THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

The University Faculty Senate

AGENDA

Tuesday, January 29, 2019 – 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 News at http://news.psu.edu/.

A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Minutes of the December 4, 2018 Meeting in The Senate Record 52:3

B. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report of January 15, 2019

Editorial Revisions to Standing Rules – Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education

Appendix A

Appendix B

C. REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL - Meeting of January 15, 2019

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

SPECIAL INFORMATIONAL REPORT

University Planning

Temporary Budget Overview

Appendix C
G. FORENSIC BUSINESS

Committee and Rules

Discussion of a Proposal to Reorganize Senate Leadership
[20 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]  Appendix D

H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

I. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Senate Committees on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid and Education

Revision to Policies on Academic Advising: Changes to Policies
32-00 Advising Policy; 32-10 The University’s Advising Program; 32-20 The Nature of the University Advising Program; 32-30 Responsibilities of Advisers and Advisees; 32-40 Assignment of Adviser; and 32-50 Audit of Unfulfilled Requirements

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules

Revisions to Standing Rules; Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (I)  Appendix F

J. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

None

K. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Senate Council

Report on Spring 2018 Commonwealth Campus Visits
[5 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]  
(Additional privileged information available to Senators in the Senate Meetings tab of BoardEffect)  Appendix G

Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits and Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits

2017-2018 Annual Report on the Status of Benefit Changes
[20 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]  Appendix H
Faculty Benefits

2018 Report on Childcare at Penn State University
[5 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]  Appendix I

Intercollegiate Athletics

Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics,
Academic Year, 2017-2018 (Division 1 Athletics at University Park)
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]  Appendix J

Discussion and Q&A with Athletic Director Sandy Barbour
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]  Appendix K

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Sustainability at PSU
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]  Appendix L

L. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

None

M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, March 12, 2019 at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate Building.

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

DATE: January 15, 2019

TO: Michael Bérubé, Chair, University Faculty Senate

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

The Senate Curriculum Report dated January 15, 2019 has been circulated throughout the University. Objections to any of the items in the report must be submitted to Kadi Corter, Curriculum Coordinator, 101 Kern Graduate Building, 814-863-0996, kkw2@psu.edu, on or before February 14, 2019.

The Senate Curriculum Report is available on the web and may be found at: http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/senate-curriculum-reports/
DATE: January 18, 2019

TO: Michael Bérubé, Chair, University Faculty Senate

FROM: Keith Shapiro, Chair, Senate Committee on Committees and Rules

An editorial change of a non-substantive nature was approved by Senate Council by a two-thirds vote at their January 15, 2019 meeting.

The revision to Senate Standing Rules will change all instances of Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education to Senate Committee on Education. A marked-up document illustrating these changes will be posted on the Senate website home page (http://senate.psu.edu) after the Senate plenary meeting on January 29, 2019 and will remain active for five days following the meeting. Any Senator who feels that the changes require a more careful review must place their objection in writing to Senate Chair Michael Bérubé, senate@psu.edu on or before Monday, February 4, 2019.
Dr. Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost of the University, will present information about the Temporary Budget and the Budget Model.
The process to set the E&G budget allows PSU to fund ongoing costs and set aside funding for contingencies and long-term strategic investments.

**Jan – June 2018**
Revenue & expense modeling
“Scrape” temporary budget for incorporation into permanent budget

**July 2018**
$2.1B FY19 permanent budget set:
Base revenue
Corresponding ongoing expenses

**August 2018**
$0.4B FY19 temporary budget set:
Dept. income and related expenses
One-time expenses

**Aug – Sept 2019**
FY19 year-end actuals compared to budget
Review proposals for use of carry-forward

**FY19 activity**

The budget consists of two components:
- Permanent: Recurring
- Temporary: Non-recurring/one-time

**Jan 2019**
FY20 budget planning begins
The total General Funds budget includes both permanently budgeted revenues and expenses as well as non-recurring funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017-18 General Funds Budget</th>
<th>Projected Year-End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent Initial Operating Budget (July)</td>
<td>Non-Recurring (Temporary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2,058</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>2,058</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Deficit)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers from/(to) Reserve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018-19 General Funds Budget</th>
<th>Permanent Initial Operating Budget (Proposed)</th>
<th>Non-Recurring (Temporary)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>2,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>2,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Deficit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Excludes College of Medicine and Penn College

Carry forward balances are used to fund central and unit-based strategic investments. Requests to carry forward funds are approved by the SVP for F&B and by the EVP and Provost.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Discussion of a Proposal to Reorganize Senate Leadership

(Forensic)

Background:

In the 2017-2018 academic year the Committee on Committees and Rules debated a plan to change Senate bylaws, thereby permitting Senate Chairs to seek re-election and serve for a second one-year term. After extensive discussion and multiple revisions to the original proposal, CC&R concluded that permitting Senate Chairs to serve a second term would improve Senate operations and strengthen faculty influence in university governance.

As outlined in its April 24, 2018 legislation titled “Revisions to Bylaws: Article I – Officers, Section 1,” CC&R concluded that to give a chair the option of seeking re-election, the Senate must establish a Vice Chair to replace the office of Chair-Elect. CC&R determined that there is no practical mechanism whereby a Chair could run for re-election with a Chair-Elect already designated as a successor. The committee noted that the University Faculty Senate had a Vice Chair from 1965 to 1974. Prior to the adoption of the Chair-Elect/Chair model, no Senate Chair ever served for more than a single one-year term.

In addition to drafting changes to the bylaws permitting chairs to stand for reelection, setting a two-term limit for the chair, and creating an independently elected vice chair, CC&R recommended a set of minimum qualifications for senators seeking election to Chair. These qualifications included a minimum number of years of Senate service and experience in leadership (e.g. serving as a Senate officer, service as a committee leader, election to CC&R, election to Senate Council, etc.).

A majority of the Senate voted to approve the proposal at the April meeting, but the tally fell short of the two-thirds majority required to revise Senate bylaws. The discussion at the April 24 meeting was very brief; given the limited discussion, the members of CC&R were unable to determine whether those who voted against the proposal did so because they believed the legislation needed improvement, or if the vote reflected a fundamental opposition to providing a chair the option for reelection.

To better understand the Senate’s view of the proposed changes, and to determine whether the Senate would entertain a revised proposal, CC&R has three questions for the body.

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current rotating (Chair-Elect/Chair/Past Chair) system?
2. What are the potential benefits and drawbacks of permitting Senate Chairs to stand for re-election?
3. If Senators were permitted to run directly for the office of Chair, what safeguards would be required to ensure that the officeholder would have the necessary experience to perform the job effectively?
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

- Jonathan Abel
- Michael Bérubé
- Renee Borromeo
- Victor Brunsden, Vice-Chair
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- Dennis Jett
- Beth King
- Binh Le
- Richard Robinett
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- Keith Shapiro, Chair
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- Matthew Woessner
Revision to Policies on Academic Advising: Changes to Policies 32-00 Advising Policy; 32-10 The University’s Advising Program; 32-20 The Nature of the University Advising Program; 32-30 Responsibilities of Advisers and Advisees; 32-40 Assignment of Adviser; and 32-50 Audit of Unfulfilled Requirements

(Legislative)

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

The proposed legislative changes to Senate policy 32-00 are aimed at updating academic advising by placing more intentionality behind the organization and delivery of academic advising for all undergraduates at Penn State.

Academic advising plays an important role across our commonwealth in promoting student success. The ability of our students to not only understand degree requirements and policies, but also to have broad conversations about how to develop viable and meaningful academic pathways is enhanced by access to dedicated academic advisers—faculty and staff—that work purposefully to engage our students. By design, Penn State is a university built on movement. Students starting at Mont Alto, for example, can seamlessly transition to University Park or Berks to complete the extensive range of academic programs we offer as an institution. As we all know, the depth of study and opportunity that this provides to students is a cornerstone of our efforts to promote access and affordability across the Commonwealth.

Effective academic advising should challenge students to think about their educations and how they are changed through higher education. When done well, academic advising is not focused on selecting classes or checking on degree requirements but is a learning partnership predicated on strong relationships between students and their academic advisers. To fully engage students and to enhance their educational experiences, advising must create a sustained conversation that enables students to understand and articulate how the many pieces of their education come together.
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together as a whole. Structures that create opportunities for students to access high quality advising relationships are critically important\(^2\). That Penn State has had an academic advising policy shaped by its Faculty since the late 1970s underscores that academic advising is an integral part of the University’s educational mission.

**Rationale**

The goal of the legislative report is to update the Faculty Senate policy on academic advising in a way that encourages Colleges, Enrollment Units, and Campuses to think more deliberately about what they want students to learn through academic advising and to structure its delivery in a manner that ensures even access, consistency of outreach, accuracy of information, and effective referrals to the many University-based resources that support student success across Penn State while maintaining active faculty involvement. Much of the foundation for these proposed changes come from expectations established by the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) and the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS).

As an institution, Penn State places significant value in having faculty contribute to the academic advising of undergraduate students. Faculty advisers bring knowledge of disciplines that cannot be substituted in any other fashion. This core component of academic advising at Penn State is challenged, however, by the increasingly complex curricular and administrative procedures that effectively become a major focus of advising instead of more substantive and far-reaching conversations about scholarship within disciplines and the overall value of higher education. Additionally, student needs in support of academic success are becoming broader and more varied, creating a growing need for more comprehensive academic advising that goes beyond the specifics of given academic disciplines. This complexity requires a more team-based organizational structure that ensures student access to both faculty and staff who serve as academic advisers—effectively creating a sustained conversation among the student and multiple advisers.

Students have expressed a desire for strengthening academic advising. Students are asking for broader access to advisers and desire sustained conversations around substantial topics of importance to their individual educational goals. UPUA has adopted a resolution in support of the proposed changes to the Faculty Senate’s policy on Academic Advising. Moreover, student demand for advising is evidenced through contacts recorded in Starfish. During the first week of classes in Fall 2018, there were more than 17,000 advising contacts documented across Penn State. Though at some level impressive, this number likely underrepresents the advising activity that occurred that week. These data show that students recognize the importance of advising and seek adviser help in navigating the rich opportunities that Penn State can provide. The capacity to meet the advising needs of our students must be examined and improved.

Achieving the aspirational goals of this legislation requires active leadership at many levels to embrace the value and importance of intentionality within academic advising. Within this context, it will require the University to invest in organizational structures that better meet the varied needs of our students. Additionally, it will require careful thought about development of learning outcomes and instruments to assess the effectiveness of advising programs across the University. The ability of the University Advising Council to have an active voice in recommending and consulting with units in the development of these learning outcomes and assessment instruments will help ensure a degree of consistency for academic advising.

Academic advising should be viewed as part of larger strategic efforts to advance student learning and degree completion. Deliberate attention to how academic advising is organized and delivered will help to reinvent and reinvigorate academic advising at Penn State. The overarching goal of the proposed legislative changes is to foster more dialogue about the role of academic advising in helping to promote student learning. The changes create an opportunity for the Faculty to actively make academic advising more than an exercise in selecting classes or checking on degree requirements. The proposed changes will contribute to shaping a learning environment across Penn State where academic advising can be about a sustained conversation that enables students to understand and articulate how the many pieces of their education come together as a whole. Using tools like Starfish will enable all advisers—staff and faculty—to contribute to the ongoing conversation about a student’s progress through the University. In this fashion, Starfish and other online tools (like the University Bulletin) have made important contributions to an infrastructure that can support a team-based approach to academic advising across Penn State. Academic advising is a critical part of our educational and teaching mission, contributing to retention, student success, and building a citizenry that understands and values higher education.

**Recommendation:** Based on the above rationale, our committees recommend changes to the university advising policy shown below.

### 32-00 Advising Policy

The policies of Section 32-00 define the goals and purposes of the university’s undergraduate academic advising program.

The objectives of the university’s academic advising program are to help advisees identify and achieve their academic goals, to promote their intellectual discovery, and to encourage students to take advantage of both in-and out-of-class educational opportunities in order that they become self-directed learners and decision makers.

Academic advising plays a central role in enhancing student success at Penn State and is integral to the teaching and learning mission of the University. Through active engagement with academic advising, students can identify and challenge their assumptions while developing thoughtful academic plans to meet their educational and career goals. Advising programs across the University promote intellectual discovery, help advisees articulate the value of higher education, and encourage students to take advantage of both curricular and co-curricular learning. Advisers also advocate for students, as needed, but empower them to be self-directed learners. Academic advising at Penn State is accomplished as a
partnership between faculty and staff who serve as primary-role advisers. Therefore, the careful documentation of advising interactions is an important responsibility of academic advisers and should be completed in the University’s formal online advising note system to ensure support of students’ successful navigation of the University’s academic opportunities, policies, systems and procedures. Overall, academic advising is a collaborative relationship among academic advisers, students, faculty, and the many other units that support student success at Penn State.

32-10 The University’s Advising Program
The policies of Section 32-10 describe the structure of the University’s advising program. Oversight of the University’s academic advising program rests with the University Advising Council (UAC). This Council will be appointed by the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education and will consist of the directors of academic advising from all Colleges and enrollment units at Penn State, including regional representatives from the University College, along with two faculty who are members of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education, and two students representing UPUA and CCSG, two academic advisers, and two administrators. Additionally, one member of UAC will be appointed as an ex-officio member from the Office of the University Registrar as well as from the Office of Student Aid. One representative from each of the following units will be appointed as an ex-officio member: Office of the University Registrar, World Campus, and Continuing Education. The Council will have sufficient authority to aid all academic units in improving the delivery of their advising programs in accordance with the criteria for effective advising listed below. The Council will provide input and guidance on the implementation of advising-related guide policies and assess the quality of the University’s advising program.

Academic advising programs at Penn State will create opportunities for students to actively engage with academic advisers so that they are able to: (based on CAS Standards, 2015)

- Articulate their educational decisions and plans in the context of their interests, abilities, and values;
- Synthesize information from various sources to set goals and make decisions;
- Assume responsibility for meeting academic program requirements;
- Articulate the meaning of higher education and the purpose of the curriculum;
- Cultivate the intellectual habits that encourage life-long learning;
- Function as global citizens who engage in the world around them;
- Demonstrate integrative learning by making connections across all parts of their educational experience
- Identify and participate in engaged scholarship opportunities.

32-20 The Nature of the University Advising Program
Each academic unit will establish an academic advising program designed to meet the broad goals set forth in 32-00. An effective academic advising program should possess the following elements:

Organizational structure:
1. A mission statement that aligns with 32-00 and 32-10 as well as additional student learning outcomes as determined by the unit.
2. Assessment plan to measure program effectiveness at helping students reach stated learning outcomes.
3. A clear advising structure communicated to faculty, staff, and students.
4. Access to academic advising.

**Advising Delivery:**

1. Should be student-focused to promote an environment that allows students to make informed choices relating to their goals.
2. Should promote engagement with University advising tools to reach advising objectives, including the documentation of advising interactions to permit communication across the University.
3. Should establish ratios of adviser to students at a level appropriate for additional responsibilities of the adviser and should recognize that advisers assigned to advise students within particular subgroups may need lower ratios of students.
4. Should encourage advisers to engage in proactive advising practices to help meet University commitment to academic success, student learning, and degree completion. This includes regular review of all student academic records and adherence to appropriate University policy; referral of individual students to appropriate offices; follow-up with alerts or other issues that may interfere with student success; and incorporation of a variety of advising strategies.
5. Should ensure that units maintain accurate web information on academic information as well as unit level policies and procedures.
6. Should ensure that units devise visible assessment plans that connect of the mission and objective of academic advising to student outcomes with the intent of allowing students and others to see and understand the value of academic advising.

**Academic Advisers:**

1. Should have access to professional development opportunities.
2. Should receive recognition and rewards such as university and college-level advising awards.
3. Should participate in ongoing assessment by supervisor or peer review. This assessment and feedback can serve as evidence of advising effectiveness for evaluation.
4. Should articulate clear expectations regarding their advising responsibilities to departments and academic units.

The academic advising delivery and assessment employed by each advising unit should address its own standards and practices that includes input from students.

Each academic unit will establish an academic advising program designed to meet the goals set forth in 32.00. An effective academic advising program possesses the following elements:

1. **POLICY.** An advising policy stating the program’s philosophy and practice and what students can expect from the advising program.
2. **STRUCTURE.** An organizational model for the delivery of effective advising.
3. **SUPPORT.** Appropriate information, resources, and electronic systems to work effectively with students.

4. **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.** On-going professional development for all advisers within a comprehensive development program.

5. **DELIVERY.** Strategies to accommodate the specific advising needs of the unit’s advisees.

6. **FIRST YEAR STUDENTS.** Assurance that all students in their first two semesters of study at the University, including all transfer students, will consult with an academic adviser.

7. **FREQUENCY OF CONSULTATIONS.** Workable guidelines concerning the ratio of advisees to adviser and the frequency with which they should consult.

8. **RECOGNITION AND REWARD.** Recognition of academic advising in the general rewards structure.

9. **ASSESSMENT.** A comprehensive assessment to measure the effectiveness of the advising program.

### 32-30 Responsibilities of Advisers and Advisees

The policies of section 32-30 delineate the responsibilities of advisers and advisees within each of the various university advising systems.

Both advisers and advisees share responsibility for making the advising relationship succeed. By encouraging their advisees to become engaged in their education, to meet their educational goals, and to develop the habit of learning, advisers assume a significant educational role. The advisee’s unit of enrollment will provide each advisee with a primary academic adviser, the information needed to plan the chosen program of study, and referrals to other specialized resources aimed at supporting student success at Penn State.

#### A. Responsibilities of Advisers

The Adviser Will:

1. Engage students in active discussion of their educational and career objectives with the intent of helping students to understand the range of educational opportunities available at Penn State.

2. Help students to better understand the logic of the curriculum and the relationships among educational opportunities such as General Education courses, University requirements, programs, undergraduate research opportunities, internships, study abroad programs, and other academic experiences.

3. Help students to understand the nature of the University’s academic programs and to understand the expected standards of achievement and likelihood of success in certain areas of study.

4. Assist students in addressing concerns affecting their academic progress and make referrals to appropriate support services.

5. Ensure that students are aware of appropriate University procedures and policies, and help students understand their purpose and rationale.

6. Help students to plan a course of study and give advice about courses and the adjustment of course loads.
7. Complete consistent electronic documentation of advising interactions in the “student advising system” as Penn State is based on mobility within the institution. A cohesive record of students’ movement through the institution is necessary to provide a consistent and strong advising experience.

8. Actively reach out to students as interventions are needed, and provide timely responses to concerns raised by the student or others in a student’s support network.

9. Create an inclusive environment that welcomes and supports all students.

10. Participate in ongoing professional development to keep informed of and current with advising practice and University policies.

11. Where appropriate, contribute to and engage in the scholarship of teaching, learning, and advising.

The Adviser’s Role is to:

1. Help the advisee to understand the nature of the University’s academic programs and to understand the expected standards of achievement and likelihood of success in certain areas of study. The adviser also seeks to understand each advisee’s particular concerns affecting academic progress.

2. The adviser helps the advisee to follow appropriate University procedures and to understand their purposes. The adviser neither grants nor denies administrative approval for the advisee’s particular academic actions.

3. Discuss the educational and career objectives suited to the advisee’s demonstrated abilities and expressed interests. The adviser helps the advisee to understand the relationships among the courses, General Education, University requirements, programs, undergraduate research opportunities, internships, study abroad programs, and other academic experiences provided by the University.

4. Help the advisee to plan a course of study and give advice about courses and the adjustment of course loads. The adviser will inform the advisee about the prerequisites for subsequent courses in the advisee’s program.

5. Refer advisees to other resources when appropriate.

6. Participate in the professional development provided by each college or department to keep informed and current.

B. Responsibilities of Advisees

The Student Will:

1. Acquire the information needed to assume final responsibility for course scheduling, program planning, and the successful completion of all graduation requirements.

2. Explore educational opportunities at Penn State by learning more about their [intended] major and evaluating the fit of their interests and abilities with their [intended] program.

3. Engage in planning prior to meetings with academic advisers using relevant tools and resources, such as the University Bulletin, Suggested Academic Plans, and degree audits.
4. Meet regularly with assigned academic adviser to discuss goals, plans, suitability of other educational opportunities provided by the University, academic progress, challenges, and concerns.

5. Seek a variety of opportunities and information needed to set and achieve educational goals.

6. Become knowledgeable about the relevant policies, procedures, and rules of the University, college, and academic program.

7. Use the logic of the curriculum to integrate learning across all educational experiences.

The Advisee’s Role is to:

1. Acquire the information needed to assume final responsibility for course scheduling, program planning, and the successful completion of all graduation requirements.

2. Seek the academic and career information needed to meet educational goals.

3. Become knowledgeable about the relevant policies, procedures, and rules of the University, college, and academic program.

4. Be prepared with accurate information and relevant materials when contacting the adviser.

5. Consult with the adviser at least once a semester to decide on courses, review the accuracy of the degree audit, check progress towards graduation, and discuss the suitability of other educational opportunities provided by the University.

The student’s assigned academic advising unit also will monitor the progress of its advisees towards satisfactory completion of all graduation requirements. It will ensure appropriate communication and relevant interventions in accordance with other University policies designed to promote student success. Advisees in turn will routinely contact their advisers each semester and will assume final responsibility for course scheduling, program planning, and the successful completion of graduation requirements.

Responsibility for providing the student with a primary academic adviser is as follows:

• **Degree Students**
  - University Park — The college in which the student is enrolled or the Division of Undergraduate Studies is responsible for providing the student with a primary academic adviser.
  - Commonwealth Campuses — The campus where the student is enrolled is responsible for providing the student with a primary academic adviser.

• **Non-degree Conditional Students**
  - University Park — The college where the student is seeking reinstatement and/or re-enrollment is responsible for providing the student with a primary academic adviser.
  - Commonwealth Campuses — The campus where the student is enrolled is responsible for providing the student with a primary academic adviser.

• **Non-degree Conditional Students who have never been enrolled in degree status at Penn State and all Nondegree Regular Students**
  - University Park — The college to which the student seeks admission or the Division of Undergraduate Studies (if the student is undecided or exploring curricular options) is responsible for providing the student with a primary academic adviser.
Commonwealth Campuses—The campus where the student is enrolled is responsible for providing the student with a primary academic adviser.

Degree-Seeking Students Conditionally Enrolled in DUS
University Park: The Division of Undergraduate Studies is responsible for providing the student with a primary academic adviser.
Commonwealth Campuses: The Division of Undergraduate Studies designee at the campus where the student is enrolled is responsible for providing the student with a primary academic adviser.

The college or department also will monitor the progress of its advisees towards satisfactory completion of all graduation requirements. Advisees in turn will routinely contact their advisers each semester and will assume final responsibility for course scheduling, program planning, and the successful completion of graduation requirements.

32-40 Assignment of Adviser
Degree Candidates and Non-degree Regular Students
University Park – Responsibility for assignment of adviser for every student with degree status rests with the college in which the student is enrolled (or seeking admission) or the Division of Undergraduate Studies if enrolled in DUS.

Commonwealth and World Campuses – Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the campus where the student is enrolled.

DUS Conditional Students (previous PROV status)
University Park – Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the Division of Undergraduate Studies.

Commonwealth and World Campuses – Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the Division of Undergraduate Studies designee at the campus where the student is enrolled.

Non-degree High School students
University Park: Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the Division of Undergraduate Studies. Advisers must meet all clearance requirements, as determined by the University and/or state and federal legislation.

Commonwealth Campuses – Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the Division of Undergraduate Studies designee at the campus where the student is enrolled. Advisers must meet all clearance requirements, as determined by the University and/or state and federal legislation.

Degree Candidates
University Park — Responsibility for assignment of adviser for every student with degree status rests with the college in which the student is enrolled or the Division of Undergraduate Studies.
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Commonwealth Campuses—Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the campus where the student is enrolled.

• Degree Seeking Students Conditionally Enrolled in DUS
  University Park—Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the Division of Undergraduate Studies.
  Commonwealth Campuses—Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the Division of Undergraduate Studies designee at the campus where the student is enrolled.

• Non-degree Conditional Students previously enrolled at Penn State
  University Park—Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the college to which the student seeks reinstatement and/or re-enrollment.
  Commonwealth Campuses—Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the campus where the student is enrolled.

• Non-degree Conditional Students not previously enrolled in degree status at Penn State and all Non-degree Regular Students
  University Park—Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the college to which the student seeks admission or with the Division of Undergraduate Studies if the student is undecided or exploring curricular options.
  Commonwealth Campuses—Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the campus where the student is enrolled.

32-50 Audit of Unfulfilled Requirements
The degree audit report is an important advising tool that specifically tracks progress to completion of degree requirements. The degree audit report combines the official academic record with the student’s declared academic program to identify those program requirements that are completed and those program requirements that are unfulfilled. Each undergraduate degree candidate (Baccalaureate or Associate) must have access to a current copy of that student’s degree audit report each semester the candidate is enrolled.

Clean Copy

32-00 Advising Policy
The policies of Section 32-00 define the goals and purposes of the university’s academic advising program.

Academic advising plays a central role in enhancing student success at Penn State and is integral to the teaching and learning mission of the University. Through active engagement with academic advising, students can identify and challenge their assumptions while developing thoughtful academic plans to meet their educational and career goals. Advising programs across the University promote intellectual discovery, help advisees articulate the value of higher education, and encourage students to take advantage of both curricular and co-curricular learning. Advisers also advocate for students, as needed, but empower them to be self-directed learners. Academic advising at Penn State is accomplished as a partnership between faculty and staff who serve as primary-role advisers. Therefore, the careful documentation of advising interactions is an important responsibility of academic advisers and should be completed in the University’s formal online advising note system to ensure support of students’ successful navigation of the University’s academic opportunities, policies, systems and procedures. Overall,
academic advising is a collaborative relationship among academic advisers, students, faculty, and the many other units that support student success at Penn State.

32-10 The University’s Advising Program

Oversight of the University’s academic advising program rests with the University Advising Council (UAC). This Council will be appointed by the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education and will consist of the directors of academic advising from all Colleges and enrollment units at Penn State along with two faculty who are members of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education, and two students representing UPUA and CCSG. Additionally, one member of UAC will be appointed as an ex-officio member from the Office of the University Registrar as well as from the Office of Student Aid. The Council will have sufficient authority to aid all academic units in improving the delivery of their advising programs in accordance with the criteria for effective advising listed below. The Council will provide input and guidance on the implementation of advising-related policies and assess the quality of the University’s advising program.

Academic advising programs at Penn State will create opportunities for students to actively engage with academic advisers so that they are able to: (based on CAS Standards, 2015)

- Articulate their educational decisions and plans in the context of their interests, abilities, and values;
- Synthesize information from various sources to set goals and make decisions;
- Assume responsibility for meeting academic program requirements;
- Articulate the meaning of higher education and the purpose of the curriculum;
- Cultivate the intellectual habits that encourage life-long learning;
- Function as global citizens who engage in the world around them;
- Demonstrate integrative learning by making connections across all parts of their educational experience
- Identify and participate in engaged scholarship opportunities.

32-20 The Nature of the University Advising Program

Each academic unit will establish an academic advising program designed to meet the broad goals set forth in 32-00. An effective academic advising program should possess the following elements:

**Organizational structure:**
1. A mission statement that aligns with 32-00 and 32-10 as well as additional student learning outcomes as determined by the unit.
2. Assessment plan to measure program effectiveness at helping students reach stated learning outcomes.
3. A clear advising structure communicated to faculty, staff, and students.
4. Access to academic advising.

**Advising Delivery:**
1. Should be student-focused to promote an environment that allows students to make informed choices relating to their goals.
2. Should promote engagement with University advising tools to reach advising objectives, including the documentation of advising interactions to permit communication across the University.

3. Should establish ratios of adviser to students at a level appropriate for additional responsibilities of the adviser and should recognize that advisers assigned to advise students within particular subgroups may need lower ratios of students.

4. Should encourage advisers to engage in proactive advising practices to help meet University commitment to academic success, student learning, and degree completion. This includes regular review of all student academic records and adherence to appropriate University policy; referral of individual students to appropriate offices; follow-up with alerts or other issues that may interfere with student success; and incorporation of a variety of advising strategies.

5. Should ensure that units maintain accurate web information on academic information as well as unit level policies and procedures.

6. Should ensure that units devise visible assessment plans that connect of the mission and objective of academic advising to student outcomes with the intent of allowing students and others to see and understand the value of academic advising.

Academic Advisers:

1. Should have access to professional development opportunities
2. Should receive recognition and rewards such as university and college-level advising awards
3. Should participate in ongoing assessment by supervisor or peer review. This assessment and feedback can serve as evidence of advising effectiveness for evaluation.
4. Should articulate clear expectations regarding their advising responsibilities to departments and academic units.

The academic advising delivery and assessment employed by each advising unit should address its own standards and practices.

32-30 Responsibilities of Advisers and Advisees

Both advisers and advisees share responsibility for making the advising relationship succeed. By encouraging their advisees to become engaged in their education, to meet their educational goals, and to develop the habit of learning, advisers assume a significant educational role. The advisee’s unit of enrollment will provide each advisee with a primary academic adviser, the information needed to plan the chosen program of study, and referrals to other specialized resources aimed at supporting student success at Penn State.

A. Responsibilities of Advisers

The Adviser Will:

1. Engage students in active discussion of their educational and career objectives with the intent of helping students to understand the range of educational opportunities available at Penn State.
2. Help students to better understand the logic of the curriculum and the relationships among educational opportunities such as General Education courses, University requirements, programs, undergraduate research opportunities, internships, study abroad programs, and other academic experiences.

3. Help students to understand the nature of the University’s academic programs and to understand the expected standards of achievement and likelihood of success in certain areas of study.

4. Assist students in addressing concerns affecting their academic progress and make referrals to appropriate support services.

5. Ensure that students are aware of appropriate University procedures and policies, and help students understand their purpose and rationale.

6. Help students to plan a course of study and give advice about courses and the adjustment of course loads.

7. Complete consistent electronic documentation of advising interactions in the “student advising system” as Penn State is based on mobility within the institution. A cohesive record of students’ movement through the institution is necessary to provide a consistent and strong advising experience.

8. Actively reach out to students as interventions are needed and provide timely responses to concerns raised by the student or others in a student’s support network.

9. Create an inclusive environment that welcomes and supports all students.

10. Participate in ongoing professional development to keep informed of and current with advising practice and University policies.

11. Where appropriate, contribute to and engage in the scholarship of teaching, learning, and advising.

B. Responsibilities of Advisees

The Student Will:

1. Acquire the information needed to assume final responsibility for course scheduling, program planning, and the successful completion of all graduation requirements.

2. Explore educational opportunities at Penn State by learning more about their [intended] major and evaluating the fit of their interests and abilities with their [intended] program.

3. Engage in planning prior to meetings with academic advisers using relevant tools and resources, such as the University Bulletin, Suggested Academic Plans, and degree audits.

4. Meet regularly with assigned academic adviser to discuss goals, plans, suitability of other educational opportunities provided by the University, academic progress, challenges, and concerns.

5. Seek a variety of opportunities and information needed to set and achieve educational goals.

6. Become knowledgeable about the relevant policies, procedures, and rules of the University, college, and academic program.

7. Use the logic of the curriculum to integrate learning across all educational experiences.

The student’s assigned academic advising unit also will monitor the progress of its advisees towards satisfactory completion of all graduation requirements. It will ensure appropriate communication and relevant interventions in accordance with other University policies designed
to promote student success. Advisees in turn will routinely contact their advisers each semester and will assume final responsibility for course scheduling, program planning, and the successful completion of graduation requirements.

32-40 Assignment of Adviser
Degree Candidates and Non-degree Regular Students
University Park – Responsibility for assignment of adviser for every student with degree status rests with the college in which the student is enrolled (or seeking admission) or the Division of Undergraduate Studies if enrolled in DUS.

Commonwealth and World Campuses – Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the campus where the student is enrolled.

DUS Conditional Students (previous PROV status)
University Park – Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the Division of Undergraduate Studies.
Commonwealth and World Campuses – Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the Division of Undergraduate Studies designee at the campus where the student is enrolled.

Non-degree High School students
University Park- Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the Division of Undergraduate Studies. Advisers must meet all clearance requirements, as determined by the University and/or state and federal legislation.

Commonwealth Campuses – Responsibility for assignment of adviser rests with the Division of Undergraduate Studies designee at the campus where the student is enrolled. Advisers must meet all clearance requirements, as determined by the University and/or state and federal legislation.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Standing Rules; Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (I)

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

Introduction and Rationale

The Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) is charged with fostering and promoting the creation of new knowledge by faculty and students in all disciplines across the Penn State campuses, as well as with facilitating interdisciplinary and intercampus collaboration in this regard.

Its mission statement mentions graduate research, and close collaboration with the Graduate Council Committee on Research (whose chair and members serve on the Committee) to achieve common aims and shared objectives. The committee membership also includes a graduate student senator and the Vice Provost for Graduate Education/Dean of the Graduate School, who is also an appointed Senator and therefore has full voting privileges according to Article IV Section 2 of the Bylaws. Graduate student research has a strong voice on RSCA.

Undergraduate research, on the other hand, only has a single undergraduate student senator on RSCA. RSCA feels that undergraduate research should be given more emphasis. RSCA included “fostering undergraduate research” as a priority last year, and intends to organize a presentation, for the Senate floor, on undergraduate research opportunities in the coming year. RSCA has invited Dr. Alan Rieck, the Associate Vice President and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, to attend several RSCA meetings as a guest. Dr. Rieck leads undergraduate research initiatives offered through the Office of Undergraduate Education, including the University’s annual Undergraduate Exhibition. He also collaborates with groups from across the University on broad issues concerning undergraduate education. His presence at the RSCA meetings was well received and informative.

To give undergraduate research a stronger voice on the committee, it is proposed that a representative, responsible for Undergraduate Research, from Undergraduate Education, be added to the membership of the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, as a resource member. This position would be non-voting.

This addition will enhance Committee awareness about undergraduate research issues, and will facilitate communications about research issues and policies to the undergraduate students.

In addition, there are some corrections to typographical errors, some members’ titles have been updated to reflect office name changes, ranks of other non-voting resource members have been dropped for consistency and to prevent conflicts when personnel changes occur, and phrasing has been added for certain members to send a designee when needed. The administrative members
whose listing in the Standing Rules would be affected by these changes have been consulted and concur with the changes.

RSCA submitted these editorial changes and membership recommendations to the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules (CC&R). CC&R accepts the committee’s recommendations.

**Recommendation:**

That Article II, Section 6(l) of the Standing Rules be and is hereby amended as follows:

Please note that the following contains strikethroughs for deletions and bold text for additions.

Article II

(l) Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity
1. Membership:
   (i) At least ten elected faculty senators
   (ii) One graduate student senator
   (iii) One undergraduate student senator
   (iv) Six members of the Graduate Council Committee on Graduate Research including the Committee Chair
   (v) Vice President for Research*
   (vi) Vice Provost for Graduate Education/Dean of the Graduate School or their designee*
   (vii) Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs or their designee**
   (viii) Associate Vice President for Research and Director of Technology Transfer Management or their designee**
   (ix) Associate Vice President for Research, Director of Research Protections or their designee**
   (x) Representative from Undergraduate Education responsible for undergraduate research**

* nonvoting unless Article IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws applies
** nonvoting resource person for the committee

-----------------------------

**Clean Copy**

That Article II, Section 6(l) of the Standing Rules be and is hereby amended as follows:

Article II

(l) Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity
1. Membership:
   (i) At least ten elected faculty senators
   (ii) One graduate student senator
   (iii) One undergraduate student senator
(iv) Six members of the Graduate Council Committee on Graduate Research including the Committee Chair
(v) Vice President for Research*
(vi) Vice Provost for Graduate Education/Dean of the Graduate School or their designee*
(vii) Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs or their designee**
(viii) Director of Technology Management or their designee**
(ix) Director of Research Protections or their designee**
(x) Representative from the Office of Undergraduate Education responsible for undergraduate research**

* nonvoting unless Article IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws applies
** nonvoting resource person for the committee
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SENATE COUNCIL

Report on Spring 2018 Commonwealth Campus Visits

(Informational)

The Senate Officers visited six Commonwealth Campuses during the 2017-18 academic year: Penn State Altoona (January 11, 2018), Penn State Fayette (January 11, 2018), Penn State Schuylkill (January 24, 2018), Penn State Hazleton (January 24, 2018), Penn State Scranton (January 29, 2018), and Penn State Wilkes-Barre (January 29, 2018).

During these visits, the Senate Officers met with staff, students, faculty, and administrators. Each group was met with separately to encourage open and frank discussions. Two basic questions were asked in each meeting: “What do you enjoy about your unit and your position?” and “What are the challenges faced in your unit or position?” These simple questions led to rich discussions.

Executive Summary – Commonwealth Campuses

While each campus varied in enrollment, academic programs, and the nature of its student populations, each group had positive things to say about their location and the University. There were many upbeat comments about the "home town feel" of our commonwealth campuses, touting the benefits of being at a smaller Penn State location where faculty, staff, and students can easily engage with one another and class sizes are small, while providing access to all the resources of a large University and a wealth of student activities. They also shared a pride in the beauty of their campuses and appreciation for renovations and new facilities they've received.

When asked about their challenges, consistent themes were also evident:

- **Academics:** Students, faculty, and administrators expressed a desire to offer more flexible academic programming, including summer and online courses. Faculty and Administrators stated that the current World Campus and Digital Learning Cooperative models are good but still don't give them the flexibility they need to be able to offer online courses taught by their own faculty and on their own schedule. Students shared an interest in having greater access to online and shared courses to enhance their curricular options.

- **Facilities:** Concerns about campus facilities ranged from issues related to deferred maintenance and repair problems (particularly related to HVAC issues) to a desire by students for extended access to their fitness and cafeteria facilities. Student housing also came up at several locations, either in terms of a desire to have residence hall facilities in order to attract new students, to increase housing on campus to meet rising needs, or in terms of a need to provide on campus housing for international students over academic breaks.

- **LionPATH:** LionPATH continued to be a topic of discussion this year, with reports of ongoing data errors and difficulty tracking student progress. Issues related to decreased data access were also shared.
• Marketing: Many Penn Staters discussed issues related to attracting students to our Commonwealth Campuses. In particular, there were concerns for what is seen as "one-size-fits-all" marketing approaches that they don't feel enable Commonwealth Campuses to show off their unique strengths. They would also like to see more flexibility for where they can advertise, geographically. Tuition rates were also raised as a concern, saying our costs can be a drawback when they compete with other institutions in their areas. Several campuses also said that they worry that they are seen centrally as "holding pens" for University Park.

• Promotion and Tenure: Faculty reported that they often feel that to be promoted, they are expected to be exceptional in teaching, research and service. Particularly as it applies to promotion to full professor, the standards for professional excellence are not properly tailored for the Commonwealth Campuses’ teaching-focused mission. They also shared that they perceive a disparity across Commonwealth Campus locations with regard to tenure-line expectations. Faculty also perceive that there is a move away from tenure-line positions to fixed-term in order to save money.

• Student Affairs: We heard reports that it can be difficult to engage students in clubs and activities at Commonwealth Campuses, particularly those with large commuter student populations. We were told that a lack of a "true" Common Hour makes it even more difficult for students to come together as a community. We also heard a strong need for increased counseling services despite recent efforts to increase levels of support.

Campus Summaries

In addition to the overall summary provided above, unique information was learned from each Commonwealth Campus. Below is a campus-by-campus summary. The appendix to this report provides detailed notes from our visits with each campus. A careful reading of the appendix will illustrate the unique attributes and successes of our Commonwealth Campuses, as well as the important issues they are confronting. It is our hope that detailed information provided will ultimately reveal pathways for improvement.

Penn State Altoona

Staff at Penn State Altoona focused their discussions on the need for additional student counseling services, yet-to-be-filled position vacancies as a result of the Voluntary Retirement Program (with more upcoming retirements coming in the next couple of years), new system fatigue, a desire to better get academic information to students quickly…and ensure it is read, and a need for increased student housing. Student government leaders spoke of issues related to their math program and tutoring needs, academic advising concerns, HVAC issues related to their residence halls, a desire for increased access to fitness facilities, and issues with a lack of student involvement in clubs and activities. Faculty on campus talked about their campus' struggle with the nature of their incoming student population (which varies widely in terms of college preparedness), tensions they feel with University Park over enrollment management, budget issues related to decreasing resources, frustration over promotion and tenure expectations, the impact of the VRP on their administrative capacity, a negative impact of the Common Schedule on their academic offerings, a concern that we are becoming too "corporate" in our mindset at the University, a desire to offer more summer and remedial courses, and declining
morale as staff and faculty perceive that they are continually asked to do more with less. When speaking with administrators, the key issues discussed were the campus' morale problem (particularly related to going through two VPRs in three years, the Sandusky scandal, the Greek Life problems, and system fatigue), frustrations related to academic advising, and changing policies (or new enforcement of existing ones) related to new systems that are having a negative impact on students, faculty, and staff.

**Penn State Fayette**

Faculty at Penn State Fayette discussed a desire to know how their students do after matriculating to University Park, concerns about implementing the new Gen Ed requirements at their location, frustrations over limited access to World Campus and shared courses, the loss of their 4LAS degree based on Core Council decisions, limits related to marketing their campus, the upcoming new student health insurance requirement, negative impacts of the Common Schedule, issues related to CollegeNet, concerns for Promotion and Tenure expectations, faculty compensation levels, potential changes to the University's budget model for Commonwealth Campuses, a perceived limited "voice" for fixed-term faculty, low compensation for adjunct faculty, and increasing faculty workloads. Staff talked about a need for campus housing, new system fatigue, and reported negative behavior toward staff. Student leaders shared concerns related to limited course offerings and number of faculty, the new student health insurance requirement (which, they feel, will price Penn State out of range for many students in what is an economically depressed region), counseling service needs, a downturn in participation in student activities, a desire to increase the kinesiology credit for athletic participation for student athletes, requests for increased access to World Campus courses, and a desire for more emphasis on the importance and meaning of "All-In" and tolerance in their classrooms. Administrators at the campus echoed many of the concerns and issues raised by the faculty, staff, and students during our visit.

**Penn State Schuylkill**

Penn State Schuylkill staff wanted to talk about their concerns related to LionPATH and ongoing data inaccuracies, ways they can take better advantage of Penn State's purchasing power as a campus, morale issues between staff and faculty, a lack of professional development opportunities on their campus, a perceived lessening of the feeling of a close-knit community, and frustration for rising student textbook prices. Students on campus spoke of their desire to add a pool and to update fitness facilities; a perception that their residence halls are not as up-to-date as other campus locations; their limited course options and/or resources in the areas of foreign language, research opportunities, and professional presentations beyond science and engineering; and a need for more English and psychology faculty. They also discussed their concerns with SRTEs, a desire to access discipline-specific academic advising before declaring a major, a perceived need for more employment opportunities for those who do not qualify for work study, and a request for better communications from the University related to Bursar bills and academic policies. Faculty focused their discussion on a need for better communication regarding the new fixed-term promotion pathways and a "Smoke-free Penn State"; campus marketing concerns; the Faculty Senate's new requirement for adding learning objectives to course syllabi; the impact of the VRP; a need for more efficient training on WorkLion and concerns regarding potential
inconsistencies across the University regarding what faculty do, and do not, have to do in the system; ongoing issues related to LionPATH, and a workload concern for their newly combined CFO and Bursar position. Administrators weighed in on many of the issues raised by the staff, students, and faculty, while also raising their own concerns related to LionPATH and the marketing of the campus.

**Penn State Hazleton**

Staff discussions at Penn State Hazleton revolved around campus marketing concerns, limited data access in LionPATH, overall new system fatigue, morale issues related to staff and faculty relations, concerns for the quality of faculty academic advising, issues related to services for international students on their campus, an inability to track new hires with HR Shared Services, and the loss of their ability to get tuition support to pursue a graduate degree at an institution other than Penn State. Faculty talked about concerns related to providing better job stability for their fixed-term faculty, issues with transfer credits and LionPATH, the negative impact of shared administrative positions across Commonwealth Campuses, campus marketing and budget concerns, and issues related to a curriculum that feels "top-down" (from University Park) to them. Administrators agreed with many of the issues raised by their faculty and staff, adding concerns related to the slowness of establishing articulation agreements, HR Shared Services, access to housing for international students during academic breaks, increasing infrastructure needs related to PASS students, and the recent police consolidation/centralization. Students talked about their desire to have more 4-year degree options at their location, a need to improve advertising for the campus, limited access to food services on the weekends and late night, and perceived inconsistencies with academic advising.

**Penn State Scranton**

Penn State Scranton staff discussed their concerns related to WorkLion and its negative impact on staff workloads, the implementation of the new General Education curriculum, a perceived ineffectiveness of You@PSU, and the negative impact of centralized policies and procedures at the University, campus marketing, and a need for increased levels of compensation. Students spoke about a need for more timely feedback on assignments and grades, a desire for a "true" Common Hour to support student activities, and issues related to smoking on campus. Faculty talked with us about their campus marketing concerns, a need for prerequisite checking for all courses, concerns related to the potential for inconsistent quality of instruction, expectations for promotion and tenure, morale at Penn State and the Piazza report's finding of a "culture of apathy," a need for increased communications between the faculty and administration, the potential impact of risk adversity on innovation, a desire for weekend courses for undergraduates to better serve the adult learner population, and the negative impact of the Common Schedule on course offerings. Administrators weighed in on many of the issues raised by the staff, students, and faculty.
Penn State Wilkes-Barre staff discussed their concerns related to the impact of the new General Education curriculum on small campuses, difficulties providing a robust curriculum with declining resources, difficulties attracting students to a rural campus, a lack of a "true" Common Hour, the negative impact on course offerings related to the Common Schedule, a need for better training and job aids for WorkLion, data accuracy concerns in LionPATH, overall new system fatigue, and a concern that information is not always reaching them. Students echoed staff concerns related to lack of a true Common Hour. They also discussed concerns about inconsistent enforcement of course prerequisites, a desire for more majors, varying quality of instruction, a perceived lack of impact of SRTEs, and observed faculty difficulties using classroom technology. Faculty spoke about issues related to needed HVAC repairs in classrooms and labs, increased health care costs with Aetna, issues related to the growth of fixed-term faculty, issues related to the impact of the AC21 revisions, and a perceived insufficient staff: faculty ratio on their campus. Administrators weighed in on the issues raised by the staff, students, and faculty, while also sharing their own desire to have more flexibility and agility in the curricular approval process (particularly for certificate programs), a desire for greater access to other campus' courses, and an increasing administrative workload that can mean limited headroom for one's own campus concerns.

Further Information

Additional privileged information available to Senators in the Senate Meetings tab of BoardEffect.

Prepared by:
Ann H. Taylor, Faculty Senate Secretary, in consultation with Faculty Senate Chair Michael Bérubé
This report is a summary of Penn State benefit changes, changes under consideration, and issues discussed, for which the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits provided consultation with Penn State administration between September 2017 and May 2018.

**Changes to Penn State Benefits**

**Health Plan Benefit changes in 2018**

Beginning January 1, 2018, the health plan third-party administrator changed from Highmark Blue Shield to Aetna and the pharmacy benefit manager/third party administrator from Highmark (Express Scripts) to CVS Caremark. The PPO and PPO Savings plans remained the two health plan choices in 2018.

The PPO plan structured the annual deductible around an employee’s base salary. Specifically, those with a salary of $45,000 or less have a $250/$500 (single/all other tiers) deductible; those making $45,000-$60,000, $375/$750; those making $60,000-$90,000, $500/$1,000; and those making greater than $90,000, $625/$1,250. Premiums continued to be salary-based for the PPO plan and remained the same percent of salary as 2017: Individual, 1.51%; Two-Person, 3.68%; Parent/Child(ren), 3.41%; and Family, 4.69%. The annual prescription out-of-pocket (OOP) maximum in the PPO is $2,000 per person/$8,000 per family.

In the PPO Savings plan, the Health Savings Account seed contribution from the University changed to a four-band approach based on an individual’s annual base salary as follows:

- **Band 1:** Less than or equal to $45,000, $800/$1,600
- **Band 2:** $45,000.01 – $60,000, $600/$1,200
- **Band 3:** $60,000.01 – $90,000, $400/$800
- **Band 4:** Over $90,000, $200/$400

Premiums in the PPO Savings plan are also salary-based and increased for each subscriber tier: Employee only from 0.52% to 0.78%; Employee plus spouse from 1.25% to 1.89%; Employee plus child(ren) from 1.16% to 1.75%; Family from 1.60% to 2.41%. Co-insurance rates remained the same for medical and prescription drugs.

Technical Service PPO and PPO Savings plan percentages of salary contributions for 2018 are defined per the terms of the collective bargaining agreement.
The one other change that was implemented for health care benefits was related to those employees who are dually-employed at Penn State. The following changes took effect on January 1, 2018:

**Faculty/Staff:** If employee and spouse are both employed at Penn State and are currently covered under one employee’s medical plan, the coverage election for 2018 must be made by the higher-paid spouse.

**Technical Service Employees:** Defined under the terms of the collective bargaining agreement. In addition, the tobacco surcharge was eliminated for 2018.
Two other vendor additions/changes for 2018 included:

**Unum** for Short-term Disability, Long-Term Disability, Life insurance and Accidental Death & Dismemberment.

**HealthEquity** for managing flexible spending accounts, health savings accounts and dependent care accounts.

**Retiree health**
Retirees who are not Medicare-eligible subscribe to the same PPO or PPO Savings plan as active employees until they turn age 65. In the PPO, retiree-only rates increased from $176.16 to $177.96, retiree plus spouse increased from $352.31 to $355.92, retiree plus children increased from $264.23 to $266.94, and retiree family increased from $440.39 to $444.90. In the PPO Savings plan, retiree-only rates increased from $127.18 to $128.45, retiree plus spouse increased from $254.37 to $256.90, retiree plus children increased from $190.77 to $192.68, and retiree family increased from $317.96 to $321.14. The 2018 non-Medicare retiree premiums are roughly equal to an active employee salary of $90,000.

Retirees who are Medicare participants can select the Part B Freedom Blue PPO plan as a Medicare Advantage plan that is fully insured by Highmark. For 2018, premiums for this plan increased from $79 to $80. Penn State pays approximately 80% of the total premium for this plan.

For 2018 health plan enrollment data indicated:
- 12,194 or 70% of employees enrolled in the PPO plan
- 5,203 or 30% of employees enrolled in the PPO Savings plan
- 1,193 moved from PPO in 2017 to PPO Savings plan in 2018
- 327 moved from PPO Savings in 2017 to PPO plan in 2018
- 87 Technical Service members chose the PPO Savings option
Table 1: Actual Costs with Premium Cost Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR YEAR INFORMATION</th>
<th>Total Claims Paid (% change)</th>
<th>Employee Premium Contributions (% of Total Claims)</th>
<th>Net PSU Cost (% change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>217,677,285 5% from 2012</td>
<td>41,167,636 18.91%</td>
<td>176,509,649 4.5% from 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>220,479,189 1%</td>
<td>42,747,904 19.39%</td>
<td>177,731,285 0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>236,236,199 7%</td>
<td>45,286,942 19.17%</td>
<td>190,949,257 7.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>270,407,414 14%</td>
<td>47,273,759 17%</td>
<td>223,133,655 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>271,123,472 0.26%</td>
<td>48,292,496 17.8%</td>
<td>222,830,976 -.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2017 total claims for the plans remained relatively flat compared to the 14% increase in 2016. Employee premium contributions as a percent of total claims, which offset the total claims cost to the University, increased slightly from 2016. As in previous reports, the University total cost does not include out-of-pocket payments made by employees directly to providers and these are detailed in the Table 2 below.

Table 2: Employee out-of-pocket contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR YEAR INFORMATION</th>
<th>Employee Medical Out-Of-Pocket (% change)</th>
<th>Employee Prescription Drug Out-Of-Pocket (% change)</th>
<th>Total Employee Out-Of-Pocket Cost (%change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15,890,082</td>
<td>6,460,526</td>
<td>22,350,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>17,179,997 8.1%</td>
<td>6,277,005 -2.8%</td>
<td>23,457,002 5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>18,073,639 5.2%</td>
<td>6,649,340 5.9%</td>
<td>24,722,979 5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>19,707,691 9.04%</td>
<td>6,618,254 -0.47%</td>
<td>26,325,945 6.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>25,664,374 30.2%</td>
<td>6,969,709 5.3%</td>
<td>32,634,083 24.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employee out-of-pocket costs increased by 30.2% for medical claims and 5.3% for prescription drug claims. Overall employee out-of-pocket costs increased by 24.0% in 2017 over the 6.48% increase in 2016. When these out-of-pockets costs are combined with premiums and University contributions the goal is to adhere to the cost sharing guiding principle approved in 2016, which is a 75% University/25% employee cost share. This is further examined below in Table 3.

Table 3: Cost-sharing of total health care contributions between the University and employees
The increase in the year-over-year total health care claims paid by the University changed from 14% in 2016 to 2.4% in 2017. The full employee contribution of premiums and out-of-pocket costs increased 10.7% in 2017 over 2016. The 2017 overall University cost for the total allowable charges decreased .14% over the cost in 2016. The actual percentage cost sharing between the University and employees for 2017 was 73.4% and 26.6%.

**Health Plan Benefit Changes for 2019**
The total allowed medical costs for calendar year 2019 are projected at $209,527,000. The medical plan costs and cost-sharing projections used to develop the 2019 plan design and contribution levels are in Table 4 below.
## Table 4: 2019 Estimated Medical Health Plan Cost Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR YEAR INFORMATION</th>
<th>2019 Projected Costs*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total of Allowed Charges</td>
<td>$282,409,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPO Plan Cost Share</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant OOP</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Contributions</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Employee Share</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSA seed</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Cost Share</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Penn State Share</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPO Savings Plan Cost Share</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant OOP</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Contributions</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Employee Share</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSA seed</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Cost Share</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Penn State Share</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contribution by</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>$211,923,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>$70,486,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Cost Sharing %</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2019 Benefits Open Enrollment is November 1, 2017-November 16, 2018 with all changes made effective January 1, 2019.

**Benefit Changes under Consideration at this Time and/or Topics Discussed with No Change at this Time, or for Informational Purposes**

There will not be changes to the health plan premium contribution percentages for 2019. Rather, Human Resources will be monitoring and measuring plan performance for the next year to assess the impact that the changes in third-party administrators may have to the cost of medical services and prescription drugs for both employees and the University.

Specific changes for health care plans effective **January 1, 2019** include:

**Higher co-insurance amounts when not using Quest/LabCorp**
Beginning in January 2019, if employees use Quest/Lab Corp for non-urgent labs, the coinsurance remains at 10%, after deductible. Employees and their family members will pay more in coinsurance (after deductible is met) if they do not use Quest Diagnostics/Lab Corp for non-urgent labs. If another Aetna in-network lab other than Quest/Lab Corp is used the co-
insurance goes up to 30% and if an out-of-network lab is used, the co-insurance will go up to 50%. There are more than 115 Quest labs and more than 65 LabCorp labs within Pennsylvania.

**Additional option for dependent child life insurance**
In 2019, there will be two dependent child life insurance options offered through Unum; a $5,000 policy at a premium of $1.20 per month; or, $10,000 policy at a premium of $2.40 per month.

**Survey**
The Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits requested HR develop a satisfaction survey about the changes to Aetna and CVS Caremark in health plan and prescription drug administrators. The survey is anticipated to be sent to benefits-enrolled faculty and staff in October 2018. The survey will also include a list of voluntary benefits asking the likelihood of employees signing up for them if the University offers them.

**Requests for Proposal (RFPs) For Dental/Vision**
The contracts with UCCI for the dental benefit and Davis Vision (Highmark) for the vision benefit expire on December 31, 2018. During April, 2018, RFPs will be sent to national vendors for both dental and vision with the goals of reducing Administrative Services Only (ASO) fees for the University and enhancing benefits to employees. The changes to vendors, if any, would take effect January 1, 2019, and will be announced prior to benefits open enrollment.
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2018 Report on Childcare at Penn State University

(Informational)

PURPOSE
This is the third annual report prepared for the Faculty Senate and is a summary of child care services (availability, cost, University contributions) and related research, education, and service activities associated with early child care services at Penn State University and Penn State Health. The report also summarizes changes since the implementation of recommendations from the 2014 “Presidential Task Force on Child Care at Penn State: Findings and Report to President Rodney Erickson.” An overview of changes include the development of an early child care services strategic plan; a new partnership between Penn State Health at Saint Joe’s Hospital offering spaces in their child care center for Berks campus faculty, staff, and students; increased investments in child care funding; and, changes in management of two centers from KinderCare to Bright Horizons.

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). Child care provided to families outside the University strengthens the connection between Penn State and its local communities. 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 the majority of key recommendations have been addressed. Additionally, Human Resources (HR), including the Director of Early Child Care Programs and Services and the CCAC, are working to address remaining recommendations and develop new goals and objectives for services through the development of an Early Child Care Services Strategic Plan.

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 2018, 275 (Bennett)-13,422 hours, 3 departments, 303 students spent over 8,756 hours completing coursework assignments and working as work-study or America Reads students.
- From 2014-2018, 16 research studies were conducted at the Bennett Family Center and Child Care Center at Hort Woods.
- In 2018 the Behrend Early Learning Center had 56 students participate in coursework or were employed at the center, almost doubling student participation from the previous year. Students represented four academic departments at the campus including Engineering, Biological Studies, Education and Science.
- The Daybridge Center at Innovation Park at the University Park campus reported student participation for the first time in over a decade. The center hosted 27 students from four academic colleges who participated in coursework or worked at the center in 2018.
- In 2016, the Director of Early Child Care Programs and Services launched a diversity and inclusion training initiative. The Child Care Centers partnered with the Center for Education and Civil Rights, as well as other faculty and subject area experts to offer an on-going Lunch & Learn series open to the University community and training for all Penn State child care center employees on topics such as, raising racially literature children and anti-biased curriculum approaches. In 2017, a new [Commitment to Diversity Statement](#) and objectives for educators was announced which will guide the Child Care Centers future work in this area.
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:
• 2018 parent survey results confirm that families remain satisfied with our child care services. Additionally, families feel that employer sponsored child care helps them be more productive in their job and/or studies.
• Penn State Health at Saint Joseph’s Hospital located only a short distance from the Berks campus has offered to partner with the Berks campus and at no cost offer child care openings to Berks students, staff and faculty families at their Bright Horizons Child Care Center, Creative Beginnings.
• Penn State was awarded an $824,768 CCAMPIS (Child Care Access Means Parents in School) grant from the U.S. Department of Education to provide financial assistance for child care to qualifying low-income undergraduate and graduate student parents at University Park and 20 campus locations. The four-year grant will provide $206,191 in second year funding for the Student Parent Child Care Subsidy Program in 2018-2019. For two decades the program has also been additionally funded by student fees at University Park and participating campus locations.
• Table 1 documents the current potential capacity at all campus locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Total Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altoona- Penn Mont Academy</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend- Early Learning Center</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park- Bennett Family Center</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park- Daybridge KinderCare Education</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg Children’s Learning Center</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hershey Medical Center KinderCare EDUCATION</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park- Child Care Center at Hort Woods</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Health- Saint Joseph’s Hospital-Creative Beginnings</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CAPACITY=</td>
<td>1,057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 documents the current availability at all campus locations.

**TABLE 2-CENTER OPENINGS** at University and Penn State Health child care centers (as of October 31, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Total Openings</th>
<th>Infant</th>
<th>Toddler</th>
<th>Preschool</th>
<th>School-Age/Kindergarten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altoona- Penn Mont Academy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend- Early Learning Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park- Bennett Family Center and Child Care Center at Hort Woods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park- Daybridge KinderCare Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg Children’s Learning Center</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hershey Medical Center KinderCare</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Health- Saint Joseph’s Hospital-Creative Beginnings</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 documents current tuition rates at all campus locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Infant</th>
<th>Toddler</th>
<th>Preschool</th>
<th>School-Age</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altoona- Penn Mont Academy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PSU Rate- $147 (5 days);</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*9 monthly payments (does not include summer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Rate- $155 (5 days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend- Early Learning Center</td>
<td>PSU Rates- $228 (5 days), $162 (3 days), $108 (2 days); Community Rates- $240 (5 days), $172 (3 days), $114 (2 days)</td>
<td>PSU Rates- $217 (5 days), $155 (3 days), $103 (2 days); Community Rates- $229 (5 days), $165 (3 days), $110 (2 days)</td>
<td>PSU Rates- $198 (5 days), $149 (3 days), $99 (2 days); Community Rates- $210 (5 days), $159 (3 days), $105 (2 days)</td>
<td>$180 (5 days), $135 (3 days), $96 (2 days)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Weekly rates listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park- Bennett Family Center and Child Care Center at Hort Woods</td>
<td>$211 (30K or less), $242 (30,001-70K), $275 (70,001-110K), $338 (110,001-160K), $402 (160K or more)</td>
<td>$211 (30K or less), $242 (30,001-70K), $275 (70,001-110K), $338 (110,001-160K), $402 (160K or more)</td>
<td>$168 (30K or less), $189 (30,001-70K), $213 (70,001-110K), $235 (110,001-160K), $256 (160K or more)</td>
<td>$196</td>
<td>$233 (Bennett only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Monthly sliding scale rates listed at 5 full days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park- Daybridge KinderCare Education</td>
<td>PSU Rates- $259 (5 days), $194 (3 days), $129 (2 days); Community Rates- $287 (5 days), $215 (3 days), $143 (2 days)</td>
<td>PSU Rates- $238 (5 days), $178 (3 days), $119 (2 days); Community Rates- $234 (5 days), $860 (3 days), $132 (2 days)</td>
<td>PSU Rates- $181 (5 days), $136 (3 days), $90 (2 days); Community Rates- $202 (5 days), $152 (3 days), $101 (2 days)</td>
<td>$221</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>PSU Rates-</td>
<td>PSU Rates-</td>
<td>PSU Rates-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg Children’s Learning Center</td>
<td>$222 (5 days), $172 (3 days), $131 (2 days); Community Rates- $238 (5 days), $186 (3 days), $141 (2 days)</td>
<td>$213 (5 days), $168 (3 days), $127 (2 days); Community Rates- $228 (5 days), $180 (3 days), $136 (2 days)</td>
<td>$187 (5 days), $147 (3 days), $110 (2 days); Community Rates- $199 (5 days), $158 (3 days), $119 (2 days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hershey Medical Center KinderCare EDUCATION</td>
<td>PSU Rates- $271 (5 days), $216 (3 days), $163 (2 days); Community Rates- $314 (5 days), $250 (3 days), $187 (2 days)</td>
<td>PSU Rates- $260 (5 days), $207 (3 days), $156 (2 days); Community Rates- $300 (5 days), $240 (3 days), $180 (2 days)</td>
<td>PSU Rates- $227 (5 days), $182 (3 days), $137 (2 days); Community Rates- $263 (5 days), $211 (3 days), $158 (2 days)</td>
<td>PSU Rate- Before/After- $108 (5 days), $87 (3 days), $65 (2 days); Community Rate- $126 (5 days), $101 (3 days), $76 (2 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Health- Saint Joe’s Creative Beginnings</td>
<td>Penn State Health Rates- $200 (5 days), $135 (3 days), $98 (2 days); Community Rates- $262 (5 days), $184 (3 days), $126 (2 days)</td>
<td>Penn State Health Rates- $188 (5 days), $129 (3 days), $93 (2 days); Community Rates- $252 (5 days), $179 (3 days), $122 (2 days)</td>
<td>Penn State Health Rates- $165 (5 days), $115 (3 days), $79 (2 days); Community Rates- $217 (5 days), $152 (3 days), $102 (2 days)</td>
<td>Before School- $74 (5 days), $44 (3 days), $30 (2 days)</td>
<td>After School- $85 (5 days), $51 (3 days), $34 (2 days)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 4- Affiliation as of October, 2018 (% of total enrollment Penn State affiliated vs. % Community non-affiliated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>% Penn State Affiliated</th>
<th>% Community Affiliated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altoona- Penn Mont Academy</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend- Early Learning Center</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park- Bennett Family Center</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park- Child Care Center at Hort Woods</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park- Daybridge KinderCare Education</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg Children’s Learning Center</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hershey Medical Center KinderCare</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Health- Saint Joseph’s Hospital-Creative Beginnings</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Child Care Advisory Committee (CCAC) was re-constituted in the summer of 2014.
• The University’s policy on the provision of child care (HR-48) was enforced by hiring a Director
of Early Child Care Programs and Services in January of 2015.
• Oversight of Child Care was moved from the College of Health and Human Development to
Human Resources in 2015, under the Director of Early Child Care Programs and Services.
• Human Resources continues to see Early Child Care Services as an important benefit for
recruitment and retention of faculty, staff and students. An Early Child Care Strategic Planning
Committee, including members of CCAC, HR, and the Colleges and Campuses formed in the
spring of 2018 and plans to finalize the first Strategic Plan for Early Child Care Services in early
2019.
• In September 2018 the Committee surveyed all current families and staff from our eight child
care centers in an effort to assess quality and range of existing services. Additionally, the
committee plans to solicit feedback from campus and University Park leadership, as well as other
stakeholders prior to finalizing the plan. The plan will include the review of Big Ten and
national benchmark data and available Penn State employee and student parent data to assess
current child care needs. A campus funding model recommendation (based on quality, cost
saving criteria) will be recommended to support consistency in service delivery, reduction of
costs and funding equity across existing centers.
• Altoona began a child care advisory committee in August 2016.
• HR-48 was 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 5 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY18/19</th>
<th>Bright Horizons Managed Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Bennett Family Center at University Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>Approximately 35 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Salary</td>
<td>$1,286,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>$508,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Salary + Fringe</td>
<td>$1,794,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>($Food, equipment, materials, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$211,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$2,006,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Tuition, subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,489,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>$1,489,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State contribution</td>
<td>$470,148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5- BUDGET INFORMATION (CURRENT FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 2018-JUNE 30, 2019)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY18/19</th>
<th>Bright Horizons Managed Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Child Care Center at Hort Woods, University Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>Approximately 50 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Salary</td>
<td>$1,732,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>$666,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Salary + Fringe</td>
<td>$2,416,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>($Food, equipment, materials, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$212,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$2,628,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Tuition, subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,261,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>$437,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State contribution</td>
<td>$197,915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| FY18/19                                      | Bright Horizons Managed Centers                                                                 |
|                                             | Behrend Early Learning Center                                                                  |
| Expenses                                    | Approximately 16 employees                                                                     |
| Employee Salary                            | $831,459                                                                                       |
| Fringe                                      | $-                                                                                             |
| Total Salary + Fringe                       | $831,459                                                                                       |
| Operating Expenses                          | ($Food, equipment, materials, etc.)                                                             |
|                                             | $246,258                                                                                       |
| Total Operating Expenses                    | $1,021,974                                                                                     |
| Income                                      | Tuition, subsidies                                                                             |
|                                             | $879,801                                                                                       |
| Total Income                                | $879,801                                                                                       |
| Penn State contribution                     | $197,915                                                                                        |

| FY18/19                                      | Bright Horizons Managed Centers                                                                 |
|                                             | Harrisburg Children's Learning Center                                                          |
| Expenses                                    | Approximately 10 employees                                                                    |
| Employee Salary                            | $487,943                                                                                       |
| Fringe                                      | $-                                                                                             |
| Total Salary + Fringe                       | $487,943                                                                                       |
| Operating Expenses                          | ($Food, equipment, materials, etc.)                                                             |
|                                             | $205,759                                                                                       |
| Total Operating Expenses                    | $693,702                                                                                       |
| Income                                      | Tuition, subsidies                                                                             |
|                                             | $512,089                                                                                       |
| Total Income                                | $512,089                                                                                       |
| Penn State contribution                     | $197,915                                                                                        |

| FY18/19                                      | Bright Horizons Managed Centers                                                                 |
|                                             | Saint Joe's Children's Creative Beginning                                                      |
| Expenses                                    | Approximately 30 employees                                                                    |
| Employee Salary                            | $1,055,013                                                                                     |
| Fringe                                      | $-                                                                                             |
| Total Salary + Fringe                       | $1,055,013                                                                                     |
| Operating Expenses                          | ($Food, equipment, materials, etc.)                                                             |
|                                             | $418,473                                                                                       |
| Total Operating Expenses                    | $1,473,786                                                                                     |
| Income                                      | Tuition, subsidies                                                                             |
|                                             | $1,430,078                                                                                     |
| Total Income                                | $1,430,078                                                                                     |
| Penn State contribution                     | $197,915                                                                                        |

| FY18/19                                      | Bright Horizons Managed Centers                                                                 |
|                                             | PSH/HMC/COM First Discoveries at Bright Horizons                                              |
| Expenses                                    | Approximately 20 employees                                                                    |
| Employee Salary                            | $941,317                                                                                       |
| Fringe                                      | $-                                                                                             |
| Total Salary + Fringe                       | $941,317                                                                                       |
| Operating Expenses                          | ($Food, equipment, materials, etc.)                                                             |
|                                             | $378,173                                                                                       |
| Total Operating Expenses                    | $1,319,486                                                                                     |
| Income                                      | Tuition, subsidies                                                                             |
|                                             | $1,093,304                                                                                     |
| Total Income                                | $1,093,304                                                                                     |
| Penn State contribution                     | $287,013                                                                                        |

| FY18/19                                      | Bright Horizons Managed Centers                                                                 |
|                                             | Daybridge at University Park                                                                  |
| Expenses                                    | Approximately 32 employees                                                                    |
| Employee Salary                            | $708,091                                                                                       |
| Fringe                                      | $-                                                                                             |
| Total Salary + Fringe                       | $708,091                                                                                       |
| Operating Expenses                          | ($Food, equipment, materials, etc.)                                                             |
|                                             | $378,173                                                                                       |
| Total Operating Expenses                    | $1,086,264                                                                                    |
| Income                                      | Tuition, subsidies                                                                             |
|                                             | $8,475,893                                                                                    |
| Total Income                                | $8,475,893                                                                                    |
| Penn State contribution                     | $276,092                                                                                        |

| FY18/19                                      | Bright Horizons Managed Centers                                                                 |
|                                             | Total                                                                                          |
| Expenses                                    |                                                                                               |
| Employee Salary                            | $7,043,181                                                                                     |
| Fringe                                      | $1,174,713                                                                                     |
| Total Salary + Fringe                       | $8,234,963                                                                                    |
| Operating Expenses                          |                                                                                               |
|                                             | $2,111,169                                                                                    |
| Total Operating Expenses                    | $10,192,221                                                                                   |
| Income                                      |                                                                                               |
|                                             | $8,475,893                                                                                    |
| Total Income                                | $8,475,893                                                                                    |
| Penn State contribution                     |                                                                                               |
|                                             | $1,860,878                                                                                    |
From Finding 4 (“Peer-institutions are addressing similar issues and concerns”), it was recommended that a CIC (Council of Independent Colleges) consortium be formed on the topic and that continued models and cost-structures across peer institutions be explored.

**Update:**
- The development of a Big Ten child care consortium will be recommended as part of the University Strategic Plan for Early Child Care Services.

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 center’s 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 Recent Changes**
- In 2018 the University announced a decision to change child care vendors at the Penn State Health at Hershey Medical Center/College of Medicine and the Daybridge Center at University Park from KinderCare to Bright Horizons. The Hershey Center transitioned to Bright Horizons in August 2018 and Daybridge will transition to Bright Horizons in December 2018.
In 2017 Penn State Health at Hershey Medical Center began to offer a new child care benefit to Hospital and College of Medicine employees through Bright Horizons. Back-up child care services, including in-home and center-based child care is available to employees for unplanned child care needs, including school snow days, child care break down/center closures, child with a mild illness, etc. Employees get 10 days per calendar year with a daily co-pay of $15/child at participating centers and $6/hr. for participating in-home child care providers. Hershey Medical has decided to offer this benefit again to Hospital and COM employees in 2018.
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Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, Academic Year, 2017-2018
(Division 1 Athletics at University Park)

(Informational)

Introduction

Each year the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (IAC) is mandated to provide a report on Penn State intercollegiate athletic activities to the University Faculty Senate. This report focuses on Division 1 athletics at University Park. A separate committee report focuses on intercollegiate athletics at the non-University Park campuses. The report is organized into the following sections:

- Descriptive data summarizing the Division 1 varsity student athlete population at the University Park Campus
- A review of the formal “charges” provided to the IAC from the Chair of the Faculty Senate for Academic Year 2017-2018, and progress made on these charges.
- A review of new business undertaken by the IAC during the 2017-2018 academic year.
- A review of updates and informational briefs provided by the Athletic Director, the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), and other individuals regarding oversight of athletics at Penn State and important items of interest in the broader landscape of intercollegiate athletics, including proposed and passed NCAA and Big Ten Conference legislation, legal challenges, and issues that have received significant attention nationally.
- Student Athlete Academic Highlights
- Data used by the IAC to self-monitor the academic performance of Penn State’s student athletes.

Descriptive Data of University Park Student Athletes (31 Varsity Teams) for Academic Year 2017-18 (Based on those student-athletes enrolled at the end of Spring 2018)

1. Total number of student-athletes = 806 (Fall 2017) and 751 (Spring 2018)

2. Total number of student-athletes not eligible for competition for academic reasons = 4 (e.g. lower than required GPA or insufficient progress towards major degree requirements)

3. Total number of scholarship student-athletes = 538 (includes full and partial scholarships)

4. Total number of medical (non-count) student-athletes = 3 (student athletes unable to compete due to injury or illness)

5. Total number of exhausted eligibility student-athletes = 9 (student athletes completing academic work after having exhausted eligibility for competition).
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Progress on Items Charged to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics by the Senate Chair – Academic Year 2017-2018

Chair Matthew Woessner charged IAC Chair John Regan with three tasks for academic year 2017-2018. These included:

- **Drafting of an Informational Report on Time Management** in conjunction with the Student Life Committee chaired by Kevin Harwell. Richard Duschl served as the sub-committee chair of this effort for the IAC. The sub-committee worked on this report during the year and submitted it to the Faculty Senate office for presentation at the April 2018 Senate meeting. Because of space limitations on the April Senate Agenda, the report was moved to the September 2018 Senate Meeting where it will be presented. The genesis of the charge from the Senate Chair was motivated, in part, by the understanding that the NCAA had recently passed ‘time demands legislation’ with the goal of making sure that NCAA student athletes were not being overly scheduled to the point of suffering academically or being denied the ability to experience a rich college experience. The report to be presented at the September 2018 Senate meeting examines time management resources available to Penn State students generally, as well as how the Morgan Academic Center and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics supports student athletes in the area of time balance and time management. The report also contains some comparative information of resources available to all students at peer Big Ten institutions. For more detail, please see the informational report to be presented at the Faculty Senate meeting in September 2018. With the completion of this report the IAC considers this charge to have been completed.

- **Determine if Penn State’s Faculty Senate should continue formal participation in the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA).** Committee members Thomas Poole and IAC Chair John Regan, in consultation with resource person John Nichols, discussed this charge received from Senate Chair Matthew Woessner. While COIA had served a useful purpose several years ago, some of the main original benefits of COIA have been institutionalized into Penn State’s governance and oversight structure of intercollegiate athletics. Therefore, there is ongoing conversation about Penn State’s need to participate in COIA moving forward.

- **Continue to Work on Proposed Revision to the IAC Standing Rules Given Feedback Received from the Faculty Senate’s Committee on Committees and Rules (CC&R), in Response to a Proposal Submitted by the IAC in Academic Year 2016-2017.** The topic of IAC governance structure has been an ongoing topic for the IAC for a number of years. The topic is motivated by several facts, including the reality that the business of intercollegiate athletics is complex, with ever changing rules at the NCAA and Big Ten conference level, requiring a level of familiarity and knowledge that is difficult to achieve when newly serving on the IAC or when serving for a single year. In addition, the work of intercollegiate athletics is year-round and does not follow the standard academic year nine month calendar, requiring faculty input on decision during the summer months (May 15th to August 15th). The primary objective of this proposal was to build committee member experience and
familiarity with the work of the IAC, to make sure the Chair of the IAC was sufficiently knowledgeable and experienced, and to make sure that input from the Chair and appointed faculty and committee members could be received during summer months as needed. A sub-committee was appointed to address this charge led by NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative Dennis Scanlon. The committee reviewed the history leading to this charge, discussed various options to accomplish the desired goals, and then presented ideas for discussion to the full IAC. The result was a proposed revision to the IAC standing rules submitted to CC&R in March 2018, with the IAC waiting for feedback and the potential for presentation at the September 2018 Faculty Senate meeting. The proposal specifically included a two-year minimum term for senator appointments to the IAC, with the chair having at least one year of prior service on the IAC, and a provision for meetings and votes during the summer period. With the submission of a proposal to CC&R, the IAC believes this charge has been met. Completion of this task will be determined based on feedback from CC&R and a potential Senate vote to approve changes to the IAC standing rules.

New Business Undertaken by the IAC During the 2017-2018 Academic Year

- Revisions to Faculty Senate 67-00 Policy – “Athletic Competition” – A significant amount of IAC committee time was spent on this topic during Academic Year 2017-2018. This work was precipitated by a number of circumstances the FAR and the IAC Chair became aware of. For example, while Faculty Senate 67-00 policy creates GPA requirements that student athletes must meet to be eligible for athletic practice and competition (and stricter than NCAA and Big 10 Conference minimum requirements), University Faculty Senate 67-00 policy allows for petitions for exception to these policies. However, the policy does not clearly define a legitimate basis for filing a petition, the process for submitting a petition, and which individuals or committees are charged with acting on submitted petitions. Because a number of petitions for exception were submitted to the FAR for action in Academic Year 2017-2018, and given the vagueness of 67-00 policy, the FAR (Dennis Scanlon) worked with IAC Chair John Regan and Vice Chair Richard Duschl to create a formal petition process whereby to review and adjudicate these petitions. Six petitions in total were reviewed and acted on. Four of these petitions were from first semester freshman student athletes who fell short of the required Penn State 1.80 GPA, and a 5th semester transfer student completing her first year at PSU and who also fell short of the required GPA. The final case was a fifth semester student athlete with below a 67-00 required GPA of 2.00. The latter petition was denied while the five former petitions were approved. The five petitions were approved based on the circumstances of the particular cases (e.g., choosing the wrong major and not doing well; difficulty in transitioning to college; not receiving disability services in a timely fashion—despite being ultimately approved by Penn State’s Office of Disability Services, and not receiving information about transfer credits in a timely fashion). In addition, while deliberating these petitions, the committee considered the inequity in GPA requirements after the first semester for all Penn State students as reflected in Faculty Senate policy 54-00 relative to 67-00. The five petitions were approved with
strict requirements for an academic recovery plan. Of these five petitions, four made significant academic progress in the Spring 2018 semester, elevating their GPAs above institutional requirements. As a secondary result of this process, the sub-committee discussed codifying changes in 67-00 to clarify the acceptable basis for petitioning, the petitioning process, and the individuals who will determine the results of petitions (the FAR, and the Chair and Vice Chair of the IAC). It is anticipated that these recommendations will be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval in Academic Year 2018-2019.

- **Reconciling GPA Requirements for Athletic Competition and Newly Passed Policy Regarding Academic Warning and Suspension for All Students** – At the April 2018 Faculty Senate meeting, a motion to change the policy regarding academic warning and suspension was approved. This legislation is being discussed by the Academic Leadership Council prior to implementation. It is not anticipated that final decisions related to this policy will conflict with either Senate policy 67-00 or 54-00. The IAC should prioritize discussion of this item for the early Fall 2018 semester, with an eye to how this passed legislation is being implemented in practice, and whether there are any concerns that would impact students in general, and student athletes specifically.

- **Allowing World Campus Class Credits to Count for Full Time Enrollment for Student Athletes** – Current Penn State 67-00 policy excludes World Campus courses credits from counting towards the NCAA (and Big Ten) required 12-credit minimum necessary for a student athlete to practice and compete. Penn State’s policy was partially driven by a past NCAA ruling regarding on-line credits. That ruling has since changed. The IAC discussed this issue and unanimously agreed that the quality of Penn State’s online/World Campus courses is on par with residential offerings and should be allowed to count towards a student-athlete’s required 12 credits for full time enrollment. The committee recommended updating 67-00 policy to reflect this. As part of this conversation, the IAC (and the Morgan Academic Center) while supportive of allowing credit for online and World Campus courses, would like to limit the overall number of these credits used to establish full time status, in order to maintain the residential experience for student athletes. As a result, the Morgan Academic Center was tasked to develop an internal policy to manage decisions regarding online and World Campus credits for student athletes and to ensure that this policy is consistent with changes to the 67-00 document. [Note: The Morgan Center updated its web course/online course policy for the 18/19 academic year. The current policy is to allow 2 web-based resident instruction courses each semester. World Campus courses are still not counted towards full-time enrollment.] This item should be finalized by the IAC early in Academic Year 2018-2019.

- **Approval of Athletic Schedules for Spring 2018 Sports and Fall/Winter 2018** – As per committee standard, the IAC approved competition schedules for Winter/Spring 2018 sports at the September 2017 meeting, and for Fall/Winter 2018 competition schedules at the April 2018 meeting. Lynn Holleran presented the schedules at both meetings, noting the requested number of missed class days each of the 31 teams would be missing for competitions. All requests fell at or below the Faculty Senate established maximum of *eight* missed class days per semester, not inclusive of any missed class due to post-season competition. All schedules were
approved by IAC majority vote. There was one request for waiver of the Faculty Senate 67-00 policy related to not scheduling competitions on final exam study days for the Spring 2018 schedules. This (annually recurrent) request was for the men’s and women’s track and field teams to compete in the Penn Relays during Saturday and Sunday final exam study days at the end of the spring semester. This was approved by the IAC with the understanding that the coaching staff would provide student athletes with time for exam study, and that the Morgan Academic Center staff would work with these student athletes to prepare for exams knowing that competition would occur during these study days. There were two requests for competition on a study day for the Fall/Winter 2018 schedule; both are annual requests in men’s and women’s basketball.

**Faculty Senate policy for Approval of Football Bowl Game** – Current Penn State Faculty Senate Policy 67-10 requires the IAC to approve Penn State’s participation in a Bowl Game. Because Bowl Announcements have become ‘automatic’ through the Bowl Championship Series (BCS) process, the University has little to no choice regarding bowl game date/location/opponent. Furthermore, the timing of the invitation typically occurs after the fall semester (after the December IAC meeting). As such, the IAC Chair, Vice Chair, and the Faculty Athletics Representative acted on behalf of the IAC to ‘approve’ the invitation to the Fiesta Bowl in December of 2017. Penn State’s participation in the 2017 Fiesta Bowl was publicly announced at the same time the institution was notified. The IAC should discuss adapting current policy to allow the Athletic Director to execute responsibility for Bowl Game decisions, given the current BCS process. In this (more efficient) scenario, the Athletic Director could report the decision to the IAC Chair, Vice Chair, and FAR on notification and to the IAC as a whole at the January IAC meeting.

**Presentation by New Athletic Integrity Officer Robert Boland** – Penn State’s new Athletic Integrity Officer, Bob Boland, provided an overview of his office as well as a discussion of how Penn State is voluntarily continuing the many practices that were required and institutionalized under the 2012 ‘Consent Decree’. While the consent decree formally expired in August of 2017, Penn State has voluntarily maintained its’ provisions to maximize institutional control and oversight.

**Updates and Informational Briefs Regarding Important Items of Interest in the Broader Landscape of Intercollegiate Athletics**

Over the course of the IAC meetings during Academic Year 2017-2018, the committee was briefed by various individuals on a number of items receiving attention in the broader landscape of intercollegiate athletics. These briefings included:

- A discussion of the implementation of time management and time balance legislation passed by the NCAA. Various individuals spoke about how Penn State has implemented and is monitoring the implementation of this legislation, including requirements for the FAR and Athletic Director and the President to attest to Penn State’s compliance with this legislation.
Legislation regarding athletic transfers was a major topic of discussion nationally. Matt Stolberg, Penn State’s Associate Athletics Director for Compliance, and Sandy Barbour, Athletic Director, led a discussion of proposed NCAA legislation related to new transfer rules. This included new processes regarding the notification of transfer and the ability of institutions to withdrawal financial aid for those student athletes who provide notification of transfer.

In September of 2017 the FBI began an investigation of Division 1 men’s college basketball which received significant press coverage. Shortly thereafter the NCAA commissioned an independent commission to review and address corruption in men’s college basketball. Condoleezza Rice led this commission, which reported a list of broad recommendations in the Spring of 2018. The IAC was updated about the FBI investigation and the Rice Commission’s work. Implementation of recommendations is beginning and the IAC should be briefed on where this stands when the 2018-2019 academic year commences.

The IAC was informed of ongoing work and research being conducted by the NCAA and an alliance between the Big Ten and the Ivy League on head injury and concussion research, which is a significant issue for multiple sports sponsored by the NCAA and at Penn State. Dr. Scott Lynch and Dr. Sam Slobounov are two of Penn State’s officials tracking and participating in this important work.

Faculty Athletics Representative, Dennis Scanlon, was available for questions and discussion on the Senate floor at the September 2017 meeting, to answer questions about the IAC’s work or the informational report it filed with the Senate Office in August of 2017 summarizing the IAC’s work over the previous academic year.

Reports to Facilitate Self-Monitoring and Quality Improvement of Intercollegiate Athletics – Academic Year 2017-18

The IAC routinely monitors various metrics of student-athlete academic performance and hears reports about programs, processes and outcomes from several administrators regarding various dimensions of the student athlete academic and athletic experience. During Academic Year 2017-2018, the committee received the following reports/updates.

Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education, Robert Pangborn, distributed two reports. One report was the Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program sponsored by the Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid. For 2017, 118 of 140 allotted reserved spaces were used, noting that athletics has not needed to use what has been allotted. Dr. Pangborn also presented data on the predicted GPA for students admitted under the reserved spaces program. The admissions office uses a mathematical regression model to predict a science and non-science GPA based on academic indicators and standardized testing from the admissions process. Dr. Pangborn examines whether reserved spaces are being used to admit high-risk student athletes. Based on his review, no significant concerns regarding the athletic department’s use of reserved spaces were reported. Dr. Pangborn also reported the results of an examination of grades in all University Park courses
with over 20% student-athlete enrollment. As in past years, no issues were identified and the grade distributions between student-athletes and non-student-athletes were comparable.

It was also noted that beginning in the Fall of 2017, the registrar’s office provides daily grade change reports to the FAR, the Athletics Compliance office, and the Morgan Academic Center. A process has been instituted to flag grade changes for student athletes that would positively alter eligibility (i.e., going from ineligible to eligible due to the grade change). In situations where eligibility changed, the Faculty Athletics Representative follows up with the faculty member to confirm the legitimacy of the grade change. Dr. Scanlon reported that he has confirmed three grade changes thus far with faculty members.

Russ Mushinsky provided the IAC with information on academic data for the Penn State student athlete population. The NCAA published ‘Graduation Success Rate (GSR)’ and the ‘Academic Progress Rate (APR)’, were presented along with the Federal Graduation Rate (FGR). The GSR, FGR and APR are metrics tracked and reported by the NCAA to benchmark, compare, and track institutional results on the academic progress of student athletes. These statistics are included at the end of this report. Overall, Penn State’s progress on these metrics is very good, with the most recent GSR rising to 90%. The data included at the end of this report provides these academic metrics by teams with comparable data for other Big Ten and NCAA institutions. Data are also presented by gender and for African American student athletes. A brief synopsis of the methodology used to compete these measures is also provided.

Senior Associate Athletic Director and Senior Woman Administrator, Charmelle Green, provided information from a student athlete experience survey fielded by the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. While the overall results were positive, several areas for improvement were identified. For example, noise in the study hall area and the availability of tutors were two specific areas for improvement. At another IAC meeting, Charmelle discussed the Student Athlete Mental Health Task Force report, and introduced two members of the committee reviewing behavioral health issues and services available for our student athletes. Dr. Brendan Carr from Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) and Dr. Carl Ohlson Assistant Athletic Director for Performance Psychology Services talked about the work of the task force, behavioral health treatment services for student athletes, and fielded questions from committee members on this topic.

Student Athlete Academic Highlights

Post-Graduate Scholarship Winners

- Two student athletes were awarded Big Ten Post-Graduate Scholarships to support the pursuit of graduate education. Matt McCutcheon (Men’s Wrestling) and McKayla Mawn (Women’s Swimming and Diving).
- The Faculty Athletics Representative nominated several other student athletes for prestigious national awards offered by the NCAA and Big Ten.
Academic Highlights of Penn State Student Athletes

- Penn State is second among all Big Ten institutions with 6,235 Academic All-Big Ten honorees since 1991-92 (our first year of competition in some Big Ten sports). Only Ohio State (which has 36 varsity sports) has more selections (5,887 selections since 1991-92).

- 520 Fall student-athletes earned a 3.0 GPA or higher and a record 26 (up 2 from Fall 2016) teams recorded an average team GPA of 3.0 or higher.

- 487 Spring student-athletes earned a 3.0 GPA or higher and a record tying 26 teams (up 2 from Spring 2017) recorded an average team GPA of 3.0 or higher.

Big Ten Conference Distinguished Scholar Award Recipient Past 5 Year History
*2013-2014 academic year; 73 student athletes recognized
*2014-2015 academic year; 69 student athletes recognized
*2015-2016 academic year; 81 student athletes recognized
*2016-2017 academic year; 97 student athletes recognized
*2017-2018 academic year; 90 student athletes recognized
*Overall PSU Ten-Year Total; 694 student athletes recognized

Big Ten, Academic All-Big Ten Selections Fall, Winter and Spring

- 117 Penn State student athletes (in 7 fall sports) earned Academic All-Big Ten honors. Below is the number of selections from each team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Selections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Soccer</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Soccer</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Cross Country</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Cross Country</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Volleyball</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 77 Penn State student athletes (in 8 winter sports) earned Academic All-Big Ten honors. Below is the number of selections from each team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Selections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Basketball</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Basketball</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
166 Penn State student athletes (in 14 spring/at-large sports) earned Academic All-Big Ten honors. Below is the number of selections from each team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Selections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Gymnastics</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Gymnastics</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Ice Hockey</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, Penn State had 360 Academic All-Big Ten selections during the 2017-2018 academic year, which was a school record. Academic All-Big Ten selections are based on having a 3.0 cumulative GPA or higher (change from last year – no longer need to be a letter winner).

Through (24) years of full membership in the Big Ten Conference, 6,235 Penn State student athletes have been recognized as Academic All-Big Ten Conference selections.

Data Used by the IAC to Monitor the Academic Performance of Penn State’s Student Athletes

- Penn State's Team Academic Progress Rate (APR) for the four-year Cohort of AY 2012-13 through AY 2016-17,
- Federal Graduation Rate (FGR) for single year cohort of 2010-2011
- Graduation Success Rates (GSR) for the single year cohort of students 2007-2010
Notes to facilitate interpreting the data:

The APR is based on four years of data, with the most current year's data added and the oldest year removed to create a four-year (multi-year) rolling average. The APR scores are a measure of eligibility and retention/graduation for each student athlete receiving athletic aid during the identified academic semester/year. Retention is evaluated for each student athlete with the following question in mind: Did that student athlete return to the institution the next semester (students can earn 2 points after the fall semester and 2 points after the spring and summer semesters). Eligibility is evaluated using NCAA, conference (if applicable), and institutional standards.

APR is calculated by dividing all possible points for all scholarship athletes into total points earned.
The APR minimum academic standard to participate in postseason competition is 900. Beginning with 2012-13 NCAA championships, teams must earn a minimum 900 four-year APR or a 930 average over the most recent two years to be eligible to participate. For the 2014-15 NCAA championships, teams must earn a 930-four-year average APR or a 940 average over the most recent two years to participate in championships. In 2015-16 and beyond, teams must earn a four-year APR of 930 to compete in NCAA championships.

The Graduation Success Rate (GSR) is a percentage of scholarship student athletes graduating during a six-year window. Each cohort includes freshmen (fall and mid-year) plus incoming transfer students less any athletes who left the institution in good academic standing.

The Federal Graduation Rate (FGR) measures the percentage of fall, first-time, full-time freshman who graduate within six years of entering their original four-year institution.
# NCAA Academic Progress Rate (APR) Information

2016-2017 (Four-Year Data) / Released in May 2018

## Penn State Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penn State Intercollegiate Athletic Teams</th>
<th>Multi-Year Team APR</th>
<th>APR Ranking w/in Big Ten Conference</th>
<th>APR All Division I Average</th>
<th>APR Public Institution Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>5th (13)</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Basketball</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>6th (14)</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Cross Country</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>11th (12)</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Fencing</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>2nd (2)</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>Tied for 8th (14)</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Golf</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (14)</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Gymnastics</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>5th (7)</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Ice Hockey</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>4th (6)</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Lacrosse</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>5th (6)</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Soccer</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>5th (9)</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>8th (10)</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Tennis</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>Tied for 8th (12)</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Track (Indoor &amp; Outdoor)</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>11th (13)</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Volleyball</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>2nd (2)</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1st (14)</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Basketball</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>14th (14)</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Cross Country</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>11th (14)</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Fencing</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1st (3)</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>5th (9)</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Golf</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>8th (14)</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Gymnastics</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>10th (10)</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Ice Hockey</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1st (4)</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Lacrosse</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>4th (7)</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Soccer</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>5th (14)</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>10th (14)</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>Tied for 9th (13)</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Tennis</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (14)</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Track (Indoor &amp; Outdoor)</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>Tied for 2nd (13)</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Volleyball</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (14)</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(#{}) = Number of schools in the Big Ten Conference who sponsor the sport.
### GRADUATION SUCCESS RATE
#### 2007-2010 COHORT
#### PENN STATE RANKINGS, BIG TEN CONFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PENN STATE VARSITY TEAMS</th>
<th>FEDERAL FOUR-YEAR GRADUATION RATE</th>
<th>FEDERAL GRADUATION RATE - DIVISION I FOUR-YEAR AVERAGE</th>
<th>GRADUATION SUCCESS RATE (GSR)</th>
<th>GRADUATION SUCCESS RATE (GSR) - DIVISION I AVERAGE</th>
<th>GRADUATION SUCCESS RATE (GSR) RANKING - (BIG TEN CONFERENCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Tied for 5th (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Basketball</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Fencing</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2nd (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Tied for 3rd (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Golf</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Tied for 12th (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Gymnastics</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Tied for 2nd (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Ice Hockey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1st (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Lacrosse</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2nd (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Soccer</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7th (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Tennis</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tied for 7th (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Track &amp; Cross Country</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6th (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Volleyball</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2nd (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Tied for 4th (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Basketball</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Tied for 11th (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Fencing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3rd (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Golf</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Gymnastics</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Ice Hockey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Lacrosse</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5th (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Soccer</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Tied for 10th (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Tied for 12th (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Tennis</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Track &amp; Cross Country</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7th (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Volleyball</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11th (14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(##) = Number of schools in the Big Ten Conference that sponsor the sport.
# NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR) Rankings
## Big Ten Conference
### 2007-2010 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
<th>Male Student Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
<th>Female Student Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota: 92</td>
<td>Minnesota: 89</td>
<td>Michigan: 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State: 90</td>
<td>Iowa: 85</td>
<td>Indiana: 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa: 90</td>
<td>Michigan: 85</td>
<td>Minnesota: 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana: 89</td>
<td>Nebraska: 85</td>
<td>Penn State: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska: 89</td>
<td>Indiana: 83</td>
<td>Iowa: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois: 88</td>
<td>Michigan State: 82</td>
<td>Rutgers: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State: 87</td>
<td>Ohio State: 82</td>
<td>Nebraska: 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State: 86</td>
<td>Illinois: 80</td>
<td>Purdue: 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin: 86</td>
<td>Wisconsin: 80</td>
<td>Maryland: 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers: 85</td>
<td>Purdue: 78</td>
<td>Wisconsin: 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland: 84</td>
<td>Maryland: 77</td>
<td>Michigan State: 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue: 84</td>
<td>Rutgers: 77</td>
<td>Ohio State: 91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Division I: 86%**  **Overall Division I: 80%**  **Overall Division I: 92%**
### NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR) Rankings
#### Big Ten Conference
**2007-2010 Cohort**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African American Student Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
<th>African American Male Student Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
<th>African American Female Student Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern: 93</td>
<td>Northwestern: 97</td>
<td>Michigan: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan: 87</td>
<td>Michigan: 84</td>
<td>Minnesota: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana: 85</td>
<td>Wisconsin: 84</td>
<td>Wisconsin: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota: 82</td>
<td>Indiana: 80</td>
<td>Rutgers: 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin: 81</td>
<td>Minnesota: 79</td>
<td>Illinois: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland: 80</td>
<td>Penn State: 77</td>
<td>Indiana: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State: 79</td>
<td>Maryland: 77</td>
<td>Ohio State: 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue: 78</td>
<td>Purdue: 77</td>
<td>Maryland: 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers: 76</td>
<td>Nebraska: 73</td>
<td>Nebraska: 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska: 75</td>
<td>Illinois: 67</td>
<td>Purdue: 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois: 73</td>
<td>Rutgers: 67</td>
<td>Penn State: 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State: 72</td>
<td>Iowa: 63</td>
<td>Iowa: 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State: 63</td>
<td>Ohio State: 61</td>
<td>Michigan State: 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Division I: 73%**

**Overall Division I: 69%**

**Overall Division I: 84%**
### NCAA Graduation Rate Rankings, Big Ten Conference
#### Class of 2010-2011, Federal Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Students (2010-2011)</th>
<th>All Students (4-Year Average)</th>
<th>All Student Athletes (2010-2011)</th>
<th>All Student Athletes (4-Year Average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland:</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Penn State: 86</td>
<td>Minnesota: 79</td>
<td>Penn State: 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State:</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Illinois: 85</td>
<td>Iowa: 77</td>
<td>Iowa: 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary: 85</td>
<td>Penn State: 76</td>
<td>Minnesota: 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State:</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Ohio State: 83</td>
<td>Michigan State: 76</td>
<td>Nebraska: 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers:</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Rutgers: 80</td>
<td>Purdue: 76</td>
<td>Ohio State: 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State:</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Michigan State: 78</td>
<td>Nebraska: 74</td>
<td>Michigan State: 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota:</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Indiana: 77</td>
<td>Ohio State: 74</td>
<td>Purdue: 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue:</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Minnesota: 77</td>
<td>Rutgers: 73</td>
<td>Rutgers: 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Purdue: 74</td>
<td>Indiana: 72</td>
<td>Wisconsin: 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa:</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Iowa: 71</td>
<td>Wisconsin: 68</td>
<td>Indiana: 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska:</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Nebraska: 67</td>
<td>Maryland: 57</td>
<td>Maryland: 66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Division I:** 66%  **Overall Division I:** 65%  **Overall Division I:** 68%  **Overall Division I:** 67%
# NCAA Graduation Rate Rankings, Big Ten Conference

**Class of 2010-2011, Federal Graduation Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Male Student Athletes (2010-2011)</th>
<th>All Male Student Athletes (4-Year Average)</th>
<th>All Female Student Athletes (2010-2011)</th>
<th>All Female Student Athletes (4-Year Average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa: 74</td>
<td>Penn State: 73</td>
<td>Illinois: 89</td>
<td>Illinois: 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan: 72</td>
<td>Iowa: 71</td>
<td>Minnesota: 88</td>
<td>Penn State: 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota: 72</td>
<td>Minnesota: 71</td>
<td>Ohio State: 87</td>
<td>Minnesota: 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue: 71</td>
<td>Nebraska: 67</td>
<td>Penn State: 83</td>
<td>Iowa: 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State: 70</td>
<td>Michigan State: 65</td>
<td>Indiana: 82</td>
<td>Ohio State: 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska: 70</td>
<td>Ohio State: 65</td>
<td>Purdue: 82</td>
<td>Rutgers: 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin: 70</td>
<td>Purdue: 65</td>
<td>Rutgers: 82</td>
<td>Purdue: 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois: 65</td>
<td>Wisconsin: 63</td>
<td>Iowa: 80</td>
<td>Nebraska: 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana: 64</td>
<td>Indiana: 61</td>
<td>Michigan State: 76</td>
<td>Wisconsin: 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State: 64</td>
<td>Rutgers: 60</td>
<td>Maryland: 72</td>
<td>Indiana: 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland: 45</td>
<td>Maryland: 59</td>
<td>Wisconsin: 65</td>
<td>Maryland: 74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Division I: 61%**

**Overall Division I: 60%**

**Overall Division I: 75%**

**Overall Division I: 74%**
### NCAA GRADUATION RATE RANKINGS, BIG TEN CONFERENCE
**CLASS OF 2010-2011, FEDERAL GRADUATION RATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (2010-2011)</th>
<th>ALL AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (4-Year Average)</th>
<th>ALL AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENT ATHLETES (2010-2011)</th>
<th>ALL AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENT ATHLETES (4-Year Average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois: 80</td>
<td>Michigan: 78</td>
<td>Purdue: 65</td>
<td>Maryland: 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan: 80</td>
<td>Illinois: 74</td>
<td>Penn State: 56</td>
<td>Wisconsin: 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin: 75</td>
<td>Ohio State: 73</td>
<td>Rutgers: 54</td>
<td>Penn State: 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State: 74</td>
<td>Rutgers: 73</td>
<td>Minnesota: 53</td>
<td>Purdue: 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers: 74</td>
<td>Wisconsin: 72</td>
<td>Illinois: 50</td>
<td>Indiana: 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State: 70</td>
<td>Penn State: 70</td>
<td>Maryland: 48</td>
<td>Minnesota: 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue: 67</td>
<td>Indiana: 61</td>
<td>Ohio State: 43</td>
<td>Nebraska: 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota: 63</td>
<td>Purdue: 61</td>
<td>Indiana: -</td>
<td>Rutgers: 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana: 60</td>
<td>Minnesota: 59</td>
<td>Iowa: -</td>
<td>Ohio State: 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa: 53</td>
<td>Iowa: 56</td>
<td>Nebraska: -</td>
<td>Michigan State: 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska: 50</td>
<td>Nebraska: 49</td>
<td>Northwestern: -</td>
<td>Iowa: 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL DIVISION I: 46%**  **OVERALL DIVISION I: 46%**  **OVERALL DIVISION I: 59%**  **OVERALL DIVISION I: 57%**
### 2017 FEDERAL GRADUATION RATE/NCAA GRADUATION SUCCESS RATE (GSR) NATIONAL COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>86 (13th)</td>
<td>86 (13th)</td>
<td>76 (8th)</td>
<td>78 (Tied 7th)</td>
<td>90 (Tied 8th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIVISION I AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rankings indicated on this chart are based on the (23) institutions listed.*
SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

- Sandy Barbour
- Terry Blakney, Vice Chair
- Robert Boland
- Alexis Burke
- Wendy Coduti
- Dwight Davis
- Frank Guadagnino
- Charmelle Green
- Galen Grimes
- Meredith Handley
- Lynn Holleran
- Todd LaJeunesse
- Andrew Miles
- Russell Mushinsky
- Robert Pangborn
- Daniel Perkins
- Dennis Scanlon
- Mark Stephens, Chair
- Cynthia Stifter
- Matthew Stolberg
- James Strauss
- Michael Tyworth
SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Discussion and Q&A with Athletic Director Sandy Barbour

(Informational)

Director of Intercollegiate Athletics, Sandy Barbour, will make a presentation on the state of Intercollegiate Athletics and take questions.
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Penn State Athletics
Strategic Plan
2017-2021

Proud Past | Bright Future

Vision: Preparing Students for a Lifetime of IMPACT

Mission: Driven by a commitment to comprehensive excellence, Penn State Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) will serve our student-athletes by creating conditions for success so that they can maximize their full potential. ICA will engage with our collective Penn State communities to serve as a valuable campus asset in the interest of advancing the broader University mission.

Values: We will deliver this mission by living the University’s values of Integrity, Respect, Responsibility, Discovery, Excellence and Community, along with ICA’s complimentary core values –

• Tradition – build on a legacy of Success with Honor
• Teamwork – We’re better together
• Diversity – Multiple talents, ONE TEAM
• Transparency – Clarity, communication, accountability
• Innovation – Creatively and effectively identify solution for a bright future
Penn State Athletics
Strategic Plan
2017-2021

Leadership Directives:
1. Set the standard for Comprehensive Excellence
2. Be a national leader in the landscape of intercollegiate athletics – financially, socially and educationally
3. Be a strategic partner in delivering the higher education mission at Penn State
4. Engage our community in meaningful ways by extending the University and ICA brand
5. Fully capture the family and “One Team” culture in Penn State Intercollegiate Athletics

Strategic Goals:
1. Comprehensive Excellence
2. We Are – Promote our story
3. Key Partnerships and Relationships
4. Culture
5. Financial Model

Academic Highlights
2017-18

• 90 percent NCAA GSR (2017 matches all time historic high)
• 8 programs earned 100% GSR in 2018
  • Field Hockey and Women’s Tennis 14th consecutive 100% GSR
• 145 graduates (2017-18); Record 42 in Fall 2017
• Record Semester 3.15 GPA for Spring 2018
• Record 26 teams with > 3.0 GPA Fall 2017 and Spring 2018
• Record 360 Academic All Big Ten honorees 2017-18
• Record-tying 66% of student-athlete body earned > 3.0 Spring 2018
• 12 Programs with perfect APR scores of 1,000
• 5 NCAA “Programs of Distinction”: W. Fencing, M. Golf, W. Tennis, W. Volleyball, Wrestling
• 3 CoSIDA Academic All Americans
  • 204 Academic All Americans all-time (4th in Division I historically)
Academic Highlights
Fall 2018

- 90 percent NCAA GSR (2018, back to back years match all time historic high)
- 34 graduates for the Fall 2018
- Tie record Semester 3.15 GPA for Fall 2018
- Tie record 26 teams with > 3.0 GPA Fall 2018
- 94 Academic All Big Ten honorees Fall 2018
- 64% of student-athlete body earned > 3.0 Fall 2018

Athletic Highlights
2017-18

- 3 Big Ten Conference Championships
  - 108 Big Ten Titles all-time
- 1 NCAA Team Championship (Wrestling)
  - 78 All Time
  - 9 in the last 5 years
- 7 NCAA Individual Championships (1 M. Gymnastics, 2 M. Track & Field, 4 Wrestling)
- Men’s Basketball NIT Championship
- 10 programs finished in their respective top 10 final national ranking
- 12th place finish in the Learfield/NACDA Director’s Cup
  - Among 9 programs to finish in top 25 in all 25 final Director’s Cup rankings
Athletic Highlights
Fall 2018

- 1 Big Ten Conference Championship (Women’s Soccer)
  - 109 Big Ten Titles all-time
- Women’s Soccer and Volleyball finish 5th Nationally
- Field Hockey finishes 9th Nationally
- Men’s and Women’s Cross Country finish in the top 35
- Football top 12 in the CFP and 17th in the AP rankings
- Currently 3rd in the Learfield/NACDA Director’s Cup

Community Engagement
2017-18

- Penn State student athletes in all 31 programs performed approximately 6,000 hours of community service
- Remain intimately involved in primary causes, as well as hundreds of local programs
  - Coaches vs. Cancer
  - PA Pink Zone
  - THON
  - Uplifting Athletes
  - Centre Safe
  - Special Olympics
  - Youth Services Bureau
  - School Reading Programs
  - Giving Tuesday
  - United Way Day of Caring
  - Hershey Children’s Hospital
  - LifeLink
Community Engagement
Fall 2018

- Over 800 Penn State student athletes were engaged in over 20 Fall community service events
- Remain intimately involved in primary causes, as well as hundreds of local programs
  - Be the Match—Bone Marrow Drive
  - Centre Country Women’s Resource Center
  - Fit for Fitz
  - THON 5K
  - Be the Match—Bone Marrow Drive
  - Centre Country Women’s Resource Center
  - Fit for Fitz
  - THON 5K
  - Mack Brady Memorial Youth Soccer
  - Centre Safe
  - Special Olympics
  - Youth Services Bureau
  - School Reading Programs
  - Giving Tuesday
  - United Way Day of Caring
  - Hershey Children’s Hospital
  - LifeLink

Morgan Academic Center & Student Development

- Morgan Academic Center Facility (Centralized Location)
- Additional Staffing (Tutor Coordinator)
- Expanded Student Welfare & Development
  - Life Skills
  - Harm Prevention
  - Financial Literacy
  - ADLI (Leadership Institute)
  - Career Counseling/Networking
Facility Enhancements & Master Plan

• Completed (Last 4 years)
  • Morgan Academic Center (Greenberg consolidation)
  • Multiple phases of Lasch renovation project
  • Panzer Lacrosse Stadium
  • Holuba Hall refurbishment
  • New Turf football, field hockey, rugby
  • Rec Hall sound system, lighting, aqua therapy, Volleyball Locker Room, Soccer office area
  • Fueling Stations

• Future Priorities
  • Master Plan Priorities: Aquatics, Soccer, Tennis, Center of Excellence, Indoor Field
  • Lasch/Holuba/Practice Fields completion of FB Master Plan
  • Basketball Locker Room, Sports Med, Strength & Conditioning
  • Field Hockey Stadium Phase II
With the hiring of its first Chief Sustainability Officer, Dr. Paul Shrivastava, Penn State has elevated sustainability to strategic importance within the institution. The Sustainability Institute’s (SI) 2018-2021 Work Plan (http://sustainability.psu.edu/sites/default/files/documents/SI%20Work%20Plan%207-27-2018.pdf) aligns the University Strategic Plan themes with the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals, and proposes programs to incorporate those confluences into curriculum, research, student life, and community engagement. In that context, Dr. Shrivastava will discuss a proposed approach to climate action that depends on partnership with, and engagement of, students, faculty, staff, administration, and communities.
Challenges of the Anthropocene: A Sustainable Penn State

Dr. Paul Shrivastava
Chief Sustainability Officer
Director, Sustainability Institute & Professor of Management
The Pennsylvania State University
paul@psu.edu

Outline

• Challenge – Building PSU for the Anthropocene
• Solution = Sustainability across PSU and Pennsylvania
• Sustainable Penn State - Implementing SDGs + Climate Action
... the continued functioning of the Earth system as it has supported human civilizations in recent centuries is at risk.

--State of the Planet Declaration (2012)

We’re Breaching Planetary Boundaries

- Biosphere Integrity (Genetic Diversity)
- Biogeochemical Flows (Phos, Nitrogen)

- Climate Change
- Land-system change

- Freshwater Use
- Novel Entities (NGQ?)
- Stratospheric Ozone depletion
- Atmospheric Aerosol loading (NGQ?)
- Ocean Acidification
The Anthropocene

2050 POPULATION 7B -> 10B

DOUBLING Global Economy accelerating earth system impacts

INDEBTING Future Generations
Global Debt 233 Tril, GDP 80 Tril

INEQUALITY - 0.7% owns 46% wealth
Richest 8 people = poor 50%
1.6 Bil in Multidimensional poverty

ASPIRATIONS – Safe & Just Space

ANTHROPOCENE – Humans Driving Nature

2015-16 Watershed Global Consensus

Sustainable Development Goals
Climate Treaty COP21
Solution = Sustainable Development Goals or Global Goals

GOAL 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere
GOAL 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture
GOAL 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
GOAL 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all
GOAL 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
GOAL 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all
GOAL 7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all
GOAL 8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all
GOAL 9: Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation

Not Environment alone - Interdependent, Tradeoffs Synergies
How is Pennsylvania doing on SDGs

FIGURE 2: US State SDG Index and Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranked 30 of 50
How is PSU Doing on Sustainability – Strategic + STARS

PSU Strategic Themes

• Stewarding Our Planet’s Resources
• Enhancing Health/Well-being
• Driving Digital Innovation
• Transforming Education
• Advancing Arts & Humanities

Energy University
Land Grant Mission

STARS Assessment Report

• AASHE 360° Assessment 69 topics
• Penn State ranks 4th among the Big Ten
• Doing OK, can do MUCH MORE

Visioning Sustainability @ PSU - as a Function Across Levels

Sustainability Across All Levels

1. Faculty, Employees, Students, Community
2. 13 Colleges, 24 CWCs, + Admin Units
3. BOT and Stakeholders, Media
4. Local, State, Regional, National, Global

Work Areas

Work Area 1. Curriculum and Teaching
Work Area 2. Student Life & Co-Curricular
Work Area 3. Solutions Research
Work Area 4: Finance and Business – Admin
Work Area 5: Community Outreach

STARS Scores, by Major Category

Points

Academics Engagement Operations Planning & Administration
Sustainability @ PSU – It’s Happening, MORE IS NEEDED

- Lots happening, Much more needed (roughly 600 Faculty involved)
- How – Each Unit needs to own and organically develop, SI facilitator
  - Many Colleges are leading (Smeal, CoEng, CoAA, CoHHD, CoNursing, CoMed)
  - Campuses with S Councils/Coordinators (Altoona, Behrend, Brandywine, Mont Alto, New Kensington)
- Living Labs – Living Filter, 2.5MW Solar, Reinvention Fund 33 projects
  - Student Farm and the Sustainable Food Systems Program
  - PSIEE + CoE 2019 Drawdown Conference & Env Monitoring Mesonet

Summary Foci for Sustainability @ PSU in 2018-2020

- Sustainable Solutions Development for SDGs
- In that Context focus on Goal13 – Climate Action
- Encourage Transdisciplinary Solutions work
- Sustainable Solutions Development Network - USA
- Initiating Climate Action Conversations
- Transdisciplinarity Capacity
Sustainable Solutions Development Network - USA

- SDSN Global Network – 17 Countries + 11 Regions
- SDSN -USA launched Dec 4 Columbia Earth Institute, with Universities, Major Cities, NGOs & PSU Founding Member
- Premise- Federal leadership vacuum, oppy for Cities and States
- PSU brings unique Value – 23 Campuses + 25 PERC Schools
- Coming Year Focus - Mobilize support for the SDGs; Promote practical solutions, high-quality education and research, support local governments

Climate Action – SDG # 13

- URGENCY – IPCC 1.5C, USGCRP Report, SOCCR2, Club of Rome CEP
- PSU
  - Leading in climate research, Pledged to “We are Still In”
  - Included climate action in Operations – GHG Tier 1 KPI
  - Has Opportunity to be a National LEADER
Faculty Senate Support

- Include a sustainability course as a Gen Ed requirement
- Incentivize new sustainability and climate action courses
- Include SDGs + Climate Action into Faculty work agenda and Unit Strategic Plans
- Help convene SDG/Climate Conferences
  - 2014 Race to Zero + 2019 Carbon Drawdown Conf

We Are
(Sustainability)
MINUTES OF SENATE COUNCIL
Tuesday, January 15, 2019 – 1:30 p.m.
102 Kern Graduate Building


Members absent:  M. Ansari, N. Jones


Others absent:  R. Jolly, R. Pangborn

Chair-Elect Rowland called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 15, 2019, in 102 Kern Graduate Building.

The minutes of the November 13, 2018, meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

Chair-Elect Rowland reported that the Faculty Advisory Committee meeting was rescheduled for December 3 and had a second meeting the morning of council. Topics included:

• Discussion of the large increase in employee out of pocket healthcare expenses for 2018.
• Discussion of the procedures for senior administrative searches, such as for Deans. What are the procedures for campus visits and how can we provide greater opportunity for faculty feedback?
• How are plans for honoring former coaches or other employees vetted within the university?
• Now that we have had two Board of Trustees meetings under the new system for BoT committee meetings, what is your sense of how well this arrangement is fostering shared governance?
• Is there a plan for centralizing cost coverage of technology such as Box, Kaltura, online proctoring, etc. so we can encourage faculty and staff to use these tools without adding new expenses to department?
• We should revisit Penn State's late fees policy, which penalizes our most economically precarious students and runs athwart our access and affordability initiatives.
• We need to address Aetna's abysmal reimbursement rates and how they are affecting access to medical services, especially mental health services in Centre County.
• Discuss procedures for addressing faculty misconduct that falls short of revocation of tenure
• Updates on Admissions, Searches, Simba, Strategic Plan, and Work Lion (Jones)
Dr. Bieschke reported for Provost Jones who was not able to attend the meeting.

Given the current federal government shutdown, several steps have been taken. Faculty are encouraged to refer students facing difficulties because of the shutdown to the appropriate person in their academic unit (i.e., Deans/Chancellors/Associate Dean etc…). We will strive to support these individuals similar to how we’ve responded to other crises (e.g., hurricanes and other natural disasters). Every attempt will be made to provide funds to support grant-funded researchers whose funds have been halted; we ask that such faculty work carefully with personnel in the grants office in their unit and to make judicious decisions about how to best spend the funding they have received from granting agencies.

Vice Presidents’ and Vice Provosts’ Comments

Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs gave an update on searches. The searches for the deans of Dickinson Law and the College of the Liberal Arts are coming to a close. Three searches are currently underway including searches for deans for the colleges of Arts & Architecture and Education, and the Vice Provost for Global Programs. The plan is to complete all three searches by the end of the spring semester.

Bieschke also reported that she presented information about College and Campus Ombudspersons to the Academic Leadership Council, urging them to connect with their ombuds and ensure that an alternate has been identified. She also directed them to the Senate Ombuds webpage.

Rob Pangborn, Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education was not able to attend. Dr. Bieschke presented his update on admissions.

As of 1/13/19: First-year baccalaureate applications are at 85,288; up by 26,945 (+46%) compared to this date last year, however the yield is unknown.

- Direct applications to CCs are 18,239 (+67%)
- Applications to UP are 66,155 (+41%)
- World Campus applications are 894 (double last year’s count at this time)
- PA-resident applications are up 16%
- Non-PA domestic apps are up 74%
- International apps are up 36%
- African American apps are up 95% and Hispanic/Latino apps are up 90%

Offers of admission are 33,379 (+76%)

- UP offers are up 85% (Note: some of this increase is due to the new “early action. Decisions for early applicants made before the holidays)
- CC offers are up 65%

Paid Accepts are at 2,775 (+57%)

- UP accepts are 1,325, CC accepts are 1,390
- Accepts for African American, Hispanic/Latino and International are all up (85%, 66%, and 22%, respectively)
- PA-resident and non-PA domestic accepts are both up 58%

Applicants using the Common App. continue to comprise 70% of all undergraduate applicants.
Madlyn Hanes, Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses and Executive Chancellor, also discussed ongoing searches. The searches for Chancellor of Brandywine is ongoing. The search for the Chancellor at Schuylkill was successful with the appointment of Patrick Jones, who came from Drexel University. The search for an Associate Vice President and Senior Associate Dean for Academic Programs is ongoing. President Barron’s presentation to the Board of Trustees that celebrated the importance and accomplishments of the Commonwealth Campuses was well received.

Marcus Whitehurst, Vice Provost Educational Equity described the many events for the Martin Luther King Jr. Day of Service on January 21st. For example, World in Conversation is doing discussions with faculty and staff as well as students throughout the day.

Renata Engel, Vice Provost for Online Education, discussed how the US News and World Report rated Penn State World Campus in the top ten for all categories. There was a brief discussion of transfer credits.

ACTION ITEMS

The Unit Constitution Subcommittee reviewed a constitution revision from Penn State Law and recommended its ratification. Senate Council’s vote to approve was unanimous.

The next action item was to vote on editorial changes of a nonsubstantive nature. In recent legislation, the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education was changed to the Senate Committee on Education. The changes that were submitted changed the name of the Senate Committee for Undergraduate Education to the Senate Committee on Education in the Senate governing documents. Senate Council voted unanimously to approve the changes. The changes will now be published in a Communication to the Senate in the next Senate agenda. For five days following the Senate meeting, any faculty senator who feels that the changes require a more careful review, may place their objections in writing to the Senate Chair to be returned to the Committee on Committees and Rules who will submitted them via the regular legislative process. If there are no objections after five days, the changes will automatically go into effect.

REPORT OF GRADUATE COUNCIL for December 12, 2018. John Nousek reported that their were two issues of general importance. A provision to require a dissertation committee to meet with every doctoral student at least once a year, has not been favored by some professional programs that have more students. The second issue revolves around some areas that have added additional coursework to students that they saw as having a deficiency in qualifying exams.

SENATE AGENDA ITEMS FOR JANUARY 29, 2019

FORENSIC SESSION
Senate Committee on Committees and Rules. Discussion of a Proposal to Reorganize Senate Leadership. The report was placed on the agenda by a Nousek/Wenner motion. Twenty minutes were allotted.
LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Committee on Committees and Rules. Revisions to Standing Rules; Article II - Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (1). The report was placed on the agenda by a Nousek/Wenner motion. Twenty minutes were allotted.

Senate Committees on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid and Undergraduate Education. Changes to Senate Policy 42-98: Educational Experiences in the Armed Services. The report was placed on the agenda by an Eckhardt/Szczygiel motion. Council suggested that the footnotes be included in the text for clarity.

Senate committee on Education. Revision to Policies on Academic Advising: Changes to Policies 32-00 Advising Policy; 32-10 The University’s Advising Program; 32-20 The Nature of the University Advising Program; 32-30 Responsibilities of Advisers and Advisees; 32-40 Assignment of Adviser; and 32-50 Audit of Unfulfilled Requirements. The report was placed on the agenda by a Nousek/Ozment motion. Council requested a clarification of terms and a link to advising standards.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Senate Council, “Report on 2018 Commonwealth Campus Visits.” This report was placed on the agenda by a Nousek/Ozment motion. Five minutes were allocated for presentation and discussion.

Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits, “2018 Report on Childcare at Penn State University.” The report was placed on the agenda by an Eckhardt/Petrilla motion. Five minutes were allocated for presentation and discussion.

Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, “Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, Academic Year, 2017-2018, (Division 1 Athletics at University Park). The report was placed on the agenda by a Posey/Ozment motion. Ten minutes were allocated for presentation and discussion.

Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, “Discussion and Q&A with Athletic Director Sandy Barbour.” The report was placed on the agenda by an Eckhardt/Nousek motion. Fifteen minutes were allotted for this report.

Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, “Sustainability at PSU” The report was placed on the agenda by a Plummer/King motion. Fifteen minutes were allotted for this report.

Senate Committee on University Planning, “Temporary Budget Overview.” This report was placed on the agenda by an Ozment/Eckhardt motion and will be presented by Provost Jones. Council reordered the agenda to move it to the top of the agenda during the Provost’s remarks.

The Agenda for the January 29, 2019 Senate meeting was approved unanimously.
Chair-Elect Rowland thanked Council members for their attendance and participation. The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 pm.

*Dawn G. Blasko, Executive Director*
Date: January 21, 2019
To: All Senators and Committee Members
From: Dawn Blasko, Executive Director

Following is the time and location of all Senate meetings January 28 and 29, 2019. Please notify the University Faculty Senate Office and committee chair if you are unable to attend.

MONDAY, JANUARY 28, 2019

6:30 p.m. Officers and Chairs Meeting – 102 Kern Graduate Building
8:15 p.m. Commonwealth Caucus Meeting – 102 Kern Graduate Building

TUESDAY, JANUARY 29, 2019

8:00 a.m.

Intercollegiate Athletics – 102 Burrowes Building

8:30 a.m.

Committees and Rules – 201 Kern Graduate Building
Curricular Affairs – 102 Kern Graduate Building
Educational Equity and Campus Environment – 315 Grange Building
Faculty Affairs – 202 Hammond Building
Faculty Benefits – 214 Business Building
Intra-University Relations – 504 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building
Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology – 510A Paterno
Outreach – 114 Kern Building
Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity – 502 Keller Building
University Planning – 424 Ag Admin Building
9:00 a.m.
   Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid – 203 Shields Building
   Education – 110C Chandlee Lab
   Global Programs – 412 Boucke Building
   Student Life – 409H Keller Building

11:00 a.m.
   Student Senator Caucus – 114 Kern Building

11:15 a.m.
   Commonwealth Caucus Meeting - Nittany Lion Inn- Assembly Room

1:30 p.m.
   University Faculty Senate – 112 Kern Graduate Building
Date: January 21, 2019  
To: Commonwealth Caucus Senators (includes all elected campus senators)  
From: Rosemarie Petrilla and Elizabeth Seymour, Caucus Co-chairs

MONDAY, JANUARY 28, 2019 – 8:15 PM  
102 KERN BUILDING

Guest Speaker and Agenda:  
Richard Brazier, Senior Associate Dean for Faculty and Research  
Office of Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses

Topic: "An Open Discussion on Promotion to Professor in the Commonwealth College"

Zoom Connectivity Information:  
Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: https://psu.zoom.us/j/384648300  
Or iPhone one-tap (US Toll): +16468769923,384648300# or +16699006833,384648300#  
Or Telephone:  
Dial: +1 646 876 9923 (US Toll), +1 669 900 6833 (US Toll)  
Meeting ID: 384 648 300  
International numbers available: https://zoom.us/u/bWAGfK2hj  
Or an H.323/SIP room system: H.323:  
162.255.36.11 (US East)  
Meeting ID: 384 648 300  
SIP: 384648300@zoomcrc.com

***********************************

TUESDAY, JANUARY 29, 2019 – 11:15 AM  
ASSEMBLY ROOM, NITTANY LION INN  
A buffet luncheon will be provided at 12:15 p.m.

Agenda

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