academic Renewal</th>
<th>Corrected Grade</th>
<th>Course Cancel</th>
<th>Late Add</th>
<th>Late Drop</th>
<th>Late Registration</th>
<th>Registration Cancel</th>
<th>Withdrawal</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Architecture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div. of Undergrad. Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Mineral Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sci. &amp; Tech.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### University College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University College</th>
<th>Academic Renewal</th>
<th>Corrected Grade</th>
<th>Course Cancel</th>
<th>Late Add</th>
<th>Late Drop</th>
<th>Late Registration</th>
<th>Registration Cancel</th>
<th>Withdrawal</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuBois</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Allegheny</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont Alto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Scranton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS** 6 9 13 54 855* 65 6 490 35

*There was an increase in the number of retroactive late drop petitions for 2015-2016 partly due to Senate approval of the elimination of the late drop credit limit on October 27, 2015.

**NOTE:** Data represents the total number of petitions per case type for each academic unit. These numbers include specialized petitions where applicable (i.e., World Campus, eLion, Trauma, and Appeal petitions).
INCREASE/DECREASE IN SUBMITTED PETITIONS BY CASE TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Type</th>
<th>2014-2015*</th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>% of Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Renewal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Grade</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Cancel</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Add</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Drop***</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Registration</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Cancel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1294</strong></td>
<td><strong>1533</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Campus</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLion</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data for the 2014-2015 academic year may be slightly different than in previous reports due to ongoing updates and subsequent data entry corrections.

**Examples of petitions in the “other” category: exceeding the 12-credit scheduling limit for Non-degree Conditional students; changing registration of a course to reflect the number of credits completed for internships; taking an additional semester/session in non-degree status past the 30-credit limit.

***There was an increase in the number of retroactive late drop petitions for 2015-2016 partly due to Senate approval of the elimination of the late drop credit limit on October 27, 2015.

NOTE:
- A **World Campus petition** is one that involves requests for courses taken through World Campus.
- An **eLion petition** is one where a student indicates the failure of eLion as the basis of the petition.
- A **Trauma petition** is one where the student’s circumstances require unusual confidentiality (e.g., the victim of a sexual assault or violent crime).
- An **Appeal petition** is one where a student provides additional documentation to support a previously denied request.
### THREE-YEAR SUMMARY OF PETITIONS BY CASE TYPE

**2013-2014; 2014-2015; 2015-2016**

#### Academic Year: 2013-2014*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Type</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Granted</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Cncl/Pndg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Renewal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Grade</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Cancel</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Add</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Drop</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Registration</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Cancel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data for the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 academic years may be slightly different than in previous reports due to ongoing process updates and subsequent data entry corrections.

#### Academic Year: 2014-2015*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Type</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Granted</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Cncl/Pndg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Renewal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Grade</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Cancel</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Add</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Drop</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Registration</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Cancel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Academic Year: 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Type</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Granted</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Cncl/Pndg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Renewal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Grade</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Cancel</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Add</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Drop***</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Registration</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Cancel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data for the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 academic years may be slightly different than in previous reports due to ongoing process updates and subsequent data entry corrections.

**Examples of petitions in the “other” category: exceeding the 12-credit scheduling limit for Non-degree Conditional students; changing registration of a course to reflect the number of credits completed for internships; taking an additional semester/session in non-degree status past the 30-credit limit.

***There was an increase in the number of retroactive late drop petitions for the 2015-2016 academic year due to Senate approval of the elimination of the late drop credit limit on October 27, 2015.
THREE-YEAR SUMMARY OF SPECIALIZED PETITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year: 2013-2014*</th>
<th>Case Type</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Granted</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Cncl/Pndg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Campus</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLion</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year: 2014-2015*</th>
<th>Case Type</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Granted</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Cncl/Pndg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Campus</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLion</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year: 2015-2016</th>
<th>Case Type</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Granted</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Cncl/Pndg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Campus</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLion</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data for the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 academic years may be slightly different than in previous reports due to ongoing updates and subsequent data entry corrections.

NOTE:
- A **World Campus petition** is one that involves requests for courses taken through World Campus.
- An **eLion petition** is one where a student indicates the failure of eLion as the basis of the petition.
- A **Trauma petition** is one where a student’s circumstances require unusual confidentiality (e.g., the victim of a sexual assault or violent crime).
- An **Appeal petition** is one where the student provides additional documentation to support a previously denied request.

**NOTE:** Numbers of specialized petitions displayed here are also included in the Comparative Summary of Petitions by College/Campus above. Data for specialized petitions is tracked due to specific interest in the numbers of World Campus, eLion, Trauma, and Appeal petitions submitted.
# FIVE-YEAR SUMMARY OF MENTAL HEALTH RELATED PETITIONS

## 2011-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Petitions Submitted</th>
<th>% of Mental Health Related Petitions based on TOTAL Number of Petitions Submitted</th>
<th>% of Mental Health Related Petitions based on Number of WITHDRAWAL AND LATE DROP Petitions Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Mental Health Related petitions are any that involve mental health issues (e.g., anxiety, depression, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)). Generally, mental health related petitions are for retroactive withdrawals and retroactive late drops. Therefore, it is important to reflect these data in the report, along with the percentages of the total number of petitions submitted.
MINUTES OF SENATE COUNCIL
Tuesday, January 10, 2017 – 1:30 p.m.
102 Kern Graduate Building


Absent: M. Ansari, S. Geisinger, K. Jablokow, B. Szczygieł, M. Woessner

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Strauss called the meeting to order at 1:37 p.m. on Tuesday, January 10, 2017, in 102 Kern Graduate Building.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF November 15, 2016

The minutes of the November 15, 2016, meeting were approved on a Brunsden/Nousek motion with one correction.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

Chair Strauss welcomed all members and guests.

Additional announcements by Chair Strauss:
• The Faculty Advisory Committee meeting was not held due to a conflict on President Barron’s calendar.

• Chair Strauss announced that an FAC meeting and Senate Council meeting are scheduled for Tuesday, February 21, 2017. Senators are invited to send Chair Strauss questions to ask at that meeting.

Executive Vice President and Provost Jones gave an update on several administrative position searches. Hari M. Osofsky is the successful candidate for Dean of Penn State Law and the
School of International Affairs. The searches for the University Budget Officer and the Dean of the Schreyer Honors College are underway. Searches for deans of Engineering and Earth and Mineral Sciences will begin soon. Holly Beaver has accepted the position of executive assistant to the provost. Implementation of the strategic plan continues. A series of regional forums will be held on various campuses to gather ideas on implementing the plan.

Vice Provost Blannie Bowen is seeking nominations for Penn State Laureate. The Academic Leadership Forum scheduled for February 3.

Vice President Madlyn Hanes announced the new chancellor of Wilkes Barre, Vernon Dale Jones. The search for the chancellor of Dubois is ongoing.

Vice President Rob Pangborn reported 60,000 applications for fall 2017 have been received to date, about 2% more than this time last year. University Park offers are about 6% lower than last year, to adjust enrollment. Paid accepts at other campuses are about 21% higher than last year whereas University Park paid accepts are intentionally lower. The summer Discovery Grant program is accepting applications. The Raise.Me program is being updated and improved.

Interim Vice Provost Renata Engel will be invited to future meetings, replacing Craig Weidemann, who has taken on other responsibilities during his phased retirement.

Marcus Whitehurst reminded councilors of the Martin Luther King Jr. celebration events, particularly the Evening Celebration on January 20 from 6-8 p.m. in Schwab Auditorium.

Senate officers had no comments

Executive Director Hagen announced he will retire on June 30, 2017. The search process will be conducted by the Provost’s office.

Councilors had no questions or comments.

ACTION ITEMS: none

DISCUSSION ITEMS

On behalf of Vice President Susan Basso, Gerald Henry gave a presentation on proposed restructuring of various university policies. Counselors provided input on the process and items needing clarification for presentation to the Senate.

REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

Minutes from the November 16, 2016, Graduate Council meeting and the draft minutes of the December 14, 2016, 2016 meeting are available on the Graduate School website. Steinn Sigurdsson pointed out some key issues being discussed in Graduate Council.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR JANUARY 24, 2017
FORENSIC BUSINESS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON OUTREACH, Faculty Preparation for Online Teaching. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Aynardi/Eckhardt motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT LIFE, Counseling and Psychological Services for Students. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Brunsden/Rowland motion. Fifteen minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS, Recommendation for Standardizing Fixed Term Titles across Units. This report was planned to be Advisory Consultative but upon Council recommendation, will first be presented as a forensic discussion at the January 24 meeting. Chair Strauss will work with the Committee Chair Michael Berube to create questions for discussion.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Strauss reminded Council members that the resolution from Abington, introduced by Judy Ozment at the December 6, 2016 meeting, will be open for discussion and possible action at the January 24 meeting.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES, Establishment of the Standing Joint Committee for General Education Assessment. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Aynardi/Eckhardt motion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES, Revisions to Senate Bylaws Article II Section 1. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Smithwick/Wolfe motion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES, Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article I Section 11. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Eckhardt/Aynardi motion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES, Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article I Section 12. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Brunsden/Eckhardt motion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION, Change to Senate Policy 43-00 (Syllabus). This report was returned to committee for clarification and potential revisions.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID, Endowed Scholarships. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Szczygiel/Brunsden motion.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT, Addressing Issues of Classroom Climate and Bias in the Classroom. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Eckhardt/Brunsden motion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS, Recommendation for Standardizing Fixed Term Titles across Units. This report will first be presented as a forensic discussion at the January 24 meeting. Chair Strauss will work with the committee chair to create questions for discussion. Following input from those Jan 24th discussions, an Advisory and Consultative Report will be developed and presented in the near future.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS, The Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits, the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits, and the Health Care Advisory Committee: Coordination of Duties. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Smithwick/Aynardi motion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS, Recommendations for Third Party Administrator (TPA) Choice for Penn State Medical and Prescription Drug Coverage. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Aynardi/Rowland motion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS, Disciplinary Communities Revisited. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Myers/Smithwick motion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS, Equivalence of Courses Across the University. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Aynardi/Rowland motion.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID, Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wolfe/Rowland motion as web only. There will be no presentation.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID and EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT, Penn State Veterans – Historical Perspectives. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Brunsden/Eckhardt motion. Five minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON CURRICULAR AFFAIRS, Update on Assessment and Accreditation. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Aynardi/Rowland motion. Five minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

ELECTIONS COMMISSION, University Faculty Census Report 2017-2018. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Brunsden/Rowland motion as web only. There will be no presentation.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON GLOBAL PROGRAMS, Program Goals for Global Penn State: Student Participation, Diversity, and Comparison to Peer Institutions. This report was placed on
the Agenda on a Myers/Rowland motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and
discussion. The report will be presented as the first informational report at the meeting.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, Report on the Penn State Facilities and
Administration Rate. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wolfe/Brunsden motion. Five
minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION, Summary of
Petitions by College, Campus, and Unit 2015-2016. This report was placed on the
Agenda on a Brunsden/Rowland motion as web only. There will be no presentation.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
The agenda was approved on a Nousek/Aynardi motion.

NEW BUSINESS
None

ADJOURNMENT
Chair Strauss thanked Council members for their attendance and participation. The meeting was
adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Daniel R. Hagen
Executive Director
Date: January 17, 2017

To: All Senators and Committee Members

From: Daniel R. Hagen, Executive Director

Following is the time and location of all Senate meetings January 23 and 24, 2017. Please notify the Senate office and committee chair if you are unable to attend.

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 2017

6:30 p.m. Officers and Chairs Meeting – 102 Kern Graduate Building

8:15 p.m. Commonwealth Caucus Meeting – 102 Kern Graduate Building

TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 2017

8:00 a.m.

   Intercollegiate Athletics – 502 Keller Building

8:30 a.m.

   Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid – 203 Shields Building
   Committees and Rules – 201 Kern Graduate Building
   Curricular Affairs – 102 Kern Graduate Building
   Educational Equity and Campus Environment – 213 Business Building
   Faculty Affairs – 202 Hammond Building
   Faculty Benefits – 519 J.R. Elliot Building
   Intra-University Relations – 504 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building
   Outreach – 216 Business Building
   Research – 214 Business Building
   University Planning – 324 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building
9:00 a.m.

Global Programs – 412 Boucke Building

Libraries, Information Systems and Technology – 510A Paterno Library

Undergraduate Education – 110C Chandlee Lab

9:30 a.m.

Student Life – 409H Keller Building

11:15 a.m.

Commonwealth Caucus Meeting - Nittany Lion Inn Assembly Room

1:30 p.m.

University Faculty Senate – 112 Kern Graduate Building
Date: January 17, 2017

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

From: Galen Grimes and Nicholas Rowland, Caucus Co-chairs

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 2017 – 8:15 PM
102 KERN BUILDING

Guest Speakers:

Madlyn Hanes, Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses
Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost

To join the evening caucus meeting remotely, please dial 440351 for video or 814-867-5845 and enter the ID# 440351 for phone.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 2017 – 11:15 AM
ASSEMBLY ROOM, NITTANY LION INN

A buffet luncheon will be provided at 12:15 p.m.

Agenda

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