



THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

The University Faculty Senate

AGENDA

Tuesday, December 6, 2016 – 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 October 18, 2016, Meeting in The Senate Record 50:2

B. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report of November 15, 2016

Appendix A

2017-2018 Senate Calendar

Appendix B

C. REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – Meeting of November 15, 2016

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

Global Programs

Embedded Study Abroad Courses: planning, resources, challenges, implementation

[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Appendix C

H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (*Motion to be voted on at the December 6, 2016 meeting*)

LionPATH Resolution  
(Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture) Appendix D

I. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid and  
Undergraduate Education Appendix E

Revisions to Senate Policy 48-40 and 48-50

Committee on Committees and Rules

Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article II Section 6(o)  
Committee on University Planning Appendix F

J. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

K. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Special Committee on University Governance

Follow-Up Report and Recommendations for Improving Governance  
and Communications and Furthering the Academic Mission at Penn State  
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion] Appendix G

Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid

Articulation Agreement Review  
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion] Appendix H

Scholarship Report 2015-16  
[5 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion] Appendix I

Curricular Affairs

Submission of Curricular Proposals  
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion] Appendix J

Educational Equity and Campus Environment

Millennium Scholars Program  
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion] Appendix K

Faculty Benefits

Third Party Administrative Services for Penn State's  
Medical and Prescription Drug Plan  
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion] Appendix L

Penn State Employee Health and Wellness Center  
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion] Appendix M

Report on Childcare at Penn State University  
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion] Appendix N

#### Research

Drug Testing Program for Penn State's Defense Related Research  
Units, Applied Research Laboratory (ARL) and Electro-Optics Center (EOC)  
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion] Appendix O

#### New Member Reports

Undergraduate Education\* Appendix P

University Planning\* Appendix Q

\* No Presentation of reports marked with an asterisk.

#### 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, January 24, 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.



**PennState**  
University Faculty Senate

101 Kern Graduate Building  
University Park, PA 16802  
Phone: 814-863-0221

*COMMUNICATION TO THE SENATE*

**DATE:** November 16, 2016

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

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

The *Senate Curriculum Report* dated November 15, 2016 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](mailto:kkw2@psu.edu), on or before **December 15, 2016**.

The *Senate Curriculum Report* is available on the web and may be found at: <http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/senate-curriculum-reports/>

### 2017-2018 SENATE CALENDAR

<b>Council Reports and Curriculum Proposals Due</b>	<b>Senate Council Meetings and Curriculum Report Publication Date</b>	<b>Senate Meetings</b>
August 4, 2017	August 22, 2017	September 12, 2017
September 15, 2017	October 3, 2017	October 17, 2017
October 27, 2017	November 14, 2017	December 5, 2017
December 15, 2017	January 9, 2018	January 23, 2018
February 2, 2018	February 20, 2018	March 13, 2018
March 23, 2018	April 10, 2018	April 24, 2018
	June 26, 2018	

## **SENATE COMMITTEE ON GLOBAL PROGRAMS**

### Embedded Study Abroad Courses: planning, resources, challenges, implementation

(Forensic)

The Global Programs Committee will lead a 15 minute Forensic Discussion on the challenges, needs, and opportunities faculty encounter arranging, marketing, and executing a short-term, embedded study abroad courses.

Our Global Programs Committee's intention is to secure feed-back from faculty and students about embedded study abroad course opportunities and create discussions and opportunities to allow more faculty and students to participate in these experiences. Being appreciative of everyone's time and opinions, we will pilot an instant Slido.com Audience Poll technology, allowing everyone in the audience to text their responses and questions anonymously for all to see on the screen (we will capture the responses for review). The two questions to be considered for our discussion are:

1. What steps would you recommend to encourage more students to participate in short-term embedded study abroad courses?
2. What resources would you recommend to encourage faculty from all campuses to lead short-term embedded study abroad courses?

Our discussion will feature a faculty member, experienced in embedded abroad course offerings, leading a discussion on the opportunities such courses represent, as well as the challenges faced by faculty including funding, marketing, registration and documentation, associated paper work, and risk management.

Complementing the faculty perspective, an outstanding student, Nick Miller, Smeal College of Business, majoring in finance, will speak on the transformative impact numerous study abroad experiences had on his Penn State education. Through programs available at PSU Lehigh Valley, Nick participated in two abroad trips to Peru and The Netherlands. Additionally, he completed an international Internship in Finance in Tunisia. Nick started a drone business through INVENT PSU and Lehigh Valley LaunchBOX, established an international philanthropy, and has now traveled to 20 plus countries. He completed a Co-op experience with Price Waterhouse Coopers and an internship with JP Morgan. Nick had employment opportunities with JP Morgan, Price Waterhouse, and IBM, and eventually chose a position with IBM. In all cases, Nick's international experiences helped to differentiate himself from other competitive applicants.

### **Senate Committee on Global Programs:**

Michel Adewumi  
Augustin Banyaga  
Timothy Farley  
L. Sam Finn  
Andrew Freiberg  
Dennis Jett Vice Chair

Jvotsna Kalavar  
Michael Krajsa Chair  
Nancy Luke  
Sinfree Makoni  
Joshua Pannaman  
Jackie Schwab  
Jim Song  
Emmanuel Teye  
Nicole Webster

**CORRECTED COPY**

**(Shaded areas in [square brackets] reflect changes made before and during the Senate meeting. )**

**LionPATH RESOLUTION**

Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture

(Legislative)

WHEREAS, the LionPath Project has caused interference and delays with our admissions process;

WHEREAS, the LionPATH Project has exhibited ongoing difficulties issuing transcripts, degree audits, and transfer credits; and

WHEREAS, continued problems with LionPath adversely impacts student financial aid and tuition payments.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the University Faculty Senate finds this situation to be unacceptable and urges, effective immediately, that the implementation of LionPATH be halted for at least one semester or until the problems are under control, and in the interim be replaced with our existing e-Lion system; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the University Faculty Senate urges that an assessment be conducted as soon as possible to explore how software upgrades, newer programs, alternative software, or other methods might more effectively accommodate the needs of the Penn State Student Information System.

---

**Amended Resolution Brought to Senate Floor 12/6**

WHEREAS, the LionPath Project has caused interference and delays with our admissions process;

WHEREAS, the LionPATH Project has exhibited ongoing difficulties issuing transcripts, degree audits, and transfer credits; and

WHEREAS, continued problems with LionPath adversely impacts student financial aid and tuition payments.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the University Faculty Senate finds this situation to be unacceptable and urges, effective immediately, that ~~the implementation of LionPATH be halted for at least one semester or until the problems are under control, and in the interim be replaced with our existing e-Lion system; and,~~ **that partial functionality be returned to e-Lion to mitigate the current noted shortcomings and supplement the primary operation of the LionPATH system, until effective functionality of LionPath is established; and,** Revised before Senate Meeting.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the University Faculty Senate urges that an assessment be conducted as soon as possible to explore how software upgrades, newer programs, alternative software, or other methods might more effectively accommodate the needs of the Penn State Student Information System.

---



**Final Version Approved by Senate 12/6**

WHEREAS, the LionPath Project has caused interference and delays with our admissions process;

WHEREAS, the LionPATH Project has exhibited ongoing difficulties issuing transcripts, degree audits, and transfer credits; and

WHEREAS, continued problems with LionPath adversely impacts student financial aid and tuition payments.

~~[THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the University Faculty Senate finds this situation to be unacceptable and urges, effective immediately, that the implementation of LionPATH be halted for at least one semester or until the problems are under control, and in the interim be replaced with our existing e-Lion system; and, that partial functionality be returned to e-Lion to mitigate the current noted shortcomings and supplement the primary operation of the LionPATH system, until effective functionality of LionPath is established; and,]~~ Revised during Senate Meeting.

BE IT RESOLVED, the University Faculty Senate urges that an assessment be conducted as soon as possible to explore how software upgrades, newer programs, alternative software, or other methods might more effectively accommodate the needs of the Penn State Student Information System.

**Clean Copy Approved by Senate 12/6**

WHEREAS, the LionPath Project has caused interference and delays with our admissions process;

WHEREAS, the LionPATH Project has exhibited ongoing difficulties issuing transcripts, degree audits, and transfer credits; and

WHEREAS, continued problems with LionPath adversely impacts student financial aid and tuition payments.

BE IT RESOLVED, the University Faculty Senate urges that an assessment be conducted as soon as possible to explore how software upgrades, newer programs, alternative software, or other methods might more effectively accommodate the needs of the Penn State Student Information System.

---

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING,  
AND STUDENT AID and UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION**

Revisions to Senate Policy 48-40 and 48-50

(Legislative)

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

**Introduction**

The current legislation is being proposed to clarify language for grade reporting.

**Discussion and Rationale**

Policies 48-40 and 48-50 are being reworded slightly to clear up any confusion as to when the grade reporting should be complete for students earning a deferred grade or no grade. If an instructor does not submit a grade for a student by the grade-reporting deadline and a deferred grade was not requested and approved (see policy 48-40), the symbol NG (no grade) appears on the student's transcript until a grade is submitted. Currently, the policy states the grade reporting is at the end date of the course as it appears in the schedule of courses. However, the end date of the course does not include the final exam period. In order to aid the University Registrar's office with determining when the deferred and no grades are due, the following changes are proposed. The Academic Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual was examined to see how the implementation of grades works. It stated the following in G:1- Grade Reporting: *Courses may be graded starting the day following the defined calendar end-date of the course. Grades are to be recorded no later than two business days after the final examination or final course assessment.* It was decided the term "grade reporting deadline" was more accurate language to use rather than "end date of the course."

**Recommendations**

ARSSA and UE suggest the following edits be made to 48-40 and 48-50.

**Revised Policy/Policies (when applicable)**

**48-40 Deferred Grades**

If, for reasons beyond the student's control, a student is prevented from completing a course within the prescribed time, the grade in that course may be deferred with the concurrence of the instructor. The symbol DF appears on the student's transcript until the course has been completed. Non-emergency permission for filing a deferred grade must be requested by the student before the beginning of the final examination period. In an emergency situation, an instructor can approve a deferred grade after the final exam period has started. Under emergency conditions during which the instructor is unavailable, authorization is required from one of the following: the dean of the college in which the candidate is enrolled; the executive director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies if the student is enrolled in that division; the campus chancellor of the student's commonwealth campus.

In certain courses where normal work of the course extends beyond the scheduled period, deferment may be granted routinely for all students in the course if prior approval of the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs has been obtained.

The period during which a grade may be deferred shall not extend beyond ten weeks following the **grade reporting deadline** ~~end date of the course (as it appears in the schedule of courses)~~ **DELETE**. A deferred grade that is not changed to a quality grade by the instructor before the end of this period automatically becomes an F. A deferred grade that is automatically converted to an F can later be corrected in accordance with Senate Policy 48-30. Students with DF on their transcripts will not be allowed to graduate.

#### **48-40 Deferred Grades (clean copy)**

If, for reasons beyond the student's control, a student is prevented from completing a course within the prescribed time, the grade in that course may be deferred with the concurrence of the instructor. The symbol DF appears on the student's transcript until the course has been completed. Non-emergency permission for filing a deferred grade must be requested by the student before the beginning of the final examination period. In an emergency situation, an instructor can approve a deferred grade after the final exam period has started. Under emergency conditions during which the instructor is unavailable, authorization is required from one of the following: the dean of the college in which the candidate is enrolled; the executive director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies if the student is enrolled in that division; the campus chancellor of the student's commonwealth campus.

In certain courses where normal work of the course extends beyond the scheduled period, deferment may be granted routinely for all students in the course if prior approval of the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs has been obtained.

The period during which a grade may be deferred shall not extend beyond ten weeks following the **grade reporting deadline**. A deferred grade that is not changed to a quality grade by the instructor before the end of this period automatically becomes an F. A deferred grade that is automatically converted to an F can later be corrected in accordance with Senate Policy 48-30. Students with DF on their transcripts will not be allowed to graduate.

#### **48-50 No Grade**

If an instructor does not submit a grade for a student by the grade-reporting deadline and a deferred grade was not requested and approved (see policy 48-40), the symbol NG (no grade) appears on the student's transcript until a grade is submitted.

The NG is to be reconciled within five weeks following the ~~posting of the NG~~ **DELETE grade reporting deadline**. If a grade is not forthcoming by that deadline, the registrar's office shall automatically change the NG to an F. A ~~missing~~ **DELETE NG** grade that is automatically converted to an F can later be corrected in accordance with Senate Policy 48-30. Students with NG on their transcripts will not be allowed to graduate.

**48-50 No Grade (clean copy)**

If an instructor does not submit a grade for a student by the grade-reporting deadline and a deferred grade was not requested and approved (see policy 48-40), the symbol NG (no grade) appears on the student's transcript until a grade is submitted.

The NG is to be reconciled within five weeks following the **grade reporting deadline**. If a grade is not forthcoming by that deadline, the registrar's office shall automatically change the NG to an F. A **NG** grade that is automatically converted to an F can later be corrected in accordance with Senate Policy 48-30. Students with NG on their transcripts will not be allowed to graduate.

**Effective Date**

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

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

- Charles Abdalla
- Steven Andelin
- Martha Aynardi
- Daniel Beaver
- Clark Brigger
- Wei-Fan Chen
- Madhuri Desai
- Maura Ellsworth
- Galen Grimes
- Anna Griswold
- Michel M. Haigh, Chair
- Harold Hayford, Vice Chair
- Robert Kubat
- George Samuel
- Douglas Wolfe

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION**

- Andrew Ahr
- Jesse Barlow
- Barbara Barr
- Paul Bartell
- Kathy Bieschke
- Linda Caldwell
- Gretchen Casper
- Richard Duschl
- David Eggebeen, Co-Vice Chair
- Joyce Furfaro

- Yvonne Gaudelius
- Sammy Geisinger
- David Han
- Claire Kelly
- Ellen Knodt
- Keefe Manning, Chair
- Karen Pollack
- Janina Safran
- David Smith
- Samia Suliman
- Mary Beth Williams
- Matthew Wilson, Co-Vice Chair
- Richard Young

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

### Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article II Section 6(o) Committee on University Planning

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate

#### Rationale

The committee reviewed mandated reports and concluded that the Space Allocation and Utilization Report should be changed from an annual report to a Biennial report. There are usually not significant space allocation changes each year to warrant a report. The University Planning Committee can decide to sponsor a Space Allocation and Utilization Report more frequently if there are significant changes to report to the Senate. In addition, over time the Committee has been consulted on additional facets of planning for University functions; these facets should be reflected in the Committee's scope.

#### Proposed Changes to Senate Standing Rules (additions in bold type)

The Committee on University Planning solely and in consultation with other committees, shall report on and/or propose action on matters of University planning that affect development and alumni relations, physical plant resources, and the academic and financial policies of the University. In accordance with the Constitutional advisory and consultative roles of the Senate, specific areas of responsibilities include but are not limited to: the allocation of resources among units and functions as they relate to educational policy; academic planning, **strategic planning**, development planning, and campus and physical planning **including safety and security of persons, buildings, and other facilities.**

The committee shall be the primary Senate body advisory to the Office of the President, including the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer, Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations, and the Executive Vice President/Provost, for all planning functions; and shall review those functions of the University that contribute to the planning processes. The committee shall participate in the development and review of the master plans for each of the University's campuses and be consulted regularly in regards to proposed changes to those plans. In addition, this committee shall assist in creating an understanding of the University's planning functions among all units within the University. The committee shall have access to all information necessary to perform their charge.

#### Mandated Reports

- a. Annual Construction Report
- b. ~~Annual~~ **Biennial** Space Allocation and Utilization Report
- c. Annual University Budget and Planning Report
- d. Biennial Development and Alumni Relations Report

The Committee on University Planning shall have the authority to approve its mandated Informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

#### 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

## **SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE**

### Follow-Up Report and Recommendations for Improving Governance and Communications and Furthering the Academic Mission at Penn State

(Informational)

The Special Committee on University Governance is a panel of faculty, administrators, staff, students, and alumni appointed by the Senate Chair in the aftermath of the events of November 2011 to study the structure and practices of the Board of Trustees and to make recommendations for improving governance and communications at Penn State. To achieve its charge, the Special Committee consulted extensively with experts, reviewed the literature on best practices in higher education, benchmarked Penn State with other institutions, interviewed a wide variety of constituent groups, and conferred frequently with the Board leadership and other interested parties. Its report was presented to and unanimously approved in a voice vote by the Senate in March 2013. The executive summary of the report appears at Appendix A, and the full report is on the Senate website at <http://senate.psu.edu/senators/special-committees/special-committee-on-university-governance/reports-and-resources/appendix-d/>.

The Senate Chair recently reconvened the Special Committee with following charge:

- Review the changes since the initial report in governance structures and practices and lines of communications among the Faculty, Administration, and the Board of Trustees,
- Report on the disposition of the Senate's recommendations for reform, and
- With the benefit of hindsight, assess whether any of its initial recommendations should be clarified, modified, or dropped and whether any additional recommendations are warranted.

### **Overview**

Since the Special Committee's initial report, the Board of Trustees has made significant and meaningful progress toward improving the governance of the University, expanding means by which an academic perspective can be more fully considered in its decision making, and enhancing its communication with the University community. Of particular interest to the Senate are the addition of an Academic Trustee to the Board's voting membership, inviting faculty representatives to participate in Board committees on a non-voting basis, and holding regular three-way consultative meetings among the leadership of the Board, Senate, and Administration. Yet, in the view of the Special Committee, more can and should be done to increase academic expertise and diversity in Board membership and to ensure mutual understanding between the Board and academic institution that it governs.



After careful review, the Special Committee reaffirms its previous findings and recommendations and, more important, the underlying philosophy of its initial report. Accordingly, it is important that the Senate be pro-active in working with the Board to achieve those goals previously endorsed by the body.

### **Summary of Previous Report and Recommendations**

In its previous report, the Special Committee concluded that there is significant opportunity for the Board of Trustees, like most higher education governing boards nationally, to gain a better understanding of the mission, values, unique structures, and operating systems of the complex academic institution that it governs. While Board members oftentimes bring a wealth of business and government experience, they may not have a commensurate level of experience in higher education or a thorough understanding of how universities advance knowledge for the benefit of society.

The Special Committee offered recommendations for bridging the cultural gap between the academic core of the University and its governing board. The Committee suggested that one of the best means of ensuring that the Board is in tune with the academic mission is to select more members who have academic expertise and professional experience in higher education. Those members, the Special Committee recommended, should include current Penn State faculty members. Other recommendations were to place greater emphasis on selecting Board members based on their qualifications to perform critical governance functions rather than on what groups they might represent and to diversify its membership in terms of both demographics and sectors and interests reflecting the modern mission of the University.

In the belief that effective communication is a necessary condition of effective governance, the Special Committee further offered recommendations for opening new and expanding existing lines of communication within the University. Those recommendations, if adopted in tandem with appropriate organizational and policy changes, should improve the flow of information throughout the University community and ensure that all participants in governance are fully informed on important issues facing Penn State.

Further, the Special Committee observed that effective communication can only take place in an environment of trust. Therefore, a high priority should be to strengthen trust and a shared understanding within the University community. Achieving that will be difficult – if not impossible – without developing a culture of collaboration and civility among the Board and other stakeholders dedicated to the well-being of Penn State and its important work.

A full listing of the Special Committee's specific recommendations appears in its previous report linked on the Senate website and at Appendix B below.

## **What Has Transpired Since the Previous Report?**

In March 2012, then Chair of the Board of Trustees Karen Peetz addressed the University Faculty Senate. She emphasized, among other important matters, the need for a wide-ranging dialogue in the University community about potential changes in governance structures and that the Board was “interested in opening up a debate ... of what is the best practice Penn State can have in terms of how we govern ourselves and how we move forward.”

The Senate Chair shortly thereafter charged the Special Committee on University Governance to study the Board’s structure, functions, and practices and to make recommendations for improving the governance at Penn State with special emphasis on enhancing the Board’s interaction with faculty, students, administration, and staff. The Administration pledged support for the Special Committee’s work, and Board Chair Peetz and her eventual successor Vice Chair Keith Masser met with the Committee.

Since the Senate received and voted to endorse the report of the Special Committee in March 2013, much has changed regarding the Board’s structure and practices and the governance of the University. In May 2013 and again in November 2014, the Board amended its Charter, Bylaws, and Standing Orders in several important ways. Some of those changes have been applauded inside and outside the University; others have been the subject of criticism.

The Board’s most-extensive reform package in 2014 was the culmination of a year-long, contentious debate within the Penn State community. A wide variety of proposals were floated regarding the size, structure, composition, and procedures of the Board; various stakeholders and interest groups lobbied aggressively for their preferred outcome; and there was extensive media coverage of the process. Unfortunately, in the Special Committee’s opinion, the debate focused on what sectors or interest groups gained or lost representation on the Board and how the members were selected with little discussion about the qualifications and skill sets of Board members (especially academic experience or expertise) needed to govern a complex academic institution.

The following external entities were particularly relevant in the Board’s deliberations and decision making regarding governance reform. The extent to which the recommendations of those entities are consistent with the institutional autonomy, shared governance, and the academic mission of Penn State should be of concern to and monitored by the Senate (SCUG Recommendation 8):

- **NCAA.** In 2012, Penn State signed a Consent Decree and Academic Integrity Agreement with the NCAA legally binding the University to make changes in its governance recommended in the Freeh Report. In its previous report, the Special Committee cautioned that some of the Freeh recommendations were ill-informed about university governance, especially the faculty’s role in shared governance, and could prove to be counter-productive. The Consent Decree has since been repealed and dissolved. Consequently, the governance changes legally mandated by the decree now

may and should be re-evaluated to determine if they currently are in the University's best interests.

- **Auditor General.** In 2012, the previous Auditor General released a report critical of Penn State's governance structures and procedures and called for legislation to enact some of his recommendations, especially related to the composition and selection methods of the Board. (See Tables 1 and 2 below.) The Special Committee similarly expressed concern about some of the recommendations and, more importantly, his seeming misunderstanding of university governance and the faculty's role in it. (N.B. The current Auditor General recently announced an audit of Penn State that would include the extent to which his predecessor's recommendations have been implemented.)
- **State Senate.** In what was clearly intended to be a counterpoint to the governance reform proposal of the Board leadership, Senate Bill 1240 "Pennsylvania State University Board of Trustees Reorganization Act" was introduced in 2015. Although differing in the specific recommendations of the Auditor General, the Senate bill similarly would enact a prescribed composition and method of selection of Board members. (See Tables 1 and 2 below.) In its previous report, the Special Committee expressed strong reservations about legislative solutions to the Board's governance challenges and cautioned that even well-intentioned legislation can undermine university autonomy -- an important bulwark protecting academic freedom. State Senate consideration of SB 1240 is pending.
- **Middle States Commission on Higher Education.** In August 2012, Middle States warned Penn State that its accreditation was in jeopardy based on information contained in the Freeh Report and the NCAA Consent Decree indicating that the University might not be in compliance with various accrediting standards, including those related to the Board's responsibility for the quality and integrity of the institution and other leadership and governance issues. In November 2012, following a site visit, the accrediting commission notified Penn State that it had removed the warning and reaffirmed accreditation of the University. It further requested a follow-up report documenting, among other things, changes to the Bylaws of the Board, specifically including "the expanded involvement of faculty, staff, and students on Board committees." (See discussion of SCUG Recommendation 20 below.)

A number of governance changes enacted by the Board as a result of its reform process are directly relevant to the Faculty Senate's 2013 recommendations and to the overall academic mission of the University:

- The size of the Board was increased from 32 voting members to 36 voting members and two ex officio non-voting members for a total of 38. (SCUG Recommendation 1)
- The President and the Governor were changed from voting ex officio members of the Board to non-voting members. (SCUG recommendations 4 and 7.)

- One Academic Trustee, one Student Trustee, and the Immediate Past-President of the Alumni Association were added to the Board membership with all of the rights and responsibilities of other members. The Academic Trustee is elected by the Board upon nomination by the Senate, and the Student Trustee is similarly elected by the Board upon nomination by a Student Selection Group. (SCUG Recommendations 3 and 5.)
- The waiting period for former University employees (including faculty) to be eligible to serve on the Board was lengthened from three to five years. Exceptions for the Academic and Student Trustees were codified.
- Three At-Large Trustees were added to the Board as voting members. They are elected by the Board upon nomination by an internal selection group.
- A regular meeting of the leadership of the Board, Administration, and Faculty was mandated. (SCUG Recommendation 23.)
- The Board Chair was authorized to invite non-voting representatives of the Faculty, students, staff, and constituent groups to participate in most standing committees of the Board, and the faculty representation was designated an “official” means of communication with the Board. (SCUG Recommendation 20.)

#### Rationale for the Academic Trustees

It is important to recall that the Senate’s rationale for recommending the addition of Academic Trustees was to bring more academic expertise to the Board and ensure that an academic perspective was more fully considered in Board decision making. The rationale was not to add a representative of the Faculty to the Board membership. In its previous report, the Special Committee strongly recommended that the Board should place greater emphasis in selecting its members based on their qualifications to perform critical governance functions rather than on what groups that they represent. Academic expertise and knowledge of how complex academic institutions operate are, in the opinion of the Special Committee, among the most important of those qualifications.

The Committee concluded in its previous report that the existing formula of representation by which various constituent groups (e.g. alumni, agricultural societies, business and industry) select a quota of Board members is anachronistic and does not further good governance. While it can enhance accountability and responsiveness to the public, the representational model is predicated on the no-win debate over who owns the University and what percentage of seats each sector should therefore control on its governing board. And, even if it were possible to make such a complicated allocation at one point in time, when the University and the public it serves inevitably change, there is no easy way to update the proportional representation on the Board.

Yet, the recent debate over changes in the composition of the Board, including adding an Academic Trustee, appeared to focus primarily on what sectors gained or lost representation and

not on the members’ qualifications to govern a complex academic institution. Consequently, Board documents varyingly label the new position as “Academic Trustee” (the Senate’s preferred wording that recognizes its underlying purpose) and “Member Elected to Represent the Faculty” (the Board’s usual wording indicating a different purpose). In announcing the changes, the then Board Chair said, “In adding voting seats for students and faculty trustees, we have made the board a more comprehensive reflection of the Penn State community. These are two constituencies that should have a voice.” While the addition of student and faculty voices on the Board is welcome and a signal of the Board's good faith efforts to make its membership more reflective of the broader University community, the Special Committee remains committed to its proposal that the Board should increase the number of members with higher education expertise or experience and that the underlying purpose of having Academic Trustees on the Board is to further that objective.

However, regardless of the Board’s rationale, the outcome of the change has been positive and early indications are that the new Academic Trustee is achieving the Senate’s goal of helping the Board to better frame its decisions within an academic context. This is a significant success that the Senate and the Board can collaboratively build upon in future initiatives to improve the governance of Penn State.

Table 1 compares the membership composition of the Board (resulting from the aforementioned changes) with its previous configuration and the proposals in the Auditor General’s report and the Senate Bill 1240. Of particular note are the addition of the Academic Trustee, the slight proportional decrease in Pennsylvania officeholders and gubernatorial appointees, and the addition of three At-Large Trustees.

**Table 1: Board Membership # (%)**

	<b>Previous (2012)</b>	<b>Current</b>	<b>Auditor General</b>	<b>Senate Bill 1240</b>
PA Officeholders	4 (13)	3 (8)	3 (14)	0
Governor’s Appointments	6 (19)	6 (17)	4 (19)	5 (22)
Academic	1 (3) <sup>a</sup>	1 (3) <sup>b</sup>	0	0
Student	0 <sup>c</sup>	1 (3) <sup>d</sup>	0	0
Alumni Assn. Past President	0	1 (3)	0	0
Alumni	9 (28)	9 (25)	6 (29)	8 (35)
Agricultural Societies	6 (19)	6 (17)	4 (19)	5 (22)
Business and Industry	6 (19)	6 (17)	4 (19)	5 (22)
At Large	0	3 (8)	0	0

Non-Voting	0	2 <sup>c</sup>	1 <sup>f</sup>	2 <sup>g</sup>
<b>Total Voting<sup>h</sup></b>	<b>32</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>23</b>

<sup>a</sup> President

<sup>b</sup> faculty member elected by the Board upon nomination by Senate

<sup>c</sup> a Student Trustee was customarily appointed by the Governor but not codified

<sup>d</sup> elected by the Board upon nomination by a Student Selection Group

<sup>e</sup> Governor and President

<sup>f</sup> Governor

<sup>g</sup> Secretaries of Education and Agriculture

<sup>h</sup> percentages reflect rounding error

Table 2 compares the current selection methods of Board members (resulting from the aforementioned changes) with the previous methods and the proposals in the Auditor General’s report and the Senate Bill 1240. Of particular note is the increase in the number and proportion of Board members who are internally selected as opposed to externally elected or appointed. Although this change disrupts the balance of selection methods that the Special Committee recommended be maintained (SCUG Recommendation 10), it is primarily the result of adding three At-Large seats, which allows the Board to diversify and add academic expertise to its membership consistent with SCUG Recommendations 2 and 11.3.2.

**Table 2: Board Membership by Selection Method – # (%)**

	Previous (2012)	Current	Auditor General	Senate Bill 1240
Governor’s Appointment	6 (19)	6 (17)	4 (19)	5 (22)
Board Selected	6 (19)	11 (25)	4 (19)	5 (22)
Business and Industry	6	6	4	5
At Large	0	3	0	0
Academic/Student <sup>a</sup>	0	2 (5)	0	0
Election	15 (47)	15 (42)	10 (48)	13 (57)
Direct (Alumni)	9	9	6	8
Indirect (Ag Societies)	6	6	4	5
Ex Officio	5 (16)	4 (11)	3 (14)	0
PA Officeholders	4	3	3	0
President	1	0	0	0
Alumni Assn. Past President	0	1	0	0
Ex Officio Non-Voting	0	2 <sup>b</sup>	0	2 <sup>c</sup>
<b>Total Voting<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>32</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>23</b>

<sup>a</sup> preferred candidate is nominated by the Senate and the Student Selection Group respectively and submitted to the Board for confirmation (approval or rejection of the preferred candidate only).

<sup>b</sup> Governor and President

<sup>c</sup> Secretaries of Education and Agriculture

<sup>d</sup> percentages reflect rounding error

### **Disposition of the Senate's Previous Recommendations**

The Board has made significant progress toward improving the governance of Penn State; however, with the notable exceptions of adding an Academic Trustee and establishing regular meetings among the leadership of the Board, Faculty, and Administration, the changes have not been substantially influenced by the Senate's previous recommendations. In announcing both its 2013 and 2014 reform packages, the Board emphasized that, in making the changes, it had taken into account the suggestions of the Pennsylvania Auditor General, the Middle States Accreditation Commission, and the Freeh Group -- but did not mention of the recommendations of the Senate. The Board's Committee on Governance and Long-Range Planning has neither distributed the Senate report among its membership nor considered its array of recommendations, and with the recent turn-over in Board membership, most of its current members may not be aware of the report's existence or its key recommendations. (N.B. The previous Board Chair Masser did informally consult with the Special Committee Chair regarding a proposal to add an Academic Trustee and invited him to attend a Board committee meeting at which it was discussed. The Board's outside governance consultant also met with some members of the Special Committee, including its Chair, but there does not appear to have been substantial consideration of any other Senate recommendations by a Board committee.)

It is also important to note that, despite the Senate's unanimous approval of the Special Committee's report, there appears to have been little effort by the Senate to encourage the Board to seriously consider its specific recommendations or to monitor overall progress toward improving governance and communication. Nor did the Senate refer its own report to a committee to implement those recommendations within its jurisdiction and, more generally, did not follow through on the Special Committee's call to make faculty involvement in governance reform an on-going process.

Moving forward, the Special Committee seeks to expand the distribution and readership of its report and urge that the Board, Senate, and others to strongly consider the report's recommendations in their continued efforts to improve governance at Penn State.

A list of all the Senate's initial recommendations and their disposition appear at Appendix B.

### **Follow-up Findings and Recommendations**

The Special Committee on University Governance reaffirms the overarching findings of its initial report, its broad objectives for improving the governance and communication at Penn State, and the rationale for its specific recommendations. Some of those recommendations have been implemented in modified form or otherwise overtaken by intervening events. Others, as the Committee acknowledged in its initial report, are "blue sky" recommendations that conceptually would improve the governance of the University but are unlikely to be implemented in the current environment.

The follow-up recommendations below are primarily restatements and elaboration of previous recommendations that can be implemented with relative ease by the leadership of both the Board and Senate. In any case, it is the Special Committee's intent to be constructive by offering recommendations that would increase the flow of information to the Board needed to effectively govern the University and ensure that an academic perspective is fully considered in its decision making. Those specific recommendations follow:

#### Increase Academic Expertise and Diversity in Board Membership

Subsequent to the Special Committee's 2013 report, a blue ribbon panel of higher education leaders chaired by Benno Schmidt, board chair of The City University of New York and former Yale president, studied the complex and growing challenges to the governance of modern universities and issued a report, Governance for a New Era: A Blueprint for Higher Education Trustees, calling for more "thoughtful and engaged stewardship" by governing boards and suggesting best practices intended to achieve it. Many (but not all) of its recommendations for improved university governance echoed and validated those previously offered by the Special Committee. The following passage from the report of these national experts summarizes well the Special Committee's goal of greater expertise and diversity in the Board's membership:

All boards – private and public – should include trustees with a range of backgrounds appropriate for building board expertise and effective oversight: those with academic experience and understanding of the internal workings of colleges and universities; those with strong financial backgrounds; those providing intellectual and professional diversity, ensuring a rich mixture of ideas, talents, and professions. They should reflect the major specialized intellectual areas of the institution – such as science and medicine. And they should have the breadth of skills and detachment necessary to be conscientious fiduciaries.



Of the 36 voting Board members authorized by the revised Charter, only one must be an academic – the newly-created Academic Trustee. Prior to the recent changes, the President was the only academic formally holding a voting seat, plus a student was customarily but unofficially among the Governor’s appointments to the Board. The President has since been changed to a non-voting member, and the Student Trustee was converted from a gubernatorial appointment to a codified seat. In the current transition period, the terms of the Governor’s last student appointee and the newly-codified Student Trustee briefly overlap. Further, a faculty member from another university was elected by the alumni to serve on the Board. Consequently, there currently are four Board members from the academic world – two faculty and two students – but only one each faculty member and student are guaranteed to continue.

The Special Committee reaffirms its previous recommendation that it is in the best interest of Penn State to substantially increase the number of Board members who have significant academic experience and deep understanding of University’s teaching, research, and service mission. Adding more Academic Trustees from the ranks of the Penn State faculty has the additional benefit of enhancing self-governance (common in professional associations) and expanding internal lines of communications among participants in shared governance. While this is probably the best way to expand academic expertise on the Board, it is certainly not the only one.

Table 3 compares the current demographic composition of the Board with its composition in 2012 (the year prior to the Special Committee’s initial report). Of particular note is a significant increase in female Board members but not minority members. The data also indicate that the number and proportion of trustees from the business world have markedly increased from a plurality in 2012 to nearly half of the Board members currently. That number does not include those trustees who are or were employed in agro-business. The number of trustees from government slightly declined, but the three groups combined (business, agriculture, and government) constitute about three-quarters of the Board’s voting membership. (N.B. The occupational categories in Table 3 are those used by the Association of Governing Boards to report national data on the demographics of governing boards. While the Special Committee recognizes that there may be significant overlap among the categories and few bright lines distinguishing them, using the categories allowed the Special Committee to benchmark the demographics of Penn State Board in its previous report and to illustrate changes over time in this report.)

It is important to emphasize that Trustees from business, agriculture, and government bring a wealth experience that is very helpful in ensuring that the University is financially sound and properly managed, and their real-world perspective is often important in keeping the University accountable to the public it serves and is responsive to rapidly changing social conditions. However, Board members from these fields often do not have a commensurate level of understanding of the academic core of the University – the values and codes of higher education and how knowledge is advanced for the benefit of society. Therefore, if the Board does not also have a significant number of members from academe, it risks making important

decisions using accepted standards and practices of business and government that do not necessarily apply to universities. Several peer universities (e.g. Iowa, Virginia, North Carolina, and Missouri) have recently encountered serious governance problems in this regard.

Again, this conclusion should not be construed as a criticism of Board members from the business world or their contributions to the governance of Penn State over many years. Rather it is the basis for one of the Special Committee's key recommendations: that the business acumen of the largest segment in Board membership should be complemented with a significant numbers of trustees with academic expertise or professional experience in higher education and, overall, the Board's membership should be more diverse, especially in better reflecting the rich mixture of scholarly areas that comprise the University. Such a hybrid model of integrating external Public Trustees with internal Professional Trustees (in this case, academic trustees) has been widely successful in the governance of non-profit institutions and should be emulated at Penn State.

Orientation and continuing education for Trustees without academic experience or expertise and more direct contact with academic units/locations are additional means of assuring that the Board as a whole understands the codes and pathway of higher education and the academic institution it governs. This is discussed further in the section below on Board Orientation and Self-Assessment (SCUG Recommendations 12 and 14).

**Table 3: Demographic Composition of Board # (% of Total Voting Members)**

	<b>2012</b>	<b>2016</b>
Female	6 (19)	9 (25)
Minority	2 (6)	2 (6)
Occupation <sup>a</sup>		
Business	11 (34)	17 (47)
Professional	4 (13)	3 (8)
Education <sup>b</sup>	5 (16)	4 (11)
Agriculture	6 (19)	7 (19)
Government	5 (16)	4 (11)
Other	1 (3)	1 (3)
<b>Total Voting <sup>c</sup></b>	<b>32</b>	<b>36</b>

<sup>a</sup> currently employed or retired

<sup>b</sup> includes students

<sup>c</sup> percentages reflect rounding error

### Expand and Formalize Faculty Participation on Board Committees

The Special Committee reaffirms its previous recommendations to increase faculty participation in Board committees and functions in order to ensure that an academic perspective is more fully considered in the Board deliberations and decision making.

**Standing Committees.** Since the 1970s, the Chair, Chair-Elect, and Secretary of the Senate and leaders of student government have been invited by the President to attend full Board meetings and have the privilege of the floor. In 2012, following inquiry by the Senate leadership, the President invited the Senate officers and Chair of the University Planning Committee to also participate on a non-voting basis in four of the Board's now seven standing committees. The leadership of student government organizations and representatives of Penn State staff and alumni were similarly invited to participate. By all account, this change significantly improved the flow of communication to and improved decision making by the Board.

Consequently, the Special Committee previously recommended that faculty representation to Board committees should be expanded and codified as follows:

Recommendation 20: A full-time, tenured faculty member should be elected by the Senate to serve as a non-voting representative on each of the six Board standing committees, including Legal and Compliance and Audit and Risk, for multi-year, staggered terms.

The Board subsequently amended its Standing Orders to allow for continued representation by faculty and others, and although they are different than those recommended by the Senate, the changes are a significant step toward greater communication and transparency in governance and should be applauded.

Standing Order VII (9) (a) "Visitors to the Meetings":

The Chair of the Board of Trustees or the President of the University shall be authorized to invite non-voting faculty representatives, non-voting student representatives or other constituent representatives to attend and participate in the meetings of standing committees, subcommittees and of special committees, except executive sessions. The representatives shall be selected by the Chair of the Board of Trustees in such manner as he/she deems appropriate.

Standing Order VIII (3) (c) "Communication with the Board":

Official faculty communication to the Board of Trustees shall be made through the President and through faculty participation on the standing committees.

Currently, the Senate Chair is invited to attend the Committee on Finance, Business and Capital Planning; the Chair-Elect to Academic Affairs and Student Life; Secretary to Outreach, Development and Community Relations; and Chair of the Senate's University Planning

Committee to Governance and Long-Range Planning. These committee assignments have been made by custom and are not codified. Consequently, there is an opportunity for the Senate to work with the Board to better match the skill sets of the individual faculty representatives with the portfolios of the committees to which they are assigned.

Further, the Senate has not proactively pursued the recommendation for the inclusion of faculty representatives on the Legal and Compliance Committee and the Audit and Risk Committee. In contrast, as a result of determined efforts by student government leaders, students successfully secured representation on those two committees. The Special Committee urges the Senate leadership to work with the Board Chair to ensure that the Board seriously considers the Senate's unanimously-approved recommendation to add faculty representation to the Legal and Compliance Committee and the Audit and Risk Committee.

In its previous report, the Special Committee also suggested that the faculty representatives to Board committees should be selected for multi-year terms to ensure continuity and greater familiarity with the relevant issues and that the Senate should establish a mechanism for coordination and communication among those representatives, Senate officers, and appropriate committees, and the full body. To the Special Committee's knowledge, this recommendation has not been considered by the Senate and, consequently, the benefits of faculty representation on Board committees have not been maximized.

**Selection Groups.** The Special Committee previously recommended (SCUG Recommendation 11.3.1&2) that faculty members should serve on the committee that nominates candidates for business and industry seats on the Board. The intent of the recommendation was to bring an academic perspective to the nomination process and to encourage greater diversity (in both demographics and sectors reflective of the University mission) in Board membership. At the time, the Business and Industry Trustees were the only ones selected internally and their nomination was the only effective route for reaching those goals. However, in the interim, the Board commendably added three at-large seats in order to achieve greater diversity in its membership and flexibility in the selection process not afforded by the direct election of alumni seats and the indirect election of agricultural seats. This also presents an even better opportunity to select new Trustees who have academic experience or expertise and a deep understanding of the University's academic mission. To help fulfill that promise and ensure that academic criteria are considered, faculty members (perhaps those who are already representatives to the standing committees) should be invited to participate on a non-voting basis in the deliberations of the At-Large Selection Group.

It is important to note that none of the At-Large Trustees selected to date have an academic background or come from sectors other than those that already dominate the Board membership. Further, although the addition of At-Large Trustees somewhat alters the specifics of the Special Committee's initial recommendation, its intent remains salient and the nomination process for Business and Industry Trustees can still benefit from greater academic input.

**Selection and Assessment of the President.** In its previous report, the Special Committee recommended: "The faculty should be consulted in the selection, periodic

assessment, contract renewals, and potential termination of the President (SCUG Recommendation 21).” The Bylaws [5.09 (a) (iv) (1)] previously required the Board to consult with “representatives of the faculty” in the selection of a President but do not specify the nature of that consultation. By all accounts, faculty were integrally involved in the most recent presidential search and contributed significantly to a successful outcome. Representatives of the faculty participated in both screening candidates and in the final selection of the President and brought valuable academic insights to the decisions. The Board should be applauded for recognizing the essential role of the faculty in bring an academic perspective to the presidential search process and, in building on that success, should consider codifying faculty involvement in more detail. Further, the Special Committee noted in its previous report that it would be difficult – if not impossible – for the Board to fully know the continuing performance of the President as the leader of an academic institution without carefully consulting with the faculty who are responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the core academic mission and, therefore, recommended that such a consultation process should be established and communicated to the University community.

**Board Orientation and Self-Assessment.** To foster a greater understanding of complexities of the academic institution it governs, the Board has significantly improved and expanded its orientation of incoming members and periodic refreshers for continuing members. Further, the Board formalized an ongoing self-assessment process. Both are positive developments and are consistent with Special Committee Recommendations 12 and 22; however, the orientations and self-assessment could benefit from rank-and-file faculty participation that could help bring the internal academic workings of the University into clearer focus.

As part of its on-going self-assessment, the Board’s Committee on Governance and Long-Range Planning has undertaken a process of drafting a list of desired skill sets, experiences, expertise and professional portfolios that should be represented – in the aggregate -- on the Board in order to enhance effective governance of the University. The list would be used by the Selection Groups in recruiting, evaluating, and nominating new trustees and thereby could assist in diversifying the demographics and professional backgrounds of Board members. The Special Committee, of course, recommends that academic expertise and experience in higher education should be prominent on this list.

#### Increase Transparency and Lines of Internal Communication

In its initial report, the Special Committee expressed concern that existing Standing Orders plus another recommended in the Freeh Report (3.5.1) were potential impediments to the flow of important information to and from the Board and called for a revision of the Orders that would allow for multiple lines of communications, especially with the Faculty, and greater openness in Board deliberations (SCUG Recommendation 19).

In the intervening period, the Board has made significant strides toward greater transparency, such as opening its standing committee meetings to the public. Three changes to

the Standing Orders, in particular, have the potential to significantly improve communication with the Faculty and thereby enhance governance at Penn State:

- A regular meeting of the University's leadership is now mandated in "furtherance of ... appropriate communication among the faculty, administration and the Board" and in direct response to a previous Senate recommendation (SCUG Recommendation 23). An amendment to the Standing Orders [VIII (3) (d)] requires that the Chair, Chair-Elect, and Secretary of the Senate; the President, Provost, and Vice President of Administration; and Chair and Vice Chair of the Board meet at least once per semester. As best as the Special Committee can determine, such meetings – in which all of the principals of University governance regularly caucus – are unprecedented. This new means of communication has the potential to break down governance silos and facilitate shared understanding among the participants and, to the extent that it furthers those goals, should be expanded.
- Under a new provision of the Standing orders [VII (9) (a)], the Chair of the Board is authorized to invite non-voting representatives from the Faculty, students, and constituent groups to participate in the meetings of most standing committees. By all accounts, this change has significantly improved the flow of information to and the deliberations of the Board. However, as discussed in the section above regarding SCUG Recommendation 19, the position of faculty representative to standing committees needs to be clarified and codified and a feedback loop to the Senate needs to be established so as to live up to its considerable potential.
- Standing Order VIII (3) (c) was amended to add faculty participation in the meetings of standing committees as an "official" line of faculty communication with the Board. Previously, faculty could only communicate with the Board through the President. The Special Committee believes that this new line of direct faculty communication with the Board significantly enhances governance at Penn State but also underlines the importance of clarifying and codifying the position of faculty representative.

At the same time, other Standing Orders that were recently added, revised, or currently are proposed could impede open communication, depending on how they are interpreted and applied. The Special Committee calls attention to following expectations of Board members listed in what is now Standing Order VIII (Governance of the University):

- "Speak openly, freely and candidly within the Board and publicly support decisions reached by the Board; it being recognized and understood that once the Board of Trustees, as the governing body of the University, makes a decision, it can be counterproductive and potentially damaging to the University for individual Trustees to publicly criticize or attempt to subvert such decision [SO VIII (1) (d) (v)]."
- "Maintain the confidentiality of confidential information without exception; it being recognized and understood that for this purpose "confidential information" includes nonpublic information concerning the University, including its finances, operations and personnel, as well as nonpublic information about internal Board discussions and dynamics [SO VIII (1) (d) (x)]."

- “Advocate the University’s interests, but speak for the Board or the University only when authorized to do so by the Board or the Chair; it being recognized and understood that it is important for the Board of Trustees to convey a consistent message and that, in most instances, the Chair of the Board of Trustees should serve as the spokesperson [SO VIII (1) (d) (xi).”

The Special Committee believes that the Board should be commended for several changes that have improved communication with the Faculty, students, and constituent groups and enhanced transparency in its deliberations. The Special Committee also expresses reservations about other changes and proposed changes and reaffirms its previous Recommendation 19 encouraging the maximum possible openness in governance consistent with the best overall best interests of the University.

### **Considerations for Further Action**

- 1) The Senate Officers and other faculty representatives to Board standing committees should encourage and, as appropriate, assist the leadership of the Board of Trustees to
  - a) increase academic expertise and diversity in the Board membership,
  - b) expand and formalize faculty participation on Board committees,
  - c) improve lines of communication and consultation with the Faculty, and
  - d) otherwise enhance the governance of Penn State.
- 2) The Senate should establish a mechanism for better matching the skill sets of faculty representatives to Board committees and for coordination and communication among those representatives, Senate officers, appropriate Senate committees, and the full body.
- 3) The Senate should establish an ongoing process to monitor changes in the governance of the University (with particular attention to the Senate’s previous recommendations) and report to the body the academic and other implications of those changes.
- 4) The governance changes mandated by the NCAA Consent Decree and Academic Integrity Agreement should be re-evaluated to determine if they currently are in the University's best interests.

### **Additional Sources Consulted**

American Association of University Professors (2013). “Faculty Communication with Governing Boards: Best Practices. <https://www.aaup.org/report/faculty-communication-governing-boards-best-practices>



American Council of Trustees and Alumni (2016). “The Basics of Responsible Trusteeship.” Institute for Effective Governance. [https://www.goacta.org/publications/the\\_basics\\_of\\_responsible\\_trusteeship](https://www.goacta.org/publications/the_basics_of_responsible_trusteeship)

American Council of Trustees and Alumni (2014), Governance for a New Era: A Blue Print for Higher Education Trustees. Project on Governance for a New Era. [https://www.goacta.org/images/download/governance\\_for\\_a\\_new\\_era.pdf](https://www.goacta.org/images/download/governance_for_a_new_era.pdf)

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (2015). “AGB Board of Directors’ Statement on Fiduciary Duties of Governing Board Members.”

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (2013). “Building Public Governing Board Capacity: Suggestions and Recommendations to Governors and State Legislatures for Improving the Selection and Composition of Public College and University Board Members.” State Policy Brief.

Barron, Eric (2015, January 29). “On the Challenges facing Penn State University Post-Sandusky.” Penn State News. <http://news.psu.edu/story/342778/2015/01/29/administration/president-barron-challenges-facing-penn-state-university-post>

Berry, Leonard L. and Seltman, Kent D. (2008). Management Lessons from Mayo Clinic: Inside One of the World’s Most Admired Service Organizations. New York: McGraw Hill.

Bowen, William G. and Tobin, Eugene M. (2015 ). Locus of Authority: The Evolution of Faculty Roles in the Governance of Higher Education. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

“Cultivating Communication: Policy Recommendations” (2013). Presidential Leadership Academy, Pennsylvania State University.

“Demand More: Penn State Administrative Representation” (2013). Presidential Leadership Academy, Pennsylvania State University.

Gerber, Larry G. (2014). The Rise & Decline of Faculty Governance: Professionalization and the Modern American University. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ginsberg, Benjamin (2011). The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why It Matters. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hendrickson, Robert M. (2013). Academic Leadership and Governance of Higher Education. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Ketchen, David J.; Snow, Charles C.; and Pope, Alice W. (2015). “Flawed by design: Why Penn State’s recent governance reforms won’t work and what should be done instead,” Business Horizons 58, 5-15.

Prisby, Matt; Ketchen, Sharon Ferrell; and Woodyard, Helen (2016). “A Comparison of The Pennsylvania State University’s Governance Reforms to Auditor General Wagner’s 2012 Recommendations.”

Rothman, Stanley; Kell-Woessner, April; and Woessner, Matthew (2011). The Still Divided Academy: How Competing Visions of Power, Politics, and Diversity Complicate the Mission of Higher Education. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Stripling, Jack (2016, January 24). “Penn State’s Abuse Scandal Still Sharply Divides Its Board.” Chronicle of Higher Education.

Yudichak, John T. (2014, August 15). “Remarks of Senator John T. Yudichak (to the) Pennsylvania State University Board of Trustees Committee on Governance and Long-Range Planning.” Senate of Pennsylvania.

## **Special Committee on University Governance**

### **Committee members<sup>1</sup>:**

John S. Nichols, Professor Emeritus of Communications and International Affairs, College of Communications (Committee Chair)

Lori J. Bechtel-Wherry, Chancellor, Penn State Altoona

Dawn Blasko, Associate Professor of Psychology, Penn State Erie

David Han, Associate Professor of Surgery and Radiology, Hershey Medical Center/College of Medicine; Academic Trustee, Penn State Board of Trustees

Peter Idowu, Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering, Penn State Harrisburg

A. Christine Long, IT Director, Enterprise Infrastructure and Operations, Office of the Vice President for IT

---

<sup>1</sup> The student member of the Committee, John Yang, graduated and did not participate in drafting this follow-up report.

Richard Robinett, Professor of Physics and Associate Department Head, Eberly College of Science

**Resource members:**

Peter Moran, Assistant Dean for Policy and Planning, Planning and Institutional Research, Penn State Altoona

Matthew Woessner, Associate Professor of Political Science and Public Policy, Penn State Harrisburg; Chair-Elect, University Faculty Senate

## Appendix A

3/12/13

### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

#### Improving the Governance of Penn State, Revising the Structure of its Board of Trustees, and Furthering the Academic Mission of the University: Report and Recommendations of the Special Committee on University Governance

##### (Executive Summary)

In the aftermath of the events of November 2011, the Chair of the University Faculty Senate appointed the Special Committee on University Governance to study the structure and practices of the Board of Trustees and to make recommendations for improving governance and communication at Penn State. To achieve its charge, the Special Committee consulted extensively with experts, reviewed the literature on best practices in higher education, benchmarked Penn State with other institutions, interviewed a wide variety of constituent groups, and conferred frequently with the Board leadership and other interested parties.

The Special Committee concludes that there is significant opportunity for the Board of Trustees, like most higher education governing boards nationally, to gain a better understanding of the academic mission and the unique structure of the university it governs. Most Board members bring a wealth of business and government experience but do not have a commensurate level of experience in higher education or understanding of how universities advance knowledge for the benefit of society. It is important to note that there is little dispute among higher education associations and experts that this is a national problem. The key question for the Committee is how it should be remedied at Penn State.

The Special Committee also concludes that this problem cannot be easily resolved with the current structure, means of representation, and composition of the Board. The Committee believes that the existing formula of representation by which constituent groups select a certain quota of Board members is anachronistic and the Board membership should come from a greater diversity of sectors and interests reflecting the modern mission of the University. At the same time, greater emphasis should be placed on selecting Board members based on their qualifications to perform critical governance functions rather than on what groups they might represent. Further, the Board should establish minimum qualifications for membership and a transparent and widely participatory nomination or vetting process to ensure the selection of qualified Trustees.

One of the best means of ensuring that the Board understands the mission, values, unique structures and operating systems of the complex academic institution that it governs is to select

members who have academic expertise and professional experience in higher education. Those members, in the opinion of the Special Committee, should include at least two current Penn State faculty members. Including internal professional trustees on governing boards of other non-profit institutions is widely considered a best practice and ensures that those boards are more fully informed and have the necessary expertise to make the best possible decisions on highly-specialized matters. Faculty representatives on governing boards, while not widespread today, are becoming increasingly common at public universities.

The Special Committee respectfully disagrees with some recent proposals that would, for example, further restrict internal academic representation on the Board, bolster a top-down, corporate style governance structure, and increase political control of the University. Such proposals are based on a misunderstanding of the time-tested concept of a university and often are at odds with the norms of higher education. There is no question that Penn State must be accountable for the state appropriations that it receives and to the public it serves, but greater political control and legislation to enact these proposals would have long-term negative consequences for the academic well-being of Penn State. In other words, while change in the governance of Penn State is needed, no change is preferable to bad change.

While it is certainly true that numerous breakdowns in communication prior to, during, and after the events of November 2011 contributed to the problems at Penn State, they were not the root cause. Similarly, while effective communication is a necessary condition of effective University governance and to restoring confidence in the leadership of the Board, it cannot be a substitute for enlightened actions. As such, the Special Committee offers numerous recommendations for improving communication that, if adopted in tandem with appropriate organizational and policy changes, may assist Penn State in responding to the recent problems. Among those recommendations are to break down governance silos and integrate internal and external stakeholders in the governance of the University and to establish multiple and alternative flows of information among the Board, faculty, students, staff, administration, alumni, and other constituencies.

The Special Committee understands that public media campaigns might improve Penn State's public image but feels that a greater emphasis should be placed on rebuilding a shared understanding within the University community. A core principle of effective communication is that the true character of an organization is expressed by its people and that the strongest opinions about an organization are shaped by the words and deeds of its people. The Penn State faculty and staff have countless external contacts every day; therefore, how they and the rest of the University community view the institution overall, how they interpret the sad events of the past several months, and whether they understand and support the strategy for recovery and accountability will largely drive their effectiveness as ambassadors of Penn State.

Finally, effective communication can only take place in an environment of trust. Therefore, a high priority should be to rebuild trust and a shared understanding within the University community. Achieving that will be difficult – if not impossible – without developing a culture of

collaboration and civility among the Board and other stakeholders dedicated to the well-being of Penn State and its important work.

Special Committee on University Governance: Lori J. Bechtel-Wherry, Dawn Blasko, Michael Dooris, David Han, Peter Idowu, A. Christine Long, Peter Moran, John S. Nichols (chair), Richard Robinett, and John Zang.

**Appendix B**

**Disposition of Senate Recommendations for Governance Reform <sup>2</sup>**

No.	Faculty Senate Recommendations	Actions Taken/Current Status
1	The size of the Board of Trustees should be reduced.	The size of the Board was increased from 32 members to 38 members (36 voting)
2	Reduce the number and proportion of Board seats allocated to agricultural societies and business and industry and, without increasing the proportion of Trustees representing all sectors, add seats representing a greater breadth of sectors and interest.	The number of seats for agricultural societies and business and industry remains the same, and their proportions slightly decreased due to the larger Board. Three at-large Trustees were added allowing for greater diversity of sectors or interests in Board membership.
3	Two tenured, full-time Penn State faculty members should be elected Academic Trustees at Large to the Board with the same rights, responsibilities, and term of office as Public Trustees.	One Trustee -- varyingly labeled "Academic Trustee" or "Member Representing the Faculty" -- was added to the Board with the same rights, responsibilities, and term of office as other members. The guidelines proposed by the University Faculty Senate and approved by a change in the Board Bylaws did not specify that candidates must be tenured or full time.
3.1	Academic Trustees at Large should be elected by the University Faculty Senate.	An amendment to the Board's Standing Orders provide that the University Faculty Senate shall recommend, in accordance with procedures and guidelines established by the Senate and approved by the Board, a preferred candidate to serve as Academic Trustee. The Senate's preferred candidate is submitted to the Committee on Governance and Long Range Planning for approval, and then submitted to the Board of Trustees for confirmation (for approval or rejection of the preferred candidate only).
3.2	One Academic Trustee should have an academic home at University Park, and the other at a campus location.	Only one Academic Trustee was authorized by the revision to the Board's Standing Orders. The University Faculty Senate's guidelines and procedures do not specify a location of the Academic Trustee.
4	The President of the University should continue to serve on the	The President of the University was converted to a non-voting, ex officio member of the Board.

<sup>2</sup> Inventory with the assistance of the Office of University Counsel

	Board as an ex officio voting member.	
5	A full-time student in good standing at Penn State should be selected to serve as an ex officio Student Trustee	The Board Bylaws were amended to provide for a Student Trustee, with a two year term. The Bylaws provide that the Student Trustee shall be a full-time undergraduate, graduate or professional student in good academic standing and in a degree seeking program at the University.
5.1	The Student Trustee should be selected in accordance with an appropriate internal process rather than by gubernatorial appointment. The existing process of nomination and vetting of candidates should be maintained.	An amendment to the Board's Standing Orders provide that a Selection Group composed of students shall recommend, in accordance with procedures and guidelines established by the Selection Group and approved by the Board, a preferred candidate for membership on the Board representing the students of the University. The selection group's preferred candidate is submitted to the Board's Committee on Governance and Long Range Planning for approval, and then submitted to the full Board for confirmation (for approval or rejection of the preferred candidate only).
5.2	The number of gubernatorial appointments to the Board (of which a student Trustee has traditionally been one) should be reduced by one as the Student Trustee moves to an ex officio position.	The number of gubernatorial appointments was not reduced and remains at six.
6	A full-time exempt or non-exempt staff member of the University who is directly engaged by activities related to the university's mission of teaching, research and service should serve a multiple-year term as a non-voting representative to the Board.	Not implemented. The chair of the Staff Advisory Council has been invited to attend and participate in the Outreach, Development and Community Relations Committee of the Board. Such participation is not codified and is at the discretion of the Board chair. (See recommendation 20 below.)
7	Political officeholders should not serve on the Board.	The Governor was converted to a non-voting ex officio member. The secretaries of Agriculture, Education, and Conservation and Natural Resources were retained by voting ex officio members. The Board Bylaws now provide that a person shall not be eligible to serve as a trustee for a period of five years after the last day of such person's employment with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as Governor,



		Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Auditor General or Treasurer.
8	If the University Faculty Senate concludes that legislation regarding Penn State's governance might undermine the academic mission of the University and its institutional autonomy, the Senate should work in cooperation with Office of Governmental Affairs to make its concerns public.	The Senate leadership has been consulted by Penn State's Office of Governmental Affairs and offered comments regarding proposed legislation to change the governance structure of the University.
9	The Board of Trustees should establish specific qualifications for membership commensurate with the stated responsibilities and expectations of Trustee.	"Qualifications for Membership" on the Board, as set forth in its Bylaws, have not been amended to include affirmative qualifications that are either necessary or preferred for trustees to fulfill their governance responsibilities. However, the Governance and Long Range Planning Committee of the Board recently has undertaken a process to list desired skill sets, professional backgrounds, demographics, and expertise of the Board. The list may be used in guiding the selection of new members and "to enhance breadth of perspectives and governance practices" of the Board.
9.1	Preferred qualifications should include, at minimum, experience in and understanding of academic institutions, record of public service, and commitment to higher education.	See 9 above. "Qualifications for Membership" on the Board do not provide for these types of qualitative preferences; however, nominating groups and the full Board may take these qualifications into consideration in connection with their selection processes under their purview.
9.2	A list of preferred qualifications for Board membership should be publicly accessible.	There is no published list of preferred qualifications.
10	The combination of methods for selecting Board members (gubernatorial appointments, direct election, indirect election, self-perpetuating) should be maintained as modified by other recommendations elsewhere in this report.	The combination of selection methods was substantially retained, although the proportion of seats internally selected by the Board has increased.
11	All four methods of selection to the Board should include a transparent and widely	The processes for selecting and vetting potential candidates for Board membership vary among the selection groups and are generally confidential for those under direct Board

	participatory nomination or vetting process.	control, i.e. Business and Industry and At-Large trustees. Significant changes were made in the procedures for selecting trustees representing alumni and agricultural societies, but the results were mixed in improving transparency, participation, and vetting. There were no changes in the gubernatorial appointment process, and it remained confidential.
11.1	A nonpartisan statewide merit selection board should be established to nominate qualified candidates to serve on the Penn State Board (and perhaps boards of other state-related universities) for possible gubernatorial appointment and legislative confirmation.	Not adopted or considered.
11.2	Qualifications for alumni elected trustees should also include, at minimum, experience in and understanding of academic institutions, record of public service, and commitment to higher education.	There are no qualitative criteria to be elected an Alumni Trustee.
11.3	The Board should establish a nominating committee to develop a slate of qualified candidates for election to Business and Industry seats.	A Board Selection Group, which nominates candidates for Business and Industry Trustees, was codified in the Bylaws and Standing Orders. The Selection Group is appointed by the Chair and is composed of three Business and Industry Trustees and those from other sectors. Any trustee may nominate for consideration by the selection group, but the vetting and selection process remains confidential. The full Board confirms candidates nominated by the Selection Group.
11.3.1	At least two faculty members (selected by the University Faculty Senate) should serve on the nominating committee.	The Selection Group for the nomination of Business and Industry Trustees is composed solely of trustees appointed by the Chair of the Board, and no faculty were invited to participate in the selection/nomination process.
11.3.2	Candidates representing other sectors potentially added to the future (e.g., Arts/Humanities and Science) should be nominated by this committee and selected in	The Bylaws and Standing Orders were amended to add three At-Large Trustees to the Board. This change provides a mechanism by which the Board can add trustees from such other sectors and diversify its membership. A five-member Selection Group is appointed by the

	accordance with this self-perpetuating process.	chair. One of the group must be either the Student Trustee, Academic Trustee, Past President of the Alumni Association, or an At-Large Trustee. Any trustee may nominate candidates for consideration, but the vetting and selection process remains confidential. The full Board confirms the candidate selected by the group. However, the addition of At-Large Trustees and a codified selection process did not result in any new Board members from academe or with credentials in the arts, sciences, humanities, or other fields reflective of the diversity of the University. Those selected appeared to fit the professional mold of previous iterations of the Board.
12	New Board members should receive orientations that foster an understanding of the complexities of the academic institution they govern, and continuing members should receive periodic refreshers.	The orientation of new Board members has been substantially upgraded. The most recent version was a day and a half of presentations by the top academic and non-academic administrators of the University. Continuing Board members periodically receive training on matters such as Clery Act compliance, NCAA matters, fiduciary duty, and other topics, and the full Board recently has heard presentations on the promotion and tenure process and the shared governance.
12.1	There should be significant faculty input in such orientations.	Rank-and-file faculty have not been invited to participate in orientations.
13	Faculty members should receive orientations that foster an understanding of institutional governance and the responsibilities of the Board.	This recommendation was neither considered nor implemented.
14	The Board should consider expanding its travel to and interactions with campuses other than University Park.	The Board currently meets six times per year, with one meeting each held at the Hershey Medical Center and a Commonwealth Campus. Individual trustees do visit other campus locations on an ad hoc basis, but there is no inventory of the extent of such visits.
15	Committees of the Board, committees of the Senate, and administrative offices should be better aligned to facilitate collaboration and communication among the three primary	Although the Special Committee continues to believe that this “blue sky” structural reform would improve the governance of the University, it recognizes that serious consideration is unlikely because it would be very difficult to implement, especially in the current challenging governance environment.

	stakeholders in the governance of the University.	
16	Penn State’s communication strategy should place greater emphasis on rebuilding a shared understanding within the University community and preparing the faculty and staff to communicate externally.	
16.1	There should be a greater reliance on talent within the University in responding to the problem.	
17	The strategy and value of the external public relations consultants should be evaluated and the results of the assessment should be made public.	
17.1	The activities of the external public relations consultants should be coordinated with the internal activities of University Relations to ensure that such outside consultants are in tune with the academic mission and truly understand the University	
18	An internal task force (including legal experts) should be formed to study the academic implications of applying the Right-to-Know Law to Penn State, and its finding should be the basis of a University-wide discussion that would better inform decision-makers about this complicated issue.	An administrative working group has been closely following proposed legislative changes to the Pennsylvania Right to Know Law. A wider process to study the academic implications of proposed changes has not been undertaken.
19	Standing Order IX should be revised to allow multiple lines of communication with the faculty and encourage greater openness in Board deliberations.	Depending on how they are interpreted and applied, some recent changes to key sections of what is now Standing Order VIII “Governance of the University” could reduce transparency of Board deliberations and further restrict lines of communication within the University and with the public it serves. Other changes to the Standing Orders, such as inviting non-voting representatives of the faculty and student body to participate in most standing committees,

		facilitate transparency and more open communication.
20	A full-time, tenured faculty member should be elected by the Senate to serve as a non-voting representative on each of the six Board standing committees, including Legal and Compliance and Audit and Risk, for multi-year, staggered terms.	The Standing Orders were amended to authorize the Board Chair to “invite non-voting faculty representatives, non-voting student representatives or other constituent representatives to attend and participate” in meetings of most standing committees. Currently, the Senate Chair, Chair-Elect, Secretary, and Chair of the University Planning Committee have been invited to participate in meetings of standing committees, excluding Legal and Compliance, Compensation, and Audit and Risk. Other “constituent representatives” invited to similarly participate are the President and Vice President of the University Park Undergraduate Association, Council of Commonwealth Student Governments, Graduate and Professional Student Association; Chair and Immediate Past Chair of the Staff Advisory Council; and President of the Alumni Association. Responding to a proposal from the student government groups, the Board Chair recently invited student representatives to expand their participation to the Legal and Compliance and Audit and Risk committees. A similar invitation was not extended to faculty representatives.
21	The faculty should be consulted in the selection, periodic assessment, contract renewals, and potential termination of the President.	Members of the faculty were integrally involved in both the screening and selection process for the new President. By all accounts, the faculty were allowed to and did make meaningful contributions that brought an academic perspective to the deliberations. The process by which faculty were involved in the presidential search and selection has not been codified, nor has the faculty been involved in the periodic assessment of a President.
22	The Board should formalize its self-assessment process to include faculty participation and ensure that an academic perspective is considered.	The Board has undertaken a self-assessment process. For its recent governance seminar, the Board utilized outside consultants rather than internal faculty participation.
23	A standing Joint Committee on University Governance should be	The Standing Orders were amended to mandate meetings at least once per semester attended by

	<p>established to assess on an ongoing basis the governance of the University, to facilitate communication among institutional stakeholders, and to make recommendations to the appropriate bodies for improving policies and procedures.</p>	<p>the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board, President, Provost, Vice President for Administration, Chair, Chair-Elect, and Secretary of the Senate. The purpose of the meetings is to further appropriate communication among the University leadership.</p>
--	---	--

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

Articulation Agreement Review

(Informational)

**Introduction**

During the 2015-2016 academic year, the Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid (ARSSA), initiated a five-year review of all articulation agreements listed on the Office of the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education's website ([http://www.psu.edu/dept/enrmgmt/artic\\_agrmnts.html](http://www.psu.edu/dept/enrmgmt/artic_agrmnts.html)). The five-year review is referenced in Senate Policy 06-20, but it had never been executed. All agreements dated prior to 2010 were reviewed.

**Information**

In January 2016, ARSSA chair, Michel M. Haigh, sent a letter to each member of the Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education (ACUE). The letter contained a list of all the articulation agreements the unit had. Each unit was asked to respond with the information by March 2016. **The letter requested each unit provide the following for each agreement:**

- 1. Renewal of the agreement:** submit a cover memo and the former proposal with an addendum noting changes made to the proposal online or state no changes have been made. If the current agreement was different than the information listed online, an updated copy of the current agreement detailing changes and justification for those changes were also requested. Statistics on the number of students participating since initial approval were also submitted.
- 2. For revision of an agreement:** submit a cover memo and an addendum that included statistics on the number of students participating since initial approval, an addendum listing course changes or other information that needed to be updated.
- 3. For termination of an agreement:** submit a cover memo and an explanation of the reason for discontinuation, as well as a plan for phase out. The unit was in charge of informing the external college or university of the termination.

**Discussion**

After the March deadline, the ARSSA chair worked with Clark Brigger, Executive Director of Undergraduate Admissions; Robert Kubat, University Registrar; and Anna Griswold, Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education and Executive Director of Student Aid; to review the materials submitted. If a unit did not respond, the agreements were terminated. In some cases, the agreements were so dated, it was easier to terminate and start over rather than trying to update the information on file. There were roughly 107 articulation agreements listed online, and 87 of them were reviewed. More than 60 of the 87 agreements under review were terminated. The five-year review has led to a change in the process of articulation agreements. During the summer of 2016, ACUE updated how articulation agreements were approved. As part of that process change, articulation agreements are now submitted to the Office of Undergraduate

Education rather than the Faculty Senate. ARSSA now has a standing subcommittee that reviews the agreements. ARSSA is also in the process of consulting with CC&R to remove the language about the subcommittee from the membership section of the Senate Standing Rules Article II Senate Committee Structure Letter B and put it in Senate Policy 06-20. The five-year review process should be expedited in the future because fewer agreements will need reviewed. In the end, this review process is necessary to keep the curriculum up-to-date.

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

- Charles Abdalla
- Steven Andelin
- Martha Aynardi
- Daniel Beaver
- Clark Brigger
- Wei-Fan Chen
- Madhuri Desai
- Maura Ellsworth
- Galen Grimes
- Anna Griswold
- Michel M. Haigh, Chair
- Harold Hayford, Vice Chair
- Robert Kubat
- George Samuel
- Douglas Wolfe



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

Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded to Undergraduates

(Informational)

On behalf of the Faculty Senate, the Office of Student Aid facilitates the awarding of University Scholarships designated as 'Faculty Senate Scholarships.' Twenty-one endowments and one annually funded source generate the support for these undergraduate awards. As a whole, the Faculty Senate endowments require recipients to be academically talented and demonstrating financial need. Individually, most of the endowments have a unique eligibility *preference* that we are required to honor. Donors agree to scholarship guidelines that can include both general eligibility criteria and specific *preferences* that donors have chosen. For instance, several guideline preferences specify students from a particular high school, city, or county; more specify students who have demonstrated leadership skills, service to community and school, and/or participation in extra-curricular activities.

Faculty and staff at each campus nominate students who have reached at least their third semester of enrollment at Penn State. In most cases, financial aid officers solicit nominations from faculty, rank order the nominees, and submit names and brief comments about the academic merit and extra-curricular activities of each nominee. The Office of Student Aid then matches a pre-determined number of nominees to appropriate guidelines and funds. In late July or early August, students receive formal scholarship award letters sent from the Faculty Senate Office. Each letter identifies the name of the Faculty Senate Scholarship, the award value, and the one-year term of the award, as well as provides the donor name and a request for a thank you note. If original scholarship recipients do not enroll or choose not to return mid-year, funds are awarded to the next nominees from those particular campuses.

In consultation with the Faculty Senate Office and under guidelines developed by the committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid (ARSSA), the Office of Student Aid ensures the equitable distribution of scholarships across all campuses. **Campus allotments are in proportion to campus undergraduate enrollments.**

In the 2015-16 academic year, Penn State undergraduates received a total of \$254,380 in Faculty Senate Scholarship awards. The majority of recipients are from Pennsylvania (87%), and they are enrolled in 19 different academic colleges. Available spending tends to fluctuate year to year based on the value of the University's investment pool and the available endowment earnings. A three-year comparison follows and confirms this fluctuation in available dollars and resulting awards.

<b>Faculty Senate Scholarship Awarding: A Three-Year Comparison</b>			
	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
<b>Student Recipients</b>	238	224	220
<b>Dollars Awarded</b>	\$254,380	\$234,725	\$221,741
<b>Median Award Value</b>	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000
<b>Average Award Value</b>	\$1,068	\$1,049	\$1,007
<b>Median GPA</b>	3.78	3.8	3.76

This report shows the distribution of scholarships across campuses, colleges and class.

### **2015-16 Faculty Senate Fund Distribution**

Student Recipients	238
Dollars Awarded	\$254,380
Median Award Value	\$1,000
Average Award Value	\$1,068
Median GPA	3.78
Average Need Index	082

#### **A. Faculty Senate Scholarships are awarded to undergraduates across all campuses.**

*The number of awards made per campus is in proportion to campus vs. total undergraduate enrollment figures from the University Budget Office's fall head count, prior to the year of awarding.*

### **Campus Distribution**

<b>Campus</b>	<b># of Awards</b>	<b>% of Total Awards</b>	<b>Fall 2014 Enrollment</b>	<b>% of Total Enrollment</b>
Abington	13	5.5%	4034	5.6%
Altoona	13	5.5%	3931	5.5%
Beaver	2	0.8%	724	1.0%
Berks	10	4.2%	2885	4.0%
Brandywine	5	2.1%	1520	2.1%
Dubois	2	0.8%	636	0.8%
Erie	14	5.9%	4122	5.7%
Fayette	2	0.8%	728	1.0%
Greater Allegheny	2	0.8%	618	0.9%
Harrisburg	12	5.0%	3755	5.2%
Hazleton	3	1.3%	885	1.2%

Lehigh Valley	3	1.3%	882	1.2%
Mont Alto	3	1.3%	989	1.4%
New Kensington	2	0.8%	678	0.9%
Schuylkill	3	1.3%	808	1.1%
Shenango	2	0.8%	550	0.8%
University Park	137	58%	41316	57.4%
Wilkes Barre	2	0.8%	558	0.8%
Worthington Scranton	4	1.7%	1225	1.8%
York	4	1.7%	1143	1.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>238</b>		<b>71,987</b>	

**B. The majority of Faculty Senate Scholarship recipients are from Pennsylvania.**

<b>Residency Distribution</b>		
	<b># of Awards</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
PA	208	87
Non-PA	30	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>238</b>	

**C. At least one Faculty Senate Scholarship recipient is enrolled in each academic College.**

The table below shows the distribution of recipients for the last three years across all academic colleges. This table is not intended to compare to Table A since the student's academic college is not a factor in the selection of Faculty Senate Scholarship recipients. This distribution is an outcome of the selection process and varies from year to year. This table is provided for informational purposes only.

<b>College Distribution</b>			
<b>College</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Abington College	9	10	11
Agricultural Sciences	8	9	20
Altoona College	10	7	6
Arts & Architecture	2	7	7
Behrend College	11	12	14
Berks College	8	6	4
Smeal Business	29	18	25
Capital College	10	11	12
University College	24	20	25
Communications	7	7	8
Division of Undergraduate Studies	1	6	3
Earth & Mineral Science	8	7	3

Education	16	16	10
Engineering	26	29	28
Health & Human Development	21	12	12
Information Sciences & Technology	6	6	2
Liberal Arts	14	22	14
Nursing	9	1	2
Science	19	22	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>220</b>

**D. Faculty Senate Scholarship recipients are predominantly juniors and seniors.**

**Class Distribution**

Semester Standing	# of Awards	% of Total	
3	1		
4	22	10%	Sophomores
5	13		
6	24	16%	Juniors
7	21		
8	86		
9	56		
10	6		
11	9	75%	Seniors
Total	238		

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

- Charles Abdalla
- Steven Andelin
- Martha Aynardi
- Daniel Beaver
- Clark Brigger
- Wei-Fan Chen
- Madhuri Desai
- Maura Ellsworth
- Galen Grimes
- Anna Griswold
- Michel M. Haigh, Chair
- Harold Hayford, Vice Chair
- Robert Kubat

- George Samuel
- Douglas Wolfe

\*Prepared by the Office of Student Aid

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

### Submission of Curricular Proposals

(Informational)

The purpose of this brief report is to inform the university community of the undergraduate curricular pathway, to highlight curricular resources, and to suggest best practices to enhance efficient, successful navigation of curricular review in this time of wide-spread curricular change including, but not limited to:

- a. general education course recertification
- b. new general education course submission (including courses seeking single domain and integrative studies designations)
- c. substantial prerequisite updates in anticipation of LionPath enforcement of prerequisites
- d. implementation of recent US/IL requirement changes
- e. routine course and program reviews

All course and program proposals are required to be initiated through the Curriculum Review & Consultation System (<https://curriculum.psu.edu/>). All proposals are retained as part of the curriculum archives, and thus, all additions, changes, or drops to curriculum must utilize the Curriculum Review & Consultation System no matter the size or scope of the proposal. The curriculum system communicates with LionPath (<https://www.lionpath.psu.edu/>) to create the current Course Catalog which lists specific course information such as the course description. Program information is presented in the University Bulletin (<http://bulletins.psu.edu/bulletins/bluebook/>).

#### **Curricular Pathway and Course Updates**

Though units and colleges may differ in specific practices in executing the curricular pathway, curriculum is developed at the faculty and departmental level and then passes through several stages of academic approval. The academic approval pathway includes: approval by the department, division or school; the college; and the Senate. Additionally, administrative approval may include ACUE, Provost, and the Board of Trustees (programs). A representation of curricular flow can be viewed via the Senate website (<http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/26829-2/>).

Faculty submitting any new course proposal should be prepared to thoroughly outline and describe the course including providing a course outline, description, objectives, justification, relationship to other courses, and seek and secure appropriate consultation (<http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/guide-to-curricular-procedures/glossary/#consultation-statement>). Additionally, courses seeking general education designation need to include

identification and explanation of two to four general education learning objectives and a minimum of three domain-specific criteria per domain; a course syllabus including a minimum of general education learning objectives, course objectives, and a detailed course description and content is required. The Office for General Education provides resources for syllabus content.

Faculty submitting any course proposal will be required to update the long course description and ensure its durability and flexibility which includes delivery in various formats, by different instructors, and on multiple campuses where appropriate. Faculty should also review proper placement and presence of prerequisites, co-requisites, concurrent coursework, and recommended preparations; once LionPath initiates prerequisite check at the point of enrollment, the accuracy of this information becomes of utmost importance.

Though general proposal changes including, but not limited to description updates, prerequisites changes, and content shifts will be directed to the next Senate Curriculum Report upon receipt by the Senate Office, courses requesting a university designation (US, IL, Writing), Bachelor of Arts, or general education (single domains or integrative studies) are directed to the appropriate SCCA subcommittee. Courses seeking an aforementioned special designation are evaluated for approximately 2 weeks in a subcommittee before being included on the next available Senate Curriculum Report if approved. Courses seeking an Integrative Studies certification (linked or inter-domain) must first have the general education domain(s) approved in the general education subcommittee before moving on to the Integrative Studies subcommittee. Units should be mindful of curricular due dates and the timeliness of moving through the various curricular steps for a more streamlined process. The length of time necessary for a proposal to be approved is dependent upon time taken by the department, college, senate, and administrative processes.

### **Resources Available to Assist in the Curricular Process**

There are several resources available to assist in the curricular process. Many of these materials are housed on the curriculum page of the Faculty Senate website (<http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/>).

The most comprehensive resource is the Guide to Curricular Procedures (<http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/guide-to-curricular-procedures/>) found on the Faculty Senate website. As curriculum is constantly changing, the Guide to Curricular Procedures is updated frequently to reflect current practices in submission of course and program proposals. Faculty submitting undergraduate course and program proposals can locate explanations and instruction for curricular submission in the link provided for such topics as:

- a. Submitting proposals to add, change or drop majors, options, and minors
- b. Senate policies concerning majors, options, and minors
- c. Submitting proposals to add, change or drop courses
- d. Senate policies and procedures concerning courses
- e. Bachelor of Arts requirements

- f. First-Year Seminars/ First-Year Engagement
- g. General Education courses (single domain and integrative studies)
- h. United States Cultures (US) and International Cultures (IL) courses
- i. Writing Across the Curriculum courses

Another helpful resource is the set of Guidelines for Curricular Consultation. Consultation is a key component in the curricular process; it ensures effective flow of communication between academic units, disciplinary communities and other stakeholders. Proper consultation enables all units affected by a proposed addition to, change in, or discontinuation of curriculum have an opportunity to voice concerns or make suggestions. Consultation should be viewed as an act in collegiality, but it also allows for assessment of impact to a unit and may be used to inform academic units about other curricula that may interest their students. Consultation should include affected units, disciplinary communities, and campuses that have historically offered a particular course and/or that offer a particular program. A direct link to specific guidelines for curricular consultation is provided on the Faculty Senate curriculum website (<http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/guide-to-curricular-procedures/glossary/#consultation-statement> ).

### **Recommendations to Units to Streamline Reviews**

Though it is not possible to foresee all issues, proposers should pay special attention to the following:

- a. Propose course recertification in general education for courses historically serving a high number of students.
- b. Be mindful of consultation guidelines and collaborate with disciplinary communities and campus partners.
- c. Meet with partners to discuss course content, agree upon objectives and a sample syllabus prior to initiating a curricular proposal.
- d. Take care to ensure accuracy of prerequisites, co-requisites, concurrent courses, and recommended preparation recommendations prior to the LionPath enforcement.
- e. Follow as closely as possible the Guide to Curricular Procedures, Curricular Consultation Guidelines, and Syllabus Guidelines.

### **SENATE COMMITTEE ON CURRICULAR AFFAIRS**

- Asad Azemi
- Michael Bartolacci
- Raymonde Browne
- Colleen Connolly-Ahern
- Michele Duffey, Chair



- Marc Friedenber
- James Jaap, Co-Vice Chair
- Paul Kalapos
- Lawrence Kass
- Kenneth Keiler
- William Kenyon
- Suzanna Linn, Co-Vice Chair
- Robert Melton
- Judith Ozment
- Timothy Palmer
- Mari Pierce
- Julia Plummer
- Lisa Posey
- Felisa Preciado
- Ljubisa Radovic
- Ling Rothrock
- Robert Shannon
- Richard Singer
- Jennifer Sliko
- Rodney Troester

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

### Millennium Scholars Program

(Informational)

#### **Introduction**

The Pennsylvania State University Millennium Scholars Program (MSP) is a very selective merit-based program designed to increase the number of U.S. research scientists and engineers with STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) Ph.Ds. Achieving this goal requires that the program draw upon the full diversity inherent in the student population and so the MSP is open to all high-achieving STEM students who are committed to both becoming leaders in STEM and increasing the diversity of leadership in STEM fields. The MSP was originally launched by the College of Engineering and the Eberly College of Science in 2013 with support for the summer bridge program coming from the Office of Educational Equity and the Provost. From the beginning the PSU program partnered with the Meyerhoff program from the University of Maryland in Baltimore County (UMBC) and in 2014 additional support for the program and its assessment was obtained from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute in the form of a grant for the “Meyerhoff Adaptation Experiment.” In 2015 the program was re-organized under the Provost and now includes the Colleges of Earth and Mineral Sciences, Agricultural Sciences, and Information Sciences and Technology, in addition to Engineering and Science. The Penn State Millennium Scholars Program is modeled after the Meyerhoff Program at UMBC, which has achieved unparalleled success in preparing students of diverse backgrounds for academic and professional success in science and engineering. Since 1993, the UMBC program has graduated more than 1,000 students, who are more than five times as likely to pursue and complete advanced degrees in STEM than students offered admission to the program who declined and went elsewhere (Summers and Hrabowski, 2006; Maton et al., 2012). Like the Meyerhoff Program, the Millennium Scholars Program is much more than a scholarship. It is a program designed to produce cohorts of STEM Scholars that have internalized the program’s core values and by doing so have equipped themselves to be the compassionate leaders needed to change the face of STEM in the U.S. The program’s core values of excellence, inclusion, discipline, collaboration, service, and leadership are lived out by every member of the Millennium Scholars family; students, staff and faculty. Program activities are intentionally designed to reinforce these and related values such as accountability, professionalism, character, resilience, respect, and integrity.

#### **Program Description**

This Millennium Scholar’s experience starts off with an intensive 6-week summer bridge program, with typical days that begin at 6:45 am when all muster for breakfast together and end at 10 pm after a 3-hour tutored math study hall. This schedule is maintained 6 days a week, with most Sundays free until 5:30 pm when students gather to eat together and proceed to cohort meetings and study groups until 10 pm. During the Summer Bridge, scholars complete seven credits of coursework in mathematics and honors English, as well as hands on training in chemistry and engineering workshops. Additional seminars address time management, study

strategies, cultural awareness (World in Conversation), professional development, and problem solving skills. Once a week scholars meet with a top University administrator who emphasize and personalize that week's "pillar of success". In addition, weekly field trips to destinations such as the NIH, Boeing, Johns Hopkins, and the Franklin Institute expose students to what it means to be a leader in STEM and helps to expand the Scholar's scientific and cultural horizons. But most importantly, the summer bridge builds a cohesive cohort of scholars that will continue to live, work and learn together at Penn State and support each other's success. When Scholars join the MSP they are given two priorities. The first is to excel academically, and the second is to make sure their entire cohort excels academically.

Millennium scholars live together on campus for their first three years in special living options where cohort interactions and group study are facilitated. By forming a cohort of ambitious students in a tight-knit learning community, in which students support, inspire, and encourage one another to achieve their full potential, the program addresses some of the traditional pitfalls that have led to low graduation rates and limited diversity within STEM programs across the country. The scholars are supported by a committed team of advisors with whom they meet regularly as individuals and in groups. During their freshman and sophomore years advising focuses on academic success, obtaining research experiences, appropriate socialization to PSU, and reinforcement of the importance of a PhD to become leaders in their chosen fields. The MSP advising team works closely with advisors from the participating Colleges to assure that the scholars are not only firmly embedded in their cohort and the MSP family, but that they are also active members of their home departments. They are in the cohort together as much as possible through their introductory calculus, chemistry and physics courses and tend to self-organize and stay together as they progress further towards their degrees. Students in the older cohorts work with students in younger cohorts as both tutors and peer mentors. A research thesis is required of all Millennium Scholars and the program works closely with the students and academic colleges to get all scholars involved in both academic year research in labs at Penn State, and summer research experiences here and elsewhere as early in their undergraduate experiences as possible. As the scholars enter their junior and senior years the advising shifts towards final preparation for, and matriculation into, the top graduate programs in their field.

### **Program Outcomes**

There are currently 85 students active in the MSP, 69% of the scholars are African American, Hispanic or Native American, and 58% are women. In our most recent cohort of 29 students, 86% are from underrepresented minorities and 69% are women. About half of the first two cohorts are also in Schreyer Honor's College (SHC) and a similar trend in the next two cohorts is expected when those already in SHC are joined by those that Gateway in. The program has had a 100% success rate with the first two cohorts in the gateway math, physics and chemistry courses for their majors and also succeeded in involving 100% of each cohort in at least one summer research experience and academic year research experience. The GPA of cohort 1 is 3.62 after three years. Cohort 2 has a GPA of 3.59 after two years and cohort three has a GPA of 3.56 after their freshman year.

The first cohort of Millennium Scholars are now seniors. Although hard data on matriculation into graduate programs does not yet exist, all 15 of the remaining scholars from the original

cohort of 20 are on track to enter either a Ph.D. or M.D. - Ph.D. program next fall. The remaining 5 students that left the program are on track to at least graduate with a BS from either PSU or elsewhere this year. The MSP has already begun to attract recruiters from several top programs (including Johns Hopkins, Stanford, and MIT) that visit PSU primarily to recruit Millennium Scholars to their REU and graduate programs.

## **References**

Maton, K. I., S. A. Pollard, T. V. McDougall Weise, and F. Hrabowski III. 2012. Meyerhoff Scholars Program: A strengths-based, institution-wide approach to increasing diversity in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. *Mount Sinai Journal of Medicine* 79: 610-623.

Summers, M. F. and F. A. Hrabowski III. 2006. Preparing Minority Scientists and Engineers. *Science* 311: 1870-1871.

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT**

- Kimberly Blockett
- Julia Bryan, Vice Chair
- Dwight Davis
- Erinn Finke
- Timothy Lawlor
- Robert Loeb, Chair
- John Malchow
- Adam Malek
- Dara Purvis
- Eileen Trauth
- Marcus Whitehurst

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS

### Third Party Administrative Services for Penn State's Medical and Prescription Drug Plan

(Informational)

#### **Background**

Penn State has developed a five (5) year strategic plan (2016-2020) that includes a thematic priority of enhancing health. The University will invest in innovative, multi-pronged, institution-wide health initiatives that inspire faculty, staff, and students to focus proactively on their physical, mental and emotional wellness. Penn State needs a service provider to advance its population health management goals in the most effective and efficient ways possible.

The current third party administration (TPA) contract for Penn State's medical and prescription drug plan offered to eligible employees and dependents is ending December 31, 2017.

Currently, Highmark Blue Shield is the TPA and provides claims payment and adjudication services, contracts with the pharmacy benefits manager (Express Scripts), develops a network of out-patient, in-patient and professional services providers, negotiates provider reimbursement rates in order to optimize discounts, provides dedicated member services, provides care management services, creates and maintains online administrative tools and resources, etc. Penn State pays a per member per month (PMPM) fee for these services—for 2017, approximately \$28 PMPM, \$13M annually.

The TPA contract with Highmark Blue Shield has been in force for ten years and Penn State is embarking on a rigorous Request for Proposal (RFP) process this fall. It is anticipated that a TPA vendor(s) decision will be finalized before the end of the Spring 2017 semester, with implementation occurring between that point and the end of 2017. The effective date of the new TPA contract(s) will be January 1, 2018.

#### **Process**

In late September, the Office of Human Resources (through its procurement dept.), sent a Request for Information (RFI) to gather relevant information about a potential partner(s). Four national TPAs were included in the RFI—Highmark Blue Shield, United Health Care, Aetna and Cigna. The University is seeking an administrator(s) that will display an ability to align competitive pricing (including aggressive performance guarantees), minimal network disruption, reasonable access to appropriate sites of care, innovative and user friendly consumer tools, account management, and a heightened focus on overall customer service. The University is exploring the possibility of separately contracting for the management of its prescription drug program and health and care management programs (through Penn State Health Care Partners).

Penn State has partnered with Willis Towers Watson to assist with the selection of one or more health plan administrative partners. The University may consider selecting more than one partner, if certain gaps are identified. For example, a potential partner could be added during the formal RFP process, if it is determined that there would be significant disruption to accessing UPMC providers and facilities that cannot be effectively managed by one of the four national TPAs.

A Steering Committee has been created to oversee the RFP process, review and analyze RFI responses, determine RFP participants, provide input on the content of the RFP, review and analyze RFP responses, determine finalist presentations and provide a recommendation to administration for a TPA partner(s). The Steering Committee includes representatives from 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.

### **Sample of Key Measures for TPA Partners**

#### ***Quantitative Measures***

- I. Medical Network Disruption
  - a. Vendors will be evaluated based on in-network, out of network/participating, out of network/non-participating providers
- II. GeoAccess
  - a. Vendors will be evaluated based on access standards for provider groups and accepting new patient status

#### ***Qualitative Measures***

- I. Penn State expects the vendor(s) to be able to limit restrictions and be flexible in meeting the needs of the University. As such, Penn State is requiring a potential health care partner to be able to accommodate several new and emerging health care delivery models including, but not limited to, the list below. These are not necessarily items that Penn State will be implementing on January 1, 2018, but are potential strategies to be implemented during the contract term.
  - a. Reference based pricing
  - b. Bundled pricing reimbursements
  - c. Accountable Care Organizations
  - d. Patient Centered Medical Homes
  - e. Alternative/Narrow Networks and Steerage (e.g. Quest Diagnostics)
  - f. Mental/Behavioral Health Services
  - g. Pharmacy utilization management
  - h. Competitive drug pricing programs
- II. Health and care management programs
  - a. Performance guarantees
  - b. Ability to collaborate with third party (e.g., Penn State Health Care Partners)
- III. Innovative strategies to leverage Penn State Health

- a. For example, the ability to create a custom network with appropriate steerage mechanisms that would be comprehensive of Penn State Health and its affiliates including the onsite employee health and wellness center?
- IV. Retail pharmacy network and formularies
  - V. Experience with large, higher education clients

Because of the participation on the Steering Committee of members of the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits and the Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits, the Faculty Senate will remain informed and have input on the determination of the TPA partner(s) for a contract term expected to be three to five years in length.

#### **SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS**

- Susan Basso
- Renee Borromeo, Chair
- Victor Brunsten
- Amy Dietz
- Mark Horn
- Peter Jurs
- Cassandra Kitko
- James Miles
- Jamie Myers
- Willie Ofosu
- Erica Smithwick, Vice-Chair
- Greg Stoner

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS**

Penn State Employee Health and Wellness Center

(Informational)

Paula Milone-Nuzzo, Dean of the School of Nursing, Kevin Black, Vice Dean for Penn State College of Medicine, Susan Basso, Vice President for Human Resources, and Greg Stoner, Senior Director of Compensation and Benefits, will present a report Penn State Employee Health and Wellness Center.

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS**

- Susan Basso
- Renee Borromeo, Chair
- Victor Brunsden
- Amy Dietz
- Mark Horn
- Peter Jurs
- Cassandra Kitko
- James Miles
- Jamie Myers
- Willie Ofosu
- Erica Smithwick, Vice-Chair
- Greg Stoner



## **SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS**

### Report on Childcare at Penn State University

(Informational)

This report is a summary of child care services (availability, cost, University contributions) and related research, education, and service activities associated with child care centers at Penn State University campuses. The report summarizes changes since the implementation of recommendations from the [\*“Presidential Task Force on Child Care at Penn State: Findings and Report to President Rodney Erickson.”\*](#)

### **BACKGROUND**

Penn State is a national leader in the provision of on-campus child care services and early childhood education through research, teaching and service activities associated with eight child care centers across the University. Historically the University has supported the philosophy that investment in early childhood education and care should be available to accommodate the changing population and to attract and retain competent and dedicated faculty, staff, and students (HR-48). In addition, many centers serve as training sites for pre-service students in Early Childhood Education and faculty and students also teach and conduct research in child care centers.

Providing care to children at University Park since 1929, Penn State currently serves approximately 1,000 children daily across the Commonwealth. Managed and/or contracted centers are located at University Park, Harrisburg, Behrend, Altoona, Hershey Medical Center and Saint Joseph’s Hospital (through Penn State Health). The majority of children served at these centers have University affiliated faculty, staff and/or student parents.

### **TASK FORCE ON CHILD CARE**

In 2013, a Presidential Task Force on Child Care was developed after a decision to outsource the Bennett Family Center at the University Park campus was reversed following strong objections from parents and staff. In January, 2014 the task force issued a Report [\*“Presidential Task Force on Child Care at Penn State: Findings and Report to President Rodney Erickson.”\*](#) This report contained a number of recommendations that were reviewed and supported by President Erickson.

In December, 2015 a re-instituted Child Care Advisory Committee (CCAC) and newly hired Director of Early Child Care Programs and Services, Holley Rochford, met with President Barron who gave his support for addressing recommendations made in the Task Force Report.

## UPDATE ON REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Since the report was issued in January, 2014 a number of key recommendations have been addressed. Additionally, The Office of Human Resources including, the Director of Early Child Care Programs and Services and the CCAC are working to address remaining recommendations.

An immediate focus is reviewing employee and student data to assess potential child care needs across the Commonwealth. CCAC is also working to ensure consistency in service delivery across centers while also effectively managing costs for parents and the University. Another focus is enhanced engagement of faculty and students in teaching, research and service opportunities within our centers, including domains outside of early childhood education.

**From Finding 1 (“The Penn State community cares about the care and education of young children”), it was recommended that the University provide leadership in early childhood education and care through research, teaching, and service; establish faculty lines; establish scholars-in-residence programs; and, provide incentives for faculty to conduct research.**

### **Update:**

- At the Bennett Family Center and the Child Care Center at Hort Woods in 2015-2016, 450 students spent over 30,000 hours completing coursework assignments and working as work-study or America Reads students.
- The Harrisburg Center has increased student participation from 1-2 students annually to approximately 15 students participating in internships, work study and America Reads in the last two years.
- The Behrend Early Learning Center has also increased student participation in the last two years with over 75 students now participating at the center representing four departments.
- From 2014-2016 there were 14 research studies conducted at the Bennett Family Center and Child Care Center at Hort Woods.

**From Finding 2 (“Penn State Parents are mostly satisfied with services, but needs exist across the University”), it was recommended that the university continue to address child care needs, including availability, financial support for parents, and educational resources.**

### **Update:**

- A Student-Parent Child Care Advisory Committee has been developed to review eligibility criteria and award allocations to Student Parent participants in order to enhance the program to meet the financial needs of low-income student parents accessing high quality child care.
- Table 1 documents the current potential capacity at all campus locations

**TABLE 1- CAPACITY (TOTAL MAX NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED)**

<u>Center</u>	<u>Total Capacity</u>
Altoona- Penn Mont Academy	30
Behrend- Early Learning Center	90
University Park- Bennett Family Center	147
University Park- Daybridge KinderCare Education	177
Harrisburg Children's Learning Center	65
Hershey Medical Center KinderCare EDUCATION	140
University Park- Child Care Center at Hort Woods	219
Penn State Health- Saint Joseph's Hospital-Creative Beginnings	189
<b>TOTAL CAPACITY=</b>	<b>1,057</b>

- Table 2 documents the current availability at all campus locations

**TABLE 2-CENTER OPENINGS at University child care centers (AS OF October 31, 2016)**

<u>Center</u>	<u>Total Openings</u>	<u>Infant</u>	<u>Toddler</u>	<u>Preschool</u>	<u>School-Age/ Kindergarten</u>
Altoona- Penn Mont Academy	6	0	0	6	N/A
Behrend- Early Learning Center	7	0	5	2	N/A
University Park- Bennett Family Center	0	0	0	0	0
University Park- Daybridge KinderCare Education	0	0	0	0	4
Harrisburg Children's Learning Center	13	0	4	9	N/A
Hershey Medical Center KinderCare	18	0	0	12	6
University Park- Child Care Center at Hort Woods	0	0	0	0	N/A
Penn State Health- Saint Joseph's Hospital- Creative Beginnings	18	0	7	11	0

- Table 3 documents current tuition rates at all campus locations

**TABLE 3- TUITION RATES (Current tuition rates for Penn State Child Care Centers)**

<u>Center</u>	<u>Infant</u>	<u>Toddler</u>	<u>Preschool</u>	<u>School-Age</u>	<u>Kindergarten</u>
<b>Altoona-Penn Mont Academy</b> <i>*9 monthly payments (does not include summer)</i>	N/A	N/A	\$651 (PSU rate at 5 full days), \$693 (Community Rate at 5 full days), \$605 (PSU Rate M-F 9-4); \$637 (Community Rate M-F 9-4), \$472 (half day rate PSU & Community)	N/A	N/A
<b>Behrend-Early Learning Center</b> <i>*Weekly rates listed</i>	PSU Rates- \$211 (5 days), \$150 (3 days) \$100 (2 days); Community Rates- \$218 (5 days), \$156 (3 days), \$104 (2 days)	PSU Rates- \$201 (5 days), \$144 (3 days) \$95 (2 days) Community Rates- \$208 (5 days), \$150 (3 days), \$100 (2 days)	PSU Rates- \$183 (5 days), \$137 (3 days) \$92 (2 days) Community Rates- \$190 (5 days), \$143 (3 days), \$95 (2 days)	N/A	N/A
<b>University Park-Bennett Family Center</b> <i>*Monthly sliding scale rates listed at 5 full days</i>	\$879 (30K or less); \$1,007 (30,001-70K); \$1,146 (70,001-110K); \$1,408 (110,001-160K), \$1,675 (160K or more)	\$879 (30K or less); \$1,007 (30,001-70K); \$1,146 (70,001-110K); \$1,408 (110,001-160K), \$1,675 (160K or more)	\$698 (30K or less); \$787 (30,001-70K); \$887 (70,001-110K); \$977 ((110,001-160K); \$1,066 (160K or more)	\$841	\$997
<b>University Park-Daybridge</b>	PSU Rates- \$1,077 (5 days); \$808 (3 days); \$538 (2 days)	PSU Rates- \$991 (5 days); \$742 (3 days); \$495 (2 days) Community Rates-	PSU Rates- \$758 (5 days), \$568 (3 days); \$379 (2 days) Community Rates-	\$959	N/A

<b>KinderCare Education</b> <i>*Monthly rates listed</i>	Community Rates- \$1,196 (5 days); \$896 (3 days); \$596 (2 days)	\$1,100 (5 days); \$826 (3 days); \$550 (2 days)	\$840 (5 days); \$631 (3 days); \$420 (2 days)		
<b>Harrisburg Children's Learning Center</b> <i>*Weekly rates listed</i>	PSU Rates-\$210 (5 days); \$163 (3 days); \$124 (2 days) Community Rates-\$224 (5 days); \$175 (3 days); \$133 (2 days)	PSU Rates- \$201 (5 days); \$158 (3 days); \$120 (2 days) Community Rates-\$213 (5 days); \$168 (3 days); \$127 (2 days)	PSU Rates- \$177 (5 days); \$139 (3 days); \$104 (2 days) Community Rates-\$187 (5 days), \$148 (3 days); \$112 (2 days)	N/A	N/A
<b>Hershey Medical Center KinderCare EDUCATION</b> <i>*Weekly rates listed</i>	PSU Rates-\$263 (5 days); \$210 (3 days); \$158 (2 days) Community Rates-\$305 (5 days); \$243 (3 days); \$182 (2 days)	PSU Rates-\$252(5 d); \$201(3 days); \$151(2 days) Community Rates-\$291 (5 days); \$233 (3 days); \$175 (2 days)	PSU Rates-\$220 (5 days); \$177 (3 days); \$133 (2 days) Community Days-\$255 (5 days); \$205 (3days); \$153 (2 days)	PSU Rates- Before /After \$105 (5 days); \$84 (3 days); \$63 (2 days) Community Rates- Before /After- \$122 (5 days); \$98 (3 days); \$74 (2 days)	PSU Rate-\$225 Community Rate-\$261

<b>University Park- Child Care Center at Hort Woods</b> <i>*Sliding tuition scale rates listed</i>	\$879 (30K or less); \$1,007 (30,001-70K); \$1,146 (70,001-110K); \$1,408 (110,001-160K), \$1,675 (160K or more)	\$879 (30K or less); \$1,007 (30,001-70K); \$1,146 (70,001-110K); \$1,408 (110,001-160K), \$1,675 (160K or more)	\$698 (30K or less); \$787 (30,001- 70K); \$887 (70,001-110K); \$977 ((110,001-160K); \$1,066 (160K or more)	\$200/week N/A summer only
<b>Penn State Health- Saint Joe's Creative Beginnings</b> <i>*Weekly rates</i>	\$247 (5 days); \$173 (3 days); \$119 (2 days)	\$238 (5 days); \$169 (3 days); \$116 (2 days)	\$205 (5 days); \$144 (3 days); \$97 (2 days)	Before/Aft \$205 (5 er School- days); \$144 \$115 (5 (3 days); days); \$69 \$97 (2 (3 days); days) \$46 (2 days)

**From Finding 3 (“Institutionalize attention to child care needs for Penn State families”), it was recommended that campus-level decision-making be supported; HR-48 should be enforced; child care should move from HHD to HR; AD-39 applicability be evaluated; and that costs and benefits be consistently evaluated.**

**Update:**

- The Universities policy on the provision of child care (HR-48) has been enforced by hiring a Director of Early Child Care Programs and Services in January of 2015.
- The Child Care Advisory Committee was also re-constituted in the summer of 2014.
- Oversight of Child Care was moved from the College of Health and Human Development to Human Resources, under the Director of Early Child Care Programs and Services
- Altoona began a child care advisory committee in August, 2016.
- Harrisburg is beginning the process for developing a child care advisory committee.
- Employees at the child care centers were made exempt from the required child-to-teacher ratios in AD-39. Since the centers are licensed and have state regulated child-to-teacher ratios, are enrolled in the Keystone Stars (Quality Rating and Improvement System for the state of PA) and are NAEYC accredited it was determined that child care centers did not need to follow required ratios as outlined in AD-39. However, the majority of centers have supervision plans in place to revert back to ratios requiring two teachers to be with children at all times if the center is put on a provisional license for any reason by the Department of Human Services.
- HR-48 is being revised to include additional guidelines to support health and safety requirements for our managed and contracted child care centers such as, handling medical emergencies, medication administration and required CPR/First Aid Certification.
- Table 4 shows budget information for all campus locations, documenting significant university investment in child care, largely through supplementation of employee fringe costs and in-kind support (not shown here, such as building maintenance), costs which are not currently met by tuition and grant income.

**TABLE 4- BUDGET INFORMATION (CURRENT FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 2016-JUNE 30, 2017)**

<b>FY16/17</b>	<b>Bright Horizons Managed Centers</b>					
	<i>The Bennett Family Center at University Park</i>	<i>The Child Care Center at Hort Woods, University Park</i>	<i>Behrend Early Learning Center</i>	<i>Harrisburg Children's Learning Center</i>	<i>Saint Joe's Children's Creative Beginning</i>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Expenses</b>						
<b>Employee Salary</b>	\$1,206,865	\$1,745,711	\$717,795	\$481,046	\$1,022,781	\$5,174,198
<b>Fringe</b>	\$430,271	\$635,278	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,065,549
<b>Total Salary + Fringe</b>	<b>\$1,637,136</b>	<b>\$2,380,989</b>	<b>\$717,795</b>	<b>\$481,046</b>	<b>\$ 1,022,781</b>	<b>\$6,239,747</b>
<b>HR related expenses *</b>	\$63,271	\$89,387	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$152,658
<b>Operating Expenses (Food, equipment, materials, etc.)</b>	\$213,474	\$186,900	\$231,774	\$144,877	\$326,397	\$1,103,422
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>\$1,913,881</b>	<b>\$2,657,276</b>	<b>\$949,569</b>	<b>\$625,923</b>	<b>\$1,349,178</b>	<b>\$7,495,827</b>
<b>Income</b>						
<b>Tuition, subsidies</b>	\$1,492,064	\$2,107,961	\$735,273	\$495,796	\$1,328,761	\$6,159,855
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>\$1,492,064</b>	<b>\$2,107,961</b>	<b>\$735,273</b>	<b>\$495,796</b>	<b>\$1,328,761</b>	<b>\$6,159,855</b>
<b>Penn State contribution</b>	<b>\$421,817</b>	<b>\$549,315</b>	<b>\$214,296</b>	<b>\$130,127</b>	<b>\$20,417</b>	<b>\$1,335,972</b>



<b><i>Net Income/(Loss)</i></b>	<b><i>\$-</i></b>	<b><i>\$-</i></b>	<b><i>\$-</i></b>	<b><i>\$-</i></b>	<b><i>\$-</i></b>	<b><i>\$-</i></b>
-------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

*\*Penn Mont Academy and KinderCare EDUCATION (Daybridge and Hershey) Centers do not report budget information. Penn State also does not currently provide a subsidy to these three centers. NOTE: Rochford and Lucas salary and fringe charged to Bennett and Hort Woods based on percentage of income*

**From Finding 4 (“Peer-institutions are addressing similar issues and concerns”), it was recommended that a CIC consortium be formed on the topic and that continued models and cost-structures across peer institutions be explored.**

**Update:**

- The Director of Early Child Care Programs and Services has examined a number of cost-structures used across peer institutions and will work with CCAC to continue to explore these structures and share findings in the future.

**From Finding 5 (“Future management of Bennett Family Center and the Child Care Center at Hort Woods needs to be determined as soon as possible”), it was recommended that University Park campus should maintain teacher status as Penn State employees for BFC and former-Child Development Lab (CDL) employees at Hort Woods, evaluate the feasibility of an outsourced management model to compete with salaries and benefits commensurate with Penn State benefits and salaries, and improve collaboration and coordination of center activities.**

**Update:**

- In May of 2015 Bright Horizons acquired Hildebrandt, LLC moving management of the Child Care Center at Hort Woods along with the Harrisburg Child Learning Center over to Bright Horizons.
- On August 18, 2015 Rochford and members of the CCAC met with Provost Nick Jones, Senior VP of F&B, David Gray and VP of Human Resources, Susan Basso. A recommendation was made to maintain management of the Bennett Family Center and move the Child Care Center at Hort Woods in-house to be managed by Penn State beginning July 1, 2016 when the centers contract expired with Hildebrandt/Bright Horizons.
- On August 31, 2015 university officials announced that they accepted the recommendation making the decision to manage both centers, moving Hort Woods in-house July 1, 2016.
- The transition of the Child Care Center at Hort Woods went smoothly with no disruption to the care and safety of children.

**Additional Changes**

- Penn State suspended operations at the Behrend campus Early Learning Center on May 25, 2015. The Early Learning Center previously managed by Penn State is now managed by Bright Horizons who took over management of the center on June 1, 2015.
- On April 29, 2016 university officials announced that Penn State would not be renewing a contract with Duck Hollow Learning Center to operate the Cub’s Den, a center at Fayette, The Eberly Campus. The center closed on May 27<sup>th</sup> 2016.

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS**

- Susan Basso

- Renee Borrromeo, Chair
- Victor Brunsdan
- Amy Dietz
- Mark Horn
- Peter Jurs
- Cassandra Kitko
- James Miles
- Jamie Myers
- Willie Ofosu
- Erica Smithwick, Vice-Chair
- Greg Stoner

Report prepared with the cooperation of Holley Rochford, Director of Early Childhood Programs and Services

## FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

### Drug Testing Program for Penn State's Defense Related Research Units, Applied Research Laboratory (ARL) and Electro-Optics Center (EOC)

(Informational)

#### **Introduction**

This report is an overview of the updated drug testing program implemented at Penn State's two Defense Related Research Units – the Applied Research Laboratory (ARL), a U.S. Navy University Affiliated Research Center (UARC), and the Electro-Optics Center (EOC), collectively referred to herein as the Laboratory. The objectives of this program enhancement, which became effective July 1, 2016, are to maintain a Laboratory work force and work environment free from the effects of drug abuse, and to ensure the Laboratory's compliance with related Federal and Penn State policies [i.e., DFARS 252.223-7004, *Drug-Free Work Force* (which applies to federal contracts that involve access to classified information) and Penn State Policy AD33, *A Drug-Free Workplace*].

#### **Information**

The program covers Penn State employees whose assigned Penn State administrative unit is ARL or EOC, including wage payroll employees and students, as well as other Penn State employees who hold government security clearances and who perform their primary duties on Laboratory premises, such as Assistant Police Services Officers assigned in support of the Laboratory. Technical Service employees are excluded from this program, pending collective bargaining.

The program prohibits illicit drug use or the presence of any illegal substance in the body while on work premises or performing covered work. It also prohibits illicit drug use or trafficking of controlled substances even if such activities are performed while off work. Employees are required to notify the Laboratory Human Resources and Security Services within seventy-two hours of any criminal arrest or conviction, per Penn State Policy HR 99, "Background Check Process," which was instituted in July 2012.

The Laboratory's program is administered through the Penn State Occupational Medicine Office. The protocols are benchmarked on the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) collection procedures to ensure testing accuracy and confidentiality, and are available for review in the Occupational Medicine Office. PSU CDL licensed drivers have been tested under this program for years without any false positive results. The Occupational Medicine Office oversees similar programs applicable to Penn State employees at University Park Airport, in keeping with Federal Aviation Administration policies, and for employees at the Breazeale Nuclear Reactor, in compliance with Nuclear Regulatory Commission policies.

Drug testing sample collections are administered by the Penn State Occupational Medicine Office, local emergency room or off-site contracted collection sites. Collections are taken as a urine sample and sent to an independent laboratory. The results are reported back to the Penn State Occupational Medicine Office. Positive test results are reviewed by Occupational Medicine

for any mitigating causes that would result in a compliant finding. Collection is confidential, and results are only shared on an as-needed basis.

Sample collections are performed pre-employment, and employment is contingent upon drug-free lab results. Other drug testing sample collections are conducted at the time of return to work after a leave that is greater than 6 months; under reasonable suspicion (such as abnormal speech or gait, or inappropriate conduct); after an on-the-job incident involving unsafe practices or causing significant damage; if deliberate disregard or negligence results in a violation of security requirements that is determined to have caused, or could have caused the loss or compromise of classified material; and under random sampling. For random testing, names will be selected by a computer program and supplied by Penn State Occupational Medicine on a random basis throughout the year. When notified of a random test, employees are required to report to the designated collection site no later than two hours after notification.

Employees who have a positive drug test result will be regarded as non-compliant with this program. Refusal to participate in testing shall be interpreted as a confirmed positive drug test result. Employees whose participation results in a drug test that is positive may request, at his or her expense, independent testing of the same sample by a laboratory that meets the requirements of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania substance abuse testing.

Employees who are non-compliant with the program will be subject to disciplinary action up to and including discharge. Dependent upon the appropriate disciplinary action decision, the employee may also be required to submit to an evaluation by a Penn State Substance Abuse Professional (SAP). Non-compliant employees that hold a government security clearance will be required to report an adverse information report to the Defense Security Services, and this may result in a change to their ability to hold a clearance. Non-compliant wage payroll employees will be subject to termination.

An employee who admits to illicit drug use and wishes to seek treatment and rehabilitation, in advance of a request to submit to a drug test, can contact the Laboratory Human Resources Management and/or Laboratory Facility Security Officer. The Laboratory, in concert with the Penn State Substance Abuse Professional (SAP), will evaluate the situation and make recommendations for treatment and rehabilitation programs. The employee will be required to successfully complete the recommended program suggested by the SAP, test negative to a drug test, as well as agree to accelerated random testing before the Laboratory will permit the employee to return to work.

## **Summary**

The enhanced Laboratory drug testing program became effective July 1, 2016 and was implemented in compliance with DFARS 252.223-7004, *Drug-Free Work Force*, which permits the Laboratory to work on federal contracts, and with Penn State Policy AD33, *A Drug-Free Workplace*. The program seeks to maintain a drug-free work place that facilitates the ability of Laboratory employees to more effectively perform research in an academic environment and to protect national security interests in the conduct of that research.

**Senate Committee on Research**

Ali Borhan  
Yohchia Frank Chen  
Alison Franklin  
Andrew Geller  
John Hanold  
Michael Hickner  
Kathleen Hodgdon  
Janet Hughes  
Ronald Huss  
Andrey Krasilnikov  
Derek Kreager  
Todd LaJeunesse  
Joshua Lambert  
George Moldovan  
Sudarshan Nelatury  
Rogerio Neves, Vice-Chair  
Azita Ranjbar  
Andrew Schulz, Chair  
Neil Sharkey  
Alok Sinha  
Mort Webster  
Candice Yekel

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

### New Members Document

(Informational)

#### **General Charge/Duties of Committee:**

The Committee on Undergraduate Education shall make recommendations on policies relating to all undergraduate instruction offered for credit by all delivery systems including Resident Instruction, Continuing Education, World Campus and independent learning. Furthermore, the Committee oversees activities related to undergraduate advising. The Committee shall serve as an advisory body to the University Faculty Senate on matters that may affect the attainment of the University's undergraduate education mission.

#### **How Committee Works:**

The Committee maintains a wide focus on undergraduate education, and therefore, is involved with many facets of the faculty senate as it pertains to undergraduates. Listed below are the many policies that the committee oversees. In addition, the Committee has a standing sub-committee (Academic Standards) that reviews student petitions seeking exemption to senate policies. The Academic Standards Sub-Committee consists of a Chair (Vice-Chair of UE) and four other members (most from UE). The UE Committee also provides liaisons to multiple Curricular Affairs sub-committees (General Education, Retention and Transfer, US/IL, and Writing) to assist in reviewing course proposals and also provides two faculty members to the University Advising Council. There are two annual reports that the committee provides to the Faculty Senate: 1. Grade Distribution, 2. Petitions.

The Committee works with other Senate Committees (including, but not limited to, ARSSA, Curricular Affairs, Student Life, and the Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology Committee) to address any issues and concerns particularly focused on undergraduate students.

The committee shall provide a liaison to the Faculty Advisory Committee for the Schreyer Honors College and the University Academic Measures Committee. It shall be the University Faculty Senate advisory body to the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education.

Given the broad applicability of the UE Committee, there are many administrative and resource persons who participate in discussions and provide perspective regarding multiple facets of the university undergraduate education academic community.

#### **Relevant Administrative/Resource Persons on Committee:**

Assistant Registrar, Academic Records

Dean, Schreyer Honors College

Associate Vice President and Senior Associate Dean, Office of Undergraduate Education

Assistant Vice Provost for Online Undergraduate and Blended Programs, World Campus

Executive Director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies and Associate Dean for Advising

**Relevant Senate Policies:** (<http://senate.psu.edu/policies-and-rules-for-undergraduate-students/>)

**02-00 Classification of Undergraduate Students**

02-20 Degree Candidates

02-50 Degree-Seeking Provisional Student

02-80 Non-degree Student

**05-00 and 06-00 Degree Candidates**

05-20 First-Year and Advanced Standing Admission

05-50 Baccalaureate and Associate Degree Candidates

05-80 First-Year Admission as a Baccalaureate or an Associate Degree Candidate

05-81 Minimum Entrance Requirements for Admission to Baccalaureate Degree Programs

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

06-30 Advanced Standing Admission as a Baccalaureate Degree Candidate

06-57 Advanced Standing with Forgiveness

06-70 Advanced Standing Admission as an Associate Degree Candidate

**10-00 Degree-Seeking Provisional Students**

**12-00 Admission of a Degree-Seeking Provisional Student Change to College of Enrollment**

12-30 Baccalaureate Degree Candidate

12-70 Associate Degree Candidate

**14-00 Non-degree Student Classification and Course Enrollment**

14-10 Limitations to Enrollment as a Non-degree Student

**16-00 Degree Candidate to Non-degree Student**



**18-00 Admission of Non-degree Student as Degree Candidate**

18-30 Baccalaureate Degree Candidate

18-70 Associate Degree Candidate

**20-00 Resolution of Classroom Problems**

**32-00 Advising Policy**

32-10 The University's Advising Program

32-20 The Nature of the University's Advising Program

32-30 Responsibilities of Advisers and Advisees

32-40 Assignment of Adviser

32-50 Audit of Unfulfilled Requirements

**39-00 Division of Undergraduate Studies**

39-20 Admission

39-50 Enrollment Time Limit

39-80 Completion of Enrollment

**43-00 Syllabus**

**44-00 Examinations**

44-10 General Examination Policy

44-20 Final Examination Policy

44-25 Conflict Final Examinations

44-30 Non-Final Examinations

44-35 Conflict of Non-Final Examinations

44-40 Proctoring of Examinations

44-45 Examinations for Failure Elimination

44-50 Examinations for Awarding Credit by Examination

**47-00, 48-00, and 49-00 Grades**

47-20 Basis for Grades

47-40 Grading System

47-60 Definition of Grades

47-70 Online Student Progress Report (Formerly Mid-Semester Evaluation)

47-80 Repeating Courses

48-20 Failure to Complete a Course

48-30 Corrected Grades

48-40 Deferred Grades

48-50 No Grade (NG)

48-80 Symbols for Course Audit

49-20 Academic Integrity

49-40 Research Grades

49-60 Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory--Baccalaureate and Associate Degree Candidates

**51-00 Grade-Point Average**

51-30 Method of Calculation of Grade Points

51-50 Cumulative Grade-Point Average

**54-00 Academic Progress**

54-10 Good Standing

54-20 Academic Warning

54-40 Academic Suspension

54-50 Academic Dismissal

54-56 Drops by Colleges

54-58 Notification

54-90 Academic Renewal

**56-00 Withdrawal And Leave Of Absence**

56-30 Withdrawal

56-70 Leave of Absence

**58-00 Re-enrollment as a Degree Candidate**

58-20 Persons to Whom Policy is Applicable

58-50 Conditions for Re-enrollment as a Degree Candidate

**59-00 Minors and Certificates**

Requirements for the Minor

Requirements for Certificates

**60-00 Completing More Than One Undergraduate Program (Concurrent Majors and Sequential Majors)**

60-10 Concurrent Major Program

60-20 Sequential Majors Program

**65-00 Schreyer Honors College**

**82-00 and 83-00 Degree Requirements**

82-20 General Requirements

82-40 Cumulative Grade-Point Average Requirements

82-44 Courses Requiring at Least C Grades

82-60 Exceptions to Degree Requirements

82-80 Implementation

83-40 ROTC Credit

83-80 Limitations on Source and Time for Credit Acquisition

**86-00 Candidate Responsibilities and Options**

**88-00 Distinction and Honors**

88-30 Graduation with Distinction

88-70 Graduation with Honors

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION**

Andrew Ahr  
Jesse Barlow  
Barbara Barr  
Paul Bartell  
Kathy Bieschke  
Linda Caldwell  
Gretchen Casper  
Richard Duschl  
David Eggebeen, Co-Vice-Chair  
Joyce Furfaro  
Yvonne Gaudelius  
Samantha Geisinger  
David Han  
Claire Kelley  
Ellen Knodt  
Keefe Manning, Chair  
Karen Pollack  
Janina Safran  
Ann Schmiedekamp  
David Smith  
Samia Suliman  
Mary Beth Williams  
Matthew Wilson, Co-Vice-Chair  
Richard Young

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING

### New Members Orientation

(Informational)

This document is a reference that provides information about the structure and function of the University Planning Committee.

#### **Membership** (Assigned by the Committee on Committees and Rules)

- (i) At least twelve elected faculty senators
- (ii) One undergraduate student senator
- (ii) One graduate student senator
- (iv) Executive Vice President/Provost of the University or representative
- (vi) Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer (nonvoting)
- (vi) Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations (nonvoting)

#### **Duties (from Senate Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6.o)**

The Committee on University Planning solely and in consultation with other committees, shall report on and/or propose action on matters of University planning that affect development and alumni relations, physical plant resources, and the academic and financial policies of the University. In accordance with the Constitutional advisory and consultative roles of the Senate, specific areas of responsibilities include but are not limited to: the allocation of resources among units and functions as they relate to educational policy; academic planning, development planning, and campus and physical planning.

The committee shall be the primary Senate body advisory to the Office of the President, including the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer, Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations, and the Executive Vice President/Provost, for all planning functions; and shall review those functions of the University that contribute to the planning processes. The committee shall participate in the development and review of the master plans for each of the University's campuses and be consulted regularly in regards to proposed changes to those plans. In addition, this committee shall assist in creating an understanding of the University's planning functions among all units within the University. The committee shall have access to all information necessary to perform their charge.

## **Mandated Reports**

- a. Annual Construction Report
- b. Annual Space Allocation and Utilization Report
- c. Annual University Budget and Planning Report
- d. Biennial Development and Alumni Relations Report

The Committee on University Planning shall have the authority to approve its mandated Informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

## **Liaison with other Senate, Administrative, Special or Joint Committees**

1. UPC Chair is a non-voting member of the Board of Trustees Governance and Long-Range Planning Committee
2. UPC Representative on FPAB (Facilities Planning Advisory Board)
3. UPC Representative on the Parking Appeal Committee

## **Relevant AD policies, HR Policies, or Faculty Senate Academic Policies and Procedures that are routinely used or referenced by UPC**

### **Administrative Policies**

- [AD01](#) - Auditoriums, Policies and Procedures for Use of University Athletic and Entertainment Facilities
- [AD02](#) - Non-University Groups Using University Facilities
- [AD05](#) - Naming University Facilities
- [AD07](#) - Use of University Name, Symbols and/or Graphic Devices
- [AD15](#) - Fees and Rates for Facilities and Services (Formerly *Fees and Charges for Facilities and Services*)
- [AD16](#) - Reporting Requirements for Vehicles Acquired or Disposed of by the University
- [AD21](#) - Use of the Agricultural Arena and Agricultural Progress Days Facilities
- [AD26](#) - Sale and Serving of Food and Beverages at University Locations (Formerly *Sale of Food and Beverages at University Locations*)
- [AD27](#) - Commercial Sales Activities at University Locations
- [AD30](#) - Cable Television (CATV) at University Facilities
- [AD31](#) - Public Art (Formerly *Outdoor Public Art*)
- [AD32](#) - Smoking Policy and Guideline
- [AD34](#) - University Recycling Program
- [AD38](#) - Administration of University Physical Facilities
- [AD51](#) - Use of Outdoor Areas for Expressive Activities
- [AD57](#) - General Regulations on Use of University Property
- [AD62](#) - Use of General Purpose Classrooms (Formerly *Scheduling and Use of General Purpose Classrooms*)
- [AD64](#) - Energy Conservation Policy
- [AD65](#) - Electronic Security and Access Systems (formerly SY33)
- [AD66](#) - Service Animal Policy
- [AD68](#) - University Access Policy
- [AD70](#) - Emergency Management
- [AD73](#) - Accessing Athletic and Recreational Facilities
- [AD75](#) - University Events and Ticket Accountability
- [AD76](#) - Emergency Notifications on Digital Signage
- [AD78](#) - Threats to Campus Safety
- [AD81](#) - Independence of the University Police and Public Safety

- [AD82](#) - Classroom Scheduling

### **Human Resources Policies**

- [HR09](#) - Reasonable Accommodation for University Employees
- [HR20](#) - Breastfeeding Support

### **Proposed Changes to Senate Standing Rules**

The Committee on University Planning solely and in consultation with other committees, shall report on and/or propose action on matters of University planning that affect development and alumni relations, physical plant resources, and the academic and financial policies of the University. In accordance with the Constitutional advisory and consultative roles of the Senate, specific areas of responsibilities include but are not limited to: the allocation of resources among units and functions as they relate to educational policy; academic planning, [strategic planning](#), development planning, and campus and physical planning [including safety and security of persons, buildings, and facilities](#).

The committee shall be the primary Senate body advisory to the Office of the President, including the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer, Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations, and the Executive Vice President/Provost, for all planning functions; and shall review those functions of the University that contribute to the planning processes. The committee shall participate in the development and review of the master plans for each of the University's campuses and be consulted regularly in regards to proposed changes to those plans. In addition, this committee shall assist in creating an understanding of the University's planning functions among all units within the University. The committee shall have access to all information necessary to perform their charge.

### **Mandated Reports**

- a. Annual Construction Report
- b. ~~Annual~~ [Biennial](#) Space Allocation and Utilization Report
- c. Annual University Budget and Planning Report
- d. Biennial Development and Alumni Relations Report

The Committee on University Planning shall have the authority to approve its mandated Informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

**Rationale: There are usually not significant space allocation changes each year to a warrant a report. The frequency of the mandated report is a minimum. UPC can decide to sponsor a Space Allocation and Utilization Report more frequently if there are significant changes to report.**

### **COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING**

James Adair  
Nancy Baldwin  
Kevin Cockroft  
Peter Eberle  
David Gray  
Nicholas Jones

Rodney Kirsch  
Binh Le  
David Lieb  
Frantisek Marko  
John Messner  
Padma Patil  
Laura Pauley, Chair  
Nicholas Pearson  
Vansh Prabhu  
Gavin Robertson  
Jeff Robzen  
Ira Saltz  
Shuang Shen  
Steinn Sigurdsson, Vice-Chair  
Rachel Smith  
H. Ford Stryker  
Ming Wang  
Jong Yun





**MINUTES OF SENATE COUNCIL**  
Tuesday, November 15, 2016 – 1:30 p.m.  
102 Kern Graduate Building

**Members Present:** M. Ansari, R. Bascom, C. Eckhardt, S. Geisinger, G. Grimes, K. Jablokow, E. Knodt, B. Le, J. Myers, J. Miles, S. Nelatury, J. Nousek, N. Rowland, E. Seymour, R. Shannon, A. Sharma, E. Smithwick, J. Strauss, B. Szczygiel, A. Taylor, M. Wilson, M. Woessner, D. Wolfe

**Guests/Others:** B. Bowen, P. Brown, D. Hagen, Z. Iqbal, C. Lin, J. Nichols, R. Pangborn, S. Sigurdsson,

**Absent:** M. Hanes, R. Jolly, N. Jones, F. Preciado, M. Whitehurst, C. Weidemann

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Strauss called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m. on Tuesday, November 15, 2016, in 102 Kern Graduate Building.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 4, 2016**

The minutes of the October 4, 2016, meeting were approved on a Brunsdan/Szczygiel motion.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS**

Chair Strauss welcomed all members and special guests.

Additional announcements by Chair Strauss:

- The November 15 Faculty Advisory Committee meeting has been rescheduled for November 29. The agenda for that meeting has not been finalized, so Councilors are invited to submit agenda topics to the elected committee members or any of the Senate officers.
- Chair Strauss announced that an FAC meeting and Senate Council meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 10, 2017.

Executive Vice President and Provost Jones was unable to attend the meeting.

Vice Provost Bowen reported that the second search for the Dean of Penn State Law is underway. The committee met yesterday and are hoping for success in this round. The search

committee for the Dean of the Schreyer Honors College met. If anyone knows any interested candidates, please send them forward.

Vice President Rob Pangborn gave an update on applications for the next admissions cycle and reported that the General Education Assessment office is up and running. Sixteen faculty fellows, nine from campuses other than University Park and seven from University Park, have been identified.

The Senate officers and the Executive Director had no comments.

There were no councilor questions or comments.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

Revisions to the Wilkes Barre constitution were approved, with the comment that the rationale should be removed from the Constitution document. The campus will be notified.

2017-2018 Senate Calendar On an Ansari/Aynardi motion, Senate Council voted to approve the calendar.

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL**

Minutes from the September 14, 2016, Graduate Council meeting and the draft minutes of the October 19, 2016 meeting are available on the Graduate School website.

### **AGENDA ITEMS FOR DECEMBER 6, 2016**

Forensic Business: Chair Strauss pointed out the item submitted by Global Programs on November 14 and distributed to Council late that afternoon. Questions were raised about the reference to “sli.do” in the report, and it was agreed that the reference should be removed, but that the Chair should inform the Senate that use of Slido.com is being tested for this forensic report. On an Ansari/Nousek motion the report was placed on the Agenda. Fifteen minutes was allotted for the report and discussion. The committee will be asked to provide information about the sli.do service prior to the December 6 meeting so that Senators are prepared to use the service.

Unfinished Business: Chair Strauss pointed out that the resolution presented by Senator K. Shapiro will be discussed as Unfinished Business at the December 6 meeting.

### Legislative Reports

Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Affairs. Revisions to Senate Policy 48-40 and 48-50. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wilson/Brunsdan motion.

*Committees and Rules.* Revisions to Senate Standing Rules Article II Section 6(o) Committee on University Planning. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Eckhardt/Wilson motion. Councilors pointed out the need for some editing of the rationale.

#### Advisory/Consultative Reports

*Special Committee on University Governance.* Follow-Up Report and Recommendations for Improving Governance and Communications and Furthering the Academic Mission at Penn State. This report was re-categorized as an Informational Report on a Wilson/Eckhardt motion.

#### Informational Reports

*Special Committee on University Governance.* Follow-Up Report and Recommendations for Improving Governance and Communications and Furthering the Academic Mission at Penn State. This re-categorized report was placed on the Agenda on an Ansari/Wilson motion. Fifteen minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

*Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid.* Articulation Agreement Review. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Szczygiel motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

*Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid.* Scholarship Report 2015-16. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Aynardi motion. Five minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

*Curricular Affairs.* Submission of Curricular Proposals. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Ansari/Szczygiel motion. Fifteen minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

*Educational Equity and Campus Environment.* Millennium Scholars Program. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Geisinger motion. Fifteen minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

*Faculty Benefits.* Third Party Administrative Services for Penn State's Medical and Prescription Drug Plan. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Brunsdan motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

*Faculty Benefits.* Penn State Employee Health and Wellness Center. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Brunsdan/Wilson motion. Fifteen minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

*Faculty Benefits.* Report on Childcare at Penn State University. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Brunsdan/Wilson motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

*Research.* Drug Testing Program for Penn State's Defense Related Research Units, Applied Research Laboratory (ARL) and Electro-Optics Center (EOC). This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wilson/Szczygiel motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

## New Member Reports

*Undergraduate Education.* New Members Document. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Brunsden/Rowland motion for web-only. There will be no presentation.

*University Planning.* New Members Document. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Aynardi/Brunsdn motion. There will be no presentation.

## **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA FOR DECEMBER 6, 2016**

The Agenda was approved on a Miles/Grimes motion.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

None

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Strauss thanked Council members for their attendance and participation. The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Daniel R. Hagen  
Executive Director



**PennState**  
University Faculty Senate

101 Kern Graduate Building  
University Park, PA 16802  
Phone: 814-863-0221

**Date:** November 29, 2016

**To:** All Senators and Committee Members

**From:** Daniel R. Hagen, Executive Director

Following is the time and location of all Senate meetings December 5 and 6, 2016. Please notify the Senate office and committee chair if you are unable to attend.

**MONDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2016**

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

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

**TUESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2016**

**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 Boardroom

**1:30 p.m.**

University Faculty Senate – 112 Kern Graduate Building



**Date:** November 29, 2016

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

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

**MONDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2016 – 8:15 PM**  
**102 KERN BUILDING**

*Guest Speaker, Greg Stoner, Senior Director of Compensation and Benefits*

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

**TUESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2016 – 11:15 AM**  
**BOARDROOM, 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