THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

The University Faculty Senate

AGENDA

Tuesday, April 23, 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 March 12, 2019 Meeting in The Senate Record 52:5

B. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report of April 9, 2019 Appendix A

C. REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL - Meeting of April 9, 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

G. FORENSIC BUSINESS

None

H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Committees and Rules

Revisions to Bylaws; Article I – Officers, Section 2 & 6 Appendix B
(Introduced at March 12, 2019 meeting)
I. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Committees and Rules

Revisions to Senate Bylaws; Article III – Election to Senate, Section 8  Appendix C

Revisions to Standing Rules; Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (b and c)  Appendix D

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

Admissions, Records, Scheduling And Student Aid and Education


Intercollegiate Athletics

Revisions to Senate Policies 67-10 Division I – Athletic Competition (University Park) and 67-30 Division III and PSUAC – Athletic Competition (non-University Park)  Appendix G

J. ADVISOR/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Educational Equity and Campus Environment

Report on Results Will Vary* and Campus Climate Issues  Appendix H

Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations

Revision to AC-14 “Academic Administrative Evaluation”  Appendix I

Revision to AC-21 “Definition of Academic Ranks”  Appendix J

Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology

Open Access Policy Recommendations  Appendix K
Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity and Graduate Council Committee on Graduate Research

Barriers to Sustainability and Growth of Intercollege Graduate Degree Programs Appendix L

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Proposed Revisions to Penn State Policy HR68, Postdoctoral Appointments Appendix M

Special Committee on Tenure and Equity

Report from Senate Committee on Tenure and Equity Appendix N

K. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid

Annual Report on the High School Students Enrolled Nondegree in Credit Courses* Appendix O

Curricular Affairs

One-Semester Experimental Course Offering Procedures* Appendix P

Elections Commission

Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2019-2020* Appendix Q

Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology

IT Fee Usage* Appendix R

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Graduate School Exit Survey Report* Appendix S

Senate Council

2017-2018 University Faculty Ombudsperson Report Appendix T
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Student Life
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, September 17, 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: April 10, 2019

TO: Michael Bérubé, Chair, University Faculty Senate

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

The Senate Curriculum Report dated April 9, 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 May 9, 2019.

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

Revisions to Bylaws; Article I – Officers, Sections 2 & 6

(Legislative)

Implementation: UPON APPROVAL BY THE SENATE

Rationale:
The University Faculty Senate is among the most complex faculty organizations in the United States, representing approximately 6,500 faculty members across the commonwealth. Despite enrollments doubling, the expansion of administration, significant change to the composition of the University’s faculty, and advances in information technology, there have been few changes to the structure of the Senate executive since the introduction of the office of Immediate Past Chair in 1974.

The Committee on Committees and Rules concluded that the office of the Chair could better perform its responsibilities if given the option of naming a data advisor to oversee special projects wherein data plays a significant role. For example, such an advisor could be assigned to a standing committee, special committee, or task force, and attend as a non-voting member. While the role of the advisor would remain flexible in order to avoid overprescribing duties to the role, such an advisor would help coordinate the initial formulation of research questions, the acquisition of data, analysis, and the presentation of data that standing committees request from the Office of Planning and Assessment in consultation with the Senate Office, thus facilitating the Senate’s capacity to produce evidence-based policy and decisions.

Recommendation:
That Article I, Section 1 of the Bylaws be and is hereby amended as follows:

Please note that the following contains bold text for additions and strikeouts indicating deleted text.

_________

Article I – Officers

Section 2

(a) The Chair shall be the presiding officer of the Senate and shall, subject to approval by the Committee on Committees and Rules, appoint a faculty member of the Senate as Parliamentarian and may, subject to approval by the Committee on Committees and Rules, appoint a member of the Senate as Data Advisor who shall not vote unless otherwise entitled.

…
Section 6

The Data Advisor to the Chair shall coordinate the acquisition, analysis, and presentation of data that standing or special committees request from the Office of Planning and Assessment, in consultation with the Senate Office, and thereby serve as a liaison between the Chair, the Senate Office, and the Office of Planning and Assessment.

Section 7

Any officer of the Senate may be removed for neglect of duty or for misconduct in office in accordance with procedures for removal in the Standing Rules, Article I, Section 11 (b).

Clean copy

Article I – Officers

Section 2

(a) The Chair shall be the presiding officer of the Senate and shall, subject to approval by the Committee on Committees and Rules, appoint a member of the Senate as Parliamentarian and may, subject to approval by the Committee on Committees and Rules, appoint a member of the Senate as Data Advisor who shall not vote unless otherwise entitled.

…

Section 6

The Data Advisor to the Chair shall coordinate the acquisition, analysis, and presentation of data that standing or special committees request from the Office of Planning and Assessment, in consultation with the Senate Office, and thereby serve as a liaison between the Chair, the Senate Office, and the Office of Planning and Assessment.

Section 7

Any officer of the Senate may be removed for neglect of duty or for misconduct in office in accordance with procedures for removal in the Standing Rules, Article I, Section 11 (b).
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Senate Bylaws; Article III – Election to Senate, Section 8

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

Introduction and Rationale

The University Faculty Senate Bylaws stipulate that the duties of Senators are to attend the Senate plenary meetings and to attend assigned standing committee meetings. It is important for senators to attend both meetings to safeguard adequate representation for their campus or college and to facilitate the responsibilities of the standing committees. We have previously provided for the removal of senators who miss three plenary meetings in two consecutive years, however we made no provisions to address absences from the standing committees.

Persistent committee meeting absences place a greater load on regularly attending committee members, chairs, and co-chairs who must all contribute significantly more to complete the required work of the committees. Some committees are now struggling to complete their priorities. Therefore, CC&R proposes that the Senate implement stricter attendance rates to ensure it accomplishes its required work in a manner that is fair to all senators. The purpose of this legislation is to expand the absence rules to include standing committees to ensure adequate attendance for both required meetings.

During 2016-17, 29 of the 212 elected senators (14% of the elected senators) were absent from three or more Senate plenary meetings. This group averaged a plenary attendance rate of 31%. In 90% of the cases these senators missed their standing committee meetings as well.

During the same period, 51 senators (24% of the elected senators) were absent from three or more standing committee meetings. On average, this group had an attendance rate of 27%.

During 2017-18, the absence numbers increased significantly and 42 of the 209 elected senators (20% of the elected senators) were absent from three or more plenary meetings. On average, this group had an attendance rate of attendance rate of 37%.

During the same period, 55 senators (26% of the elected senators) were absent from three or more standing committee meetings. On average, this group had an attendance rate of 33%.

We have a persistent problem of nearly 25% of senators routinely being absent from half or more of the standing committee meetings during a year, however under our current
rules, only 15 senators will qualify for removal and replacement. To encourage greater participation in the standing committee meetings, the Committee on Committees and Rules recommends amending the Senate attendance rules so that routine absences from both plenary meetings and standing committee meetings should serve as grounds for removal.

CC&R recommends requiring a two-thirds attendance rate for elected senators for both the plenary meetings and the standing committee meetings. This legislation continues to allow for excused absences due to sabbatical, medical, or other official leaves of absence, or absence related to professional responsibilities. However, CC&R also recognizes that special unavoidable circumstances might arise on short notice, which may prevent senators from attending plenary or standing committee meetings. To accommodate that, this plan is flexible enough to permit senators, if necessary, to miss two of the six meeting days a year (both plenary and committee). This change will have a relatively small impact on Senators who regularly attend the Senate meetings since the average yearly absences for the larger group of regular attendees is fewer than two for either the plenary or committee meetings.

Recommendation:

That Article III, Section 8 of the Senate Bylaws be and is hereby amended as follows:

Please note that the following contains strikethroughs for deletions and bold text for additions. Please note that the following contains bold text for additions and strikeouts indicating deleted text. Deleted text is notated with [Delete] [End Delete]. Added text is notated with [Add] [End Add].

Section 8
Duties of Senators:

a) Attend the Senate plenary meetings. [Delete] If a senator is absent from three or more plenary meetings in each of two consecutive years, the senator may resign if he or she wishes, otherwise the Senate will remove the senator and require the unit to replace that senator with an alternative representative. This provision does not pertain to sabbatical, medical, or other official leaves of absence, or otherwise absence related to professional responsibilities. [End Delete]
b) Attend the assigned standing committee meetings.
c) Communicate with their unit faculty governance organization pertaining to the activities of the Senate.
d) [Add] Elected faculty senators are required to maintain a two-thirds attendance rate for both the plenary meetings and the assigned standing committee meetings. Should a senator drop below this level in either meeting category in each of two consecutive years, the senator may resign if he or she wishes, otherwise the Senate will remove the senator and require the unit to replace that senator with an alternative elected representative. This provision does not pertain to sabbatical, medical, or other official leaves of absence, or absence related to professional responsibilities. [End Add]
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

- Jonathan Abel
- Michael Bérubé
- Renee Borromeo
- Victor Brunsden, Vice-Chair
- Ann Clements
- Dennis Jett
- Beth King
- Binh Le
- Richard Robinett
- Nicholas Rowland
- Keith Shapiro, Chair
- Ann Taylor
- Rodney Troester
- Matthew Woessner
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

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

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate

Introduction and Rationale

Acting on a recommendation from the chair of the Student Caucus, the Committee on Committees and Rules recommends to the Senate a redistribution of undergraduate student senators serving as members of two standing committees. In the redistribution one of the two undergraduate student senators now serving on the Senate Committee for Curricular Affairs (SCCA) will move to the Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling (ARSSA), and Student Aid, thus increasing their student senator membership to two.

CC&R has consulted with both SCCA and ARSSA who all agree that due to the nature of the work in SCCA students are unable to contribute substantially to curricular reviews. Therefore, one attending student senator will be sufficient for consultation when necessary.

Additionally, ARSSA has jurisdiction over many issues, which align with UPUA and they frequently collaborate on policy revisions. Therefore, a second undergraduate student member would provide opportunities for increased consultation, which CC&R has accepted will be of greater benefit to the Senate, ARSSA, and the student body.

Since these committee membership changes are concurrent, this one legislative report revises the student undergraduate membership of both ARSSA and SCCA, which consequently will require only a single vote.

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

Please note that the following contains bold text for additions and strikeouts indicating deleted text. Deleted text is notated with [Delete] [End Delete]. Added text is notated with [Add] [End Add].
Article II

(b) Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid

1. Membership:

(i) At least ten elected faculty senators

(ii) [Delete] One [End Delete] [Add] Two [End Add] undergraduate student [Delete] senator [End Delete] [Add] senators [End Add]

(iii) Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education and Executive Director for Undergraduate Admissions*

(iv) The University Registrar*

(v) Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education and Executive Director for Student Aid*

2. Selection: By the Committee on Committees and Rules

3. Duties: The Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid shall initiate legislation relating to academic admissions and readmission standards for the Senate Policies and Procedures for Undergraduate Students. It shall make recommendations on policies concerning the effect that Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid procedures have on the attainment of the University’s overall educational objectives. It shall be the University Faculty Senate advisory body to the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education, and it shall maintain liaison with other University officials in these areas. It shall be concerned with policies involving student awards, scholarships, and student aid. It shall have the authority to act on individual problems of reinstatement and certification of credit referred to it by the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education.

4. Standing Subcommittee on Articulation

The ARSSA Articulation Review Subcommittee membership shall include two faculty from ARSSA, including the Vice Chair of ARSSA, who serves as chair, in addition to four other representatives: one from the Undergraduate Admissions Office, one from the Office of Student Aid, one from the Office of the University Registrar, and one from the Office of Global Programs. The University Faculty Senate Office (Senate Office) shall facilitate composition by requesting those offices to identify representatives.

The subcommittee shall review articulation agreements to ensure they adhere to the current University policies.
5. Mandated reports:

a. Reserved Spaces Report
b. Faculty Senate Scholarship Report
c. High School Students Enrolled in Nondegree Credits
d. Articulation Agreement Report based on five-year review

The Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid shall have the authority to approve its mandated Informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

*nonvoting unless Article IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws applies

Article II
(c) Committee on Curricular Affairs
1. Membership:
   (i) At least 17 elected faculty senators including one faculty senator from each college at University Park and one faculty senator from each of Abington, Altoona, Berks, Erie, Harrisburg, and the University College.
   (ii) [Delete] Two [Add] One undergraduate student [Delete] senators [Add] senator
   (iii) A member of the Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education (selected by ACUE)*
   (iv) Dean of University Libraries and Scholarly Communications or representative*
   (v) Chair of the Graduate Council Committee on Programs and Courses*
2. Selection: Committee members shall be selected by the Committee on Committees and Rules. One Chair and two Vice Chairs shall be chosen from the elected faculty senate members.
3. Duties: The Committee on Curricular Affairs shall review, evaluate, and approve or reject all course and curriculum proposals including proposals to limit program enrollment submitted by the various departments, colleges, and other appropriate units of the University that have not received delegation or responsibility in this area from the Senate. With regard to program enrollment limitations, restrictions proposed for academic reasons are subject to approval or rejection while restrictions proposed for resource restraints are subject only to consultative review. The Committee shall study the existing courses and curricula of the University with reference to the needs of students and opportunities for service to the Commonwealth and make recommendations for changes where appropriate. It shall develop criteria for evaluating courses and curricula and recommend procedures for handling courses and curriculum proposals. It shall have oversight of the following subcommittees: Bachelors of Arts, Certificates, General Education, Integrative Studies, Retention and Transfer, United States and International Cultures, and Writing. It shall disperse vice chair duties such that one vice chair shall oversee General Education efforts including serving as subcommittee chair for General Education and Integrative Studies subcommittees, and one vice chair shall support all general business of the committee and shall oversee at least two remaining
subcommittees. It shall make recommendations to Senate Council on the establishment, reorganization, or discontinuation of organizational units pursuant to Council duties specified in Article II, Section 1 (d) of the Bylaws. It shall maintain such liaison with University administration and faculty as may be necessary for the implementation of these procedures.

4. Standing Subcommittees:
   (i) General Education Subcommittee
   It shall consist of nine members to monitor the General Education Program and make recommendations for assuring the delivery of effective general education as mandated in the General Education legislation. The subcommittee shall be led by the vice chair of SCCA; its membership shall be such that the subcommittee has at least one member with expertise in each of the General Education Categories (GWS, GQ, GA, GH, GN, GS and GHW). An effort should be made to include at least one member from a non-University Park location, but with disciplinary expertise remaining the primary consideration. When the subcommittee’s workload is especially intense, the chair of SCCA may appoint additional members, drawn from SCCA or other Senate committees. The Subcommittee shall review all General Education course proposals (except as provided in ii, iii, and iv below) and forward recommendations to the Committee. It shall also develop, revise, and edit official University publications that provide information about General Education. (See Appendix “H,” 1-23-90.)

   (ii) Integrative Studies Subcommittee
   It shall include at least three members of the General Education subcommittee and shall be led by the vice chair of SCCA; membership shall be such that the subcommittee has at least one member with expertise in each of the Breadth Across Knowledge Domains (GA, GH, GN, GS, GHW). An effort should be made to include at least one member from a non-University Park location, but with disciplinary expertise remaining the primary consideration. When the subcommittee’s workload is especially intense, the chair of SCCA may appoint additional members, drawn from SCCA or other Senate committees. The subcommittee shall be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Integrative Studies requirement in the undergraduate curriculum. It shall periodically review and revise, as necessary, guidelines for courses intended to fulfill this requirement. It shall also accept and review proposals for integrative coursework year-round and forward recommendations to the Committee. (See Appendix B, 4-28-15.)

   (iii) United States and International Cultures Subcommittee
   It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of ten members and shall be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the United States cultures and International Cultures requirement in the undergraduate curriculum. It shall periodically review and revise, as necessary, guidelines for courses intended to fulfill this requirement. It shall also review proposals for courses under this requirement and forward recommendations to the Committee. (See Appendix II, 12-4-90 and III, 4-27-04.)

   (iv) Writing Subcommittee
   It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of ten members and shall be responsible for overseeing and reviewing, as necessary, the implementation of Writing Across the Curriculum in the undergraduate curriculum. It shall periodically review and revise, as necessary, guidelines for writing-intensive courses. It shall also
review all writing-intensive course proposals and forward recommendations to the Committee. (See Appendix “E” 3-20-90.)

(v) Bachelor of Arts Requirements Subcommittee
It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of eleven members including a faculty member from each college that offers the BA degree (Abington, Altoona, Arts and Architecture, Berks, Communications, Earth and Mineral Sciences, Erie, Harrisburg, Liberal Arts, Science, and University College). It shall review BA course proposals and monitor and review all BA requirements and it shall consider recommendations for changes in these requirements. These recommendations shall be reported to the Committee and, if approved, shall be forwarded to the Senate for vote. (See Appendix II, 4-13-93 and E, 10-26-04.)

(vi) Retention and Transfer Subcommittee
It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of five members to review, make recommendations and monitor all holds on student admissions to programs and special or more restrictive academic requirements for entrance into a college, major or minor, and/or for retention in a program, consistent with general academic guidelines established by the Committee on Undergraduate Education. (See Appendix “E,” 10-26-93.)

(vii) Certificates Subcommittee
It shall be led by a person as appointed by the chair of SCCA and consist of at least five members to review and make recommendations about certificate programs. It shall periodically review and revise, as necessary, guidelines for undergraduate credit certificates. It shall also monitor recertification of certificates at the 5-year expiration and review extension requests. (See Appendix “E” 3-15-16)

5. Mandated reports: Senate Curriculum Report. The Committee on Curricular Affairs shall have the authority to approve its mandated Informational Reports for publication to the Senate Agenda. The committee shall continue to send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

*nonvoting unless Article IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws applies

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

- Jonathan Abel
- Michael Bérubé
- Renee Borromeo
- Victor Brunsden, Vice-Chair
- Ann Clements
- Dennis Jett
- Beth King
- Binh Le
- Richard Robinett
- Nicholas Rowland
- Keith Shapiro, Chair
- Ann Taylor
- Rodney Troester
- Matthew Woessner
Introduction and Rationale

The Committee on Committees and Rules concurs with the Committee on Outreach in recognizing the importance of outreach across the University. The Committee on Outreach approaches outreach in a manner consistent with current practices in education and community engagement. Their most recent efforts focus on online education and extension and this revision to the Standing Rules supports that focus.

CC&R agrees with Outreach that a change in its membership to add a representative from the Office of Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses will aid its efforts to carry out its duties to identify Penn State outreach activities, establish evaluation methods to ensure quality, and create recognition measures to reward outstanding performance.

This revision also adjusts the committee membership to reflect personnel title changes in the University administrative offices. The updated title of the former Director of Cooperative Extension is now Director of Penn State Extension. In addition, the position formerly known as the Vice President for Outreach and Vice Provost for Online Education, which one person previously occupied, is now split into two separate positions. Correspondingly, the Vice President for Outreach remains in committee membership. However, since the Vice Provost for Online Education is now a member of the Committee on Education and instead attends their meetings, we have removed that position from the membership of Outreach. Since the Committee on Outreach liaises with the Committee on Education as part of its duties, CC&R is satisfied this change will not adversely affect the committee’s work. The Committee on Outreach has consulted with the administrators whom these revisions most affect.

The Committee on Committees and Rules accepts that these membership revisions are necessary and will permit the Committee on Outreach to continue to perform its duties effectively.

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

Please note that the following contains bold text for additions and strikeouts indicating deleted text. Deleted text is notated with [Delete] [End Delete]. Added text is notated with [Add] [End Add].
Article II

(k) Committee on Outreach

1. Membership:

(i) At least nine elected faculty senators

(ii) One student senator

(iii) Vice President for Outreach [Add] or [his/her their] designee* [End Add] [Delete] and Vice Provost for Online Education*[End Delete]

(iv) Director of [Delete] Cooperative [End Delete] [Add] Penn State [End Add] Extension*

(v) A representative from the Office of the Vice President for the Commonwealth Campuses, designated with statewide responsibility for continuing education and outreach activities* [End Add]

2. Selection: By the Committee on Committees and Rules

3. Duties: The Committee on Outreach recommends policy and advises the University on outreach activities. Outreach is the exchange of information and the creation of meaningful collaborations between the University and its many external audiences. Responsibilities for the Outreach committee include: identifying University outreach activities, establishing evaluation methods to ensure quality, and creating recognition measures to reward outstanding performance. Its responsibilities focus on the University’s outreach and public scholarship mission as realized through community engagement, research, credit and noncredit instruction, service through continuing and online education, cooperative extension, public broadcasting, and other programs beyond the sphere of resident education. These outreach activities are located in Penn State Outreach and Online Education, Penn State Extension, and in Penn State colleges and the Commonwealth Campuses. The Committee on Outreach liaises with the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education, the bodies that are addressing engaged scholarship and other bodies as appropriate.

4. Mandated reports: none. The Committee on Outreach shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

*nonvoting unless Article IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws applies
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING AND STUDENT AID SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION


(Legislative)

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

Rationale

With the creation of the University Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) office in 2014, students, faculty, and staff have a resource to pursue opportunities for assessing and granting academic credit for prior learning. The most important single element of this process is the review of credit-bearing courses at other institutions that are transcribed as transfer credits at Penn State.

To support Senate Policy 42-80, the PLA office aids the faculty disciplinary review process that the Undergraduate Admissions Office (UAO) facilitates to add transfer course evaluations to LionPATH. While UAO previously assigned general credit to incoming transfer courses, since March 2016 over 250 faculty in 198 review committees have used the Course Substitution and Request System (CSRS) to add nearly 60K courses to the transfer database per the transfer course process outlined in AAPPM A-2. About 500 new course syllabi are being reviewed by faculty each week, and the discipline faculty have provided responses to over 90% of requested course reviews within a two-week period. Participating faculty were initially selected by their colleges and campuses, and new reviewers can be added at any time.

With the goal of collaboratively developing processes for administration of prior learning assessment, the PLA office, with input from the Committee on Prior Learning Assessment, has been working to examine, understand, and improve the prior learning assessment process. This includes proposing revisions to policies and procedures to ensure that students entering Penn State, regardless of college or campus, receive appropriate and consistent opportunities for the assessment of relevant prior learning that can be applied to meeting degree requirements.

Recommendation

We recommend that the methods for acquisition of credit apply consistent language where appropriate; address when and how credit may be earned; and also reflect Penn State criteria.

Please note that the following contains bold text for additions and strikeouts indicating deleted text.
Appendix F
4/23/19

Revised Policy

42-50 Credit by Examination (CRX)

In some circumstances credits may be earned through successful completion of comprehensive examinations made available by the Penn State academic units that offer particular courses. When such an examination serves as a substitute for completing all the usual requirements of a Penn State course, the credits received are described as “Credit by Examination” and are accepted as fulfilling degree requirements. A grade of “C” or higher must be earned in the examination for such credit to be awarded and to appear on the student’s transcript. Credit by Examination shall not be granted for any course previously completed for which a quality letter grade has been assigned for any course completed under the audit (Policy 34-68) or satisfactory/unsatisfactory (Policy 49-60) grading schemes, or for credit awarded under Senate Policies 42-80 or 42-90, or for credit earned through the College Entrance Examination Board’s Advanced Placement Program. Credit by Examination shall not be available for any course for which a student was in scheduled status for that class after the late drop date of the course and is available only to degree or certificate-seeking students.

Students may initiate a request for Credit by Examination for a course, although the academic department or program offering the course determines whether it will make Credit by Examination available.

Credit by Examination does not result in a quality grade (A, A-, etc.) and is not included in the calculation of the student’s grade point average. Any credits earned in this manner will appear on the student’s transcript with the notation CRX and without a reported grade, similar to the way that credits appear if acquired through means such as transfer from other institutions (Senate Policy 42-80), Advanced Placement credit (Senate Policy 42-92), or Credit by Portfolio credits (Senate Policy 42-97). As with Policy 42-97, a fee may be assessed to cover the costs of the procedure (see also E-2: Credit by Examination—AAPPM).

Any academic unit may award undergraduate credit by examination based on prior learning for specific courses offered by that unit. An undergraduate student interested in receiving credit for college-level learning may complete an exam that demonstrates mastery of the course objectives and be awarded credit. Awarding credit by exam will be governed by these guidelines:

1. The academic unit offering the course determines whether and how it will make Credit by Exam available. Credit may be awarded following an evaluation by individuals with expertise in the subject matter to be evaluated, including an individual faculty member, a team of faculty members, and/or other individuals selected by Penn State faculty.

2. A grade of “C” or higher must be earned in the examination for such credit to be awarded and to appear on the student’s transcript.

3. Credit by Exam does not result in a quality grade (A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, or C) and is not included in the calculation of the student’s grade point average. Any credits
earned in this manner are accepted as fulfilling degree requirements and will appear on the student’s transcript with the notation CRX and without a reported grade in the same manner as those credits acquired through other means such as transfer from other institutions (Senate Policy 42-80), which are accepted at C or better, or Advanced Placement Credit (Senate Policy 42-92). The credit limitation explained by Senate Policy 49-60 does not include credits awarded by exam.

4. Credit by Exam will be granted in accordance with Senate Policy 83-80.

5. Credit by Exam is awarded at the undergraduate level for courses numbered 001-499.

6. Credit by Exam is available to all enrolled students (Senate Policy 34-20) and those who have accepted an offer of admission.

7. Credit by Exam shall not be granted for any course previously completed for which a quality letter grade has been assigned unless the course is designated as “repeatable” (Senate Policy 47-80); for any course completed under the audit (Senate Policy 34-68) or satisfactory/unsatisfactory (Senate Policy 49-60) grading schemes; for any credit by transfer (Senate Policy 42-80); or for credit earned by external exam (Senate Policy 42-90); nor can the student then enroll for credit in a course for which credit already has been granted via Credit by Exam.

8. Credit by Exam shall not be available for any course a student has late dropped.

9. A non-refundable fee will be assessed to recover the costs of providing the service.

E-2 Credit by Examination

42-80 Credit by Transfer From Other Institutions

42-81 Credit by Validation

College-level coursework completed at colleges/universities licensed by state boards of education to award associate degrees or higher, but that are not members of one of the six regional accrediting associations, may be eligible for credit by validation. Credit for courses completed at other institutions and graded the equivalent of an “A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, or C” (2.0 or higher) at this institution Penn State may be obtained through credit by validation when the Undergraduate Admissions Office is unable to determine the transferability of a course through other means. For such courses, the student may request this option be used and must provide the necessary documentation. Awarding credit by validation will be governed by these guidelines:

1. The Undergraduate Admission Office determines from the official transcript the credits to be validated and lists these credits on the Credit by Validation form.
2. This form and the supporting documentation are forwarded to the representative of the department in which an equivalent course is taught at this University faculty discipline committee(s) for the course(s).

3. The department representative committee then conducts a review, the form and extent of which the department representative determines, and reports the results of the review to the Undergraduate Admissions Office via the Credit by Validation form.

4. The Undergraduate Admissions Office then records the appropriate entries on the candidate’s record. Course numbers in the 400 series usually are not listed in the candidate’s record. General credits may be granted by this method. However, the department representative validating the course may specify that a course number in the 400 series be listed in a candidate’s record when the course covers topics that are substantially equivalent to a specific 400-level course.

5. Credits are transferred, but quality grades and grade points are not. Grades earned at other colleges and universities are not used in calculating a candidate’s grade-point average while attending this university Penn State.

42-82 Accredited U.S. Institutions

Credits may be accepted from colleges and universities that are accredited by any of the six regional accrediting commissions in the United States. College-level coursework completed at colleges/universities licensed by state boards of education to award associate degrees or higher, but that are not members of one of the six regional accrediting associations, may be eligible for credit by validation (Senate Policy 42-81). Awarding transfer credit will be governed by these guidelines:

1. Evaluation Criteria. Course work completed at an accredited college or university may be evaluated for transfer credit if passed with a grade equivalent to A, A-, B+, B, B-, or C (2.0 or higher) at Penn State this University and useful to the candidate’s program of study at this University. Course work completed on a pass-fail or satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis normally cannot be evaluated for transfer credit.

2. Specific Credits. When a candidate student has satisfactorily completed, at another accredited institution, course work that is substantially equivalent (at least 80% the same) to a specific course at Penn State this University, direct equivalent credit is granted in the University Penn State course, except for 400-series courses. For course work that is equivalent to 400-series courses, general credits, as described in item 3, below, may be granted.

3. General Credits. When a candidate student has satisfactorily completed, at another accredited institution, course work that is not substantially equivalent to a specific course at Penn State this University, general credits may be granted in the general field of study covered by that course. General credits may be assigned in cases where it is not possible to assign a University Penn State course number because of a difference in the number of credits involved. If appropriate, general credits may be used to fulfill degree
requirements in any area. These general credits may be applied to the candidate’s student’s program of study in accordance with the policies established by the college of enrollment. Credit granted for course work that is equivalent to 400-level courses may be applied only toward completion of requirements for a college or major in accordance with the policies established by that college, but not to General Education as defined in Appendix A.1.

4. **Credit Conversion.** Courses at Penn State this University carry semester hours of credit. Courses evaluated for transfer from colleges and universities with different credit systems, such as quarter hours of credit, units, and course units, are converted to semester hours of credit.

5. **Grades.** Credits are transferred, but quality grades and grade points are not. Grades earned at other colleges and universities are not used in calculating a candidate’s student’s grade-point average while attending Penn State this University.

6. **Transfer credit is granted only to enrolled degree-seeking students or those who have been approved to re-enroll in a degree-seeking program.**

### E-5 Credit by Transfer From Other Institutions

#### 42-84 Accredited Institutions Outside the United States

Credits may be accepted from colleges and universities outside the United States that are considered to be accredited when either of the following standards is met: (a) the college or university is accredited by one of six regional accrediting associations in the United States; (b) the college or university is a recognized part of the system of higher education of another country and offers programs of study equivalent to baccalaureate degree programs. The World Education Series, published by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, is used as a guide in making decisions on the accreditation of foreign institutions. Accepted credits must meet the criteria as outlined in Senate Policy 42-82.

#### 42-86 Institutions That Are Not Regionally Accredited

Students seeking credit for work taken at a college or university that is not accredited by one of the six regional accrediting commissions associations in the United States but has been licensed by a state board of education to award an associate degree or higher may use the credit by validation method stated in Senate Policy 42-81.

Students seeking credit for work taken at a college or university that is not accredited by one of the six regional accrediting commissions associations in the United States and has not been licensed by a state board of education to award an associate degree or higher may use the credit by examination method (Senate Policy 42-50), if available, through the academic unit. Other
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means of obtaining credit are listed in policies 42-92, 42-94, 42-98, and 42-99, a national exam (Senate Policy 42-90), or credit by portfolio assessment (Senate Policy 42-97).


The director of admissions is responsible for making decisions and judgments necessary to implement these policies.

E-12 Course Substitution Process in Relation to Degree Requirements

42-90 Other Means of Credit Acquisition

42-92 Advanced Placement Program of the College Board

A student who does advanced work in a secondary school may take Advanced Placement Examinations, which are based on college-level studies. The University Penn State cooperates with the College Board in this program.

Credit may be awarded for Advanced Placement Examinations depending upon the grades earned on the examination. For some examinations, the amount of credit awarded varies with an earned grade of three, four, or five. The schedule of credit awarded for Advanced Placement Examinations may be revised annually upon review by the faculty.

Limitations on credits earned through the Advanced Placement Examinations are as follows:

1. It is the discretion of the student’s degree program to determine whether the credits earned can be used to meet degree requirements. The student’s academic program determines how credits earned apply to degree requirements.
2. A student who has earned credit for a particular course through AP examinations may elect to take the same course at Penn State (unless restricted by placement policies of the unit offering the course), but the duplicate credit cannot be used to meet any additional degree requirements. However, the grade earned in the Penn State course will count towards the student’s grade point average.

E-6 Advanced Placement Placement Program of the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB)

42-94 College-Level Examination Program of the College Board

A student, before or after admission to degree candidacy, may participate in the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP). The University Penn State cooperates with the College Board in this program, referred to as CLEP. Effective June 1, 1974,
Credit may be awarded for the CLEP Examinations depending upon the score earned on the examination and other factors as indicated in the following paragraphs. A student who has earned a score equivalent to the fiftieth percentile or higher for performance on the CLEP Examination, taken before or after admission to degree candidacy, may receive credit as indicated in the schedule of credits. The schedule of credit awarded for CLEP Examinations may be revised annually upon review by the faculty.

Limitations on credits earned through the CLEP Examinations are as follows:

1. It is the discretion of the student’s degree program to determine how credits earned apply to degree requirements. The student’s academic program determines how credits earned apply to degree requirements.

2. A student who has earned credit for a particular course through CLEP examinations may elect to take the same course at Penn State (unless restricted by placement policies of the unit offering the course), but the duplicate credit cannot be used to meet any additional degree requirements. However, the grade earned in the Penn State course will count towards the student’s grade point average.

3. The total number of credits that may be awarded is limited to 60 credits. Students must meet residency requirements as outlined in Senate Policy 83-80.

E-7 College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) of the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB)

42-96 International Secondary Schooling and International Baccalaureate Program

A student who has enrolled in foreign secondary schools or in the International Baccalaureate Program and who has taken course work that is equivalent to college-level studies may receive credit for such work if they meet the following criteria:

1. Foreign Secondary Schooling. A person who does advanced work in a secondary school in another country may receive consideration for transfer credit when the examinations taken are based on college-level studies. Credit may be awarded for advanced work in foreign secondary schools. The World Education Series, published by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, shall be used as a guide in making decisions on the awarding of credit for course work completed at an advanced level in foreign secondary schools. The number of credits awarded will reflect the introductory sequence in that subject at Penn State. The schedule of credit awarded for examinations may be revised annually upon review by the faculty.

2. International Baccalaureate. A person who does work based on college-level studies in an International Baccalaureate (IB) program in a secondary school may take the higher-level examinations. Credit may be awarded for higher-level examinations of the international baccalaureate depending upon the grades earned on the examination. Subjects examined at the higher level with an earned grade of 5 or higher will be considered for transfer
credit. The number of credits awarded will reflect the introductory sequence in that subject at Penn State. The schedule of credit awarded for IB Examinations may be revised annually upon review by the faculty.

Limitations on credits earned through advanced-level foreign secondary schooling and the International Baccalaureate examinations are as follows:

1. It is the discretion of the student’s degree program to determine how credits earned apply to degree requirements. The student’s academic program determines how credits earned apply to degree requirements.
2. A student who has earned credit for a particular course through IB examinations or advanced-level foreign secondary schooling may elect to take the same course at Penn State (unless restricted by placement policies of the unit offering the course), but the duplicate credit cannot be used to meet any additional degree requirements. However, the grade earned in the Penn State course will count towards the student’s grade point average.

42-97 Credit by Portfolio Assessment

For any academic unit that is willing to consider awarding credit on the basis of portfolio assessment for specific courses offered by that unit, an undergraduate student interested in receiving credit for college-level learning obtained in non-collegiate settings may develop a portfolio that reflects knowledge mastered, request assessment of the portfolio, and be awarded credit. The student’s petition for the award of credit via portfolio must meet the following criteria:

1. Credit is granted for college-level learning obtained during work or other experience, not for the experience itself; learning must be documented and must represent college-level achievement.
2. Credit without grades is awarded only to enrolled students.
3. Credit is awarded at the undergraduate level.
4. Credit cannot duplicate other coursework that the student has already completed, nor can the student then enroll for credit in a course for which credit already has been granted via portfolio assisted assessment.
5. Credit may be awarded following an evaluation of the portfolio by an individual faculty member or a team of faculty members and/or other selected personnel with expertise in the subject matter to be evaluated.
6. Credit earned via portfolio is designated on the transcript in the same manner as transfer credit.

A fee is assessed to recover the costs of providing the service.
Any academic unit may award undergraduate credit by portfolio assessment based on prior learning for specific courses offered by that unit. An undergraduate student interested in receiving credit for college-level learning may complete a portfolio that demonstrates mastery of the course objectives and be awarded credit. The student’s petition for the award of credit by portfolio assessment must meet the following criteria:

1. The academic unit offering the course determines whether and how it will make Credit by Portfolio Assessment available. Credit may be awarded following an evaluation by individuals with expertise in the subject matter to be evaluated, including an individual faculty member, a team of faculty members, and/or other individuals selected by Penn State faculty. These individuals will determine if the student’s performance merits that credit be awarded and shown on the student’s transcript.

2. Credit is granted for college-level learning obtained during work or other experience, not for the experience itself; the student must document the learning.

3. Credit by Portfolio Assessment does not result in a quality grade (A, A-, etc.) and is not included in the calculation of the student’s grade point average. Credit earned via portfolio assessment is designated on the transcript in the same manner as transfer credit.

4. Credit by Portfolio Assessment is available to all enrolled students (Senate Policy 34-20) and those who have accepted an offer of admission.

5. Credit by Portfolio Assessment is awarded at the undergraduate level for courses numbered 001-499.

6. Credit by Portfolio Assessment shall not be granted for any course previously completed for which a quality letter grade has been assigned unless the course is designated as “repeatable” (Senate Policy 47-80); for any course completed under the audit (Senate Policy 34-68) or satisfactory/unsatisfactory (Senate Policy 49-60) grading schemes; for any credit by transfer (Senate Policy 42-80); or for credit earned by external exam (Senate Policy 42-90); nor can the student then enroll for credit in a course for which credit already has been granted via Credit by Portfolio Assessment.

7. Credit by Portfolio Assessment will be granted in accordance with Senate Policy 83-80. The credit limitation explained by Senate Policy 49-60 does not include credits awarded by portfolio assessment.

8. Credit by Portfolio Assessment shall not be available for any course a student has late dropped.

9. A non-refundable fee will be assessed to recover the costs of providing the service.

E-10 Credit by Portfolio Assessment

42-98

(Revised and passed.)
42-99 Educational Credit for Training Programs in Non-collegiate Organizations

A student may be granted credit for educational experiences in non-collegiate organizations under the following conditions:

1. Credit may be awarded to a student upon certification of successful course completion of the American Council on Education’s Registry of Credit Recommendations.

2. Responsibility for the decision as to academic area of application and quantity of credit to be awarded rests with the director of admissions faculty discipline review committees.

3. Guidelines for this decision are drawn from the most recent edition of the National Guide of Educational Credit for Training Purposes published by the American Council on Education.

4. Use of general credits in the student’s program of study rests with the department concerned. The college with academic authority for the student’s undergraduate program of study determines how credits will apply to the student’s program.

E-9 Educational Credit for Training Programs in Non-collegiate Organizations

Clean Copy

42-50 Credit by Examination (CRX)

Any academic unit may award undergraduate credit by examination based on prior learning for specific courses offered by that unit. An undergraduate student interested in receiving credit for college-level learning may complete an exam that demonstrates mastery of the course objectives and be awarded credit. Awarding credit by exam will be governed by these guidelines:

1. The academic unit offering the course determines whether and how it will make Credit by Exam available. Credit may be awarded following an evaluation by individuals with expertise in the subject matter to be evaluated, including an individual faculty member, a team of faculty members, and/or other individuals selected by Penn State faculty.

2. A grade of “C” or higher must be earned in the examination for such credit to be awarded and to appear on the student’s transcript.

3. Credit by Exam does not result in a quality grade (A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, or C) and is not included in the calculation of the student’s grade point average. Any credits earned in this manner are accepted as fulfilling degree requirements and will appear on the student’s transcript with the notation CRX and without a reported grade in the same manner as those credits acquired through other means such as transfer from other institutions (Senate Policy 42-80), which are accepted at C or better, or Advanced Placement Credit (Senate Policy 42-92). The credit limitation explained by Senate Policy 49-60 does not include credits awarded by exam.

4. Credit by Exam will be granted in accordance with Senate Policy 83-80.
5. Credit by Exam is awarded at the undergraduate level for courses numbered 001-499.

6. Credit by Exam is available to all enrolled students (Senate Policy 34-20) and those who have accepted an offer of admission.

7. Credit by Exam shall not be granted for any course previously completed for which a quality letter grade has been assigned unless the course is designated as “repeatable” (Senate Policy 47-80); for any course completed under the audit (Senate Policy 34-68) or satisfactory/unsatisfactory (Senate Policy 49-60) grading schemes; for any credit by transfer (Senate Policy 42-80); or for credit earned by external exam (Senate Policy 42-90); nor can the student then enroll for credit in a course for which credit already has been granted via Credit by Exam.

8. Credit by Exam shall not be available for any course a student has late dropped.

9. A non-refundable fee will be assessed to recover the costs of providing the service.

**E-2 Credit by Examination**

**42-80 Credit by Transfer from Other Institutions**

**42-81 Credit by Validation**

College-level coursework completed at colleges/universities licensed by state boards of education to award associate degrees or higher, but that are not members of one of the six regional accrediting associations, may be eligible for credit by validation. Credit for courses completed at other institutions and graded the equivalent of an “A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, or C” (2.0 or higher) at Penn State may be obtained through credit by validation when the Undergraduate Admissions Office is unable to determine the transferability of a course through other means. For such courses, the student may request this option be used and must provide the necessary documentation. Awarding credit by validation will be governed by these guidelines:

1. The Undergraduate Admission Office determines from the official transcript the credits to be validated and lists these credits on the Credit by Validation form.
2. This form and the supporting documentation are forwarded to the faculty discipline committee(s) for the course(s).
3. The committee conducts a review-and reports the results to the Undergraduate Admissions Office. The Undergraduate Admissions Office then records the appropriate entries on the candidate’s record.
4. Credits are transferred, but quality grades and grade points are not. Grades earned at other colleges and universities are not used in calculating a candidate’s grade-point average while attending Penn State.
Credits may be accepted from colleges and universities that are accredited by any of the six regional accrediting commissions in the United States. College-level coursework completed at colleges/universities licensed by state boards of education to award associate degrees or higher, but that are not members of one of the six regional accrediting associations, may be eligible for credit by validation (Senate Policy 42-81). Awarding transfer credit will be governed by these guidelines:

1. Course work completed at an accredited college or university may be evaluated for transfer credit if passed with a grade equivalent to A, A-, B+, B, B-, or C (2.0 or higher) at Penn State. Course work completed on a pass-fail or satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis normally cannot be evaluated for transfer credit.

2. When a candidate has satisfactorily completed, at another accredited institution, course work that is substantially equivalent (at least 80% the same) to a specific course at Penn State, direct equivalent credit is granted in the Penn State course.

3. When a student has satisfactorily completed, at another accredited institution, course work that is not substantially equivalent to a specific course at Penn State, general credits may be assigned in the general field of study covered by that course. General credits may be assigned in cases where it is not possible to assign a Penn State course number because of a difference in the number of credits involved. If appropriate, general credits may be used to fulfill degree requirements in any area. These general credits may be applied to the student’s program of study in accordance with the policies established by the college of enrollment. Credit granted for course work that is equivalent to 400-level courses may be applied only toward completion of requirements for a college or major in accordance with the policies established by that college, but not to General Education as defined in Appendix A.1.

4. Courses at Penn State carry semester hours of credit. Courses evaluated for transfer from colleges and universities with different credit systems, such as quarter hours of credit, units, and course units, are converted to semester hours of credit.

5. Credits are transferred, but quality grades and grade points are not. Grades earned at other colleges and universities are not used in calculating a student’s grade-point average while attending Penn State.

6. Transfer credit is granted only to enrolled degree-seeking students or those who have been approved to re-enroll in a degree-seeking program.
42-84 Accredited Institutions Outside the United States

Credits may be accepted from colleges and universities outside the United States when either of the following standards is met: (a) the college or university is accredited by one of six regional accrediting associations in the United States; (b) the college or university is a recognized part of the system of higher education of another country and offers programs of study equivalent to baccalaureate degree programs. Accepted credits must meet the criteria as outlined in Senate Policy 42-82.

E-5 Credit by Transfer From Other Institutions

42-86 Institutions That Are Not Regionally Accredited

Students seeking credit for work taken at a college or university that is not accredited by one of the six regional accrediting associations in the United States but has been licensed by a state board of education to award an associate degree or higher may use the credit by validation method stated in Senate Policy 42-81.

Students seeking credit for work taken at a college or university that is not accredited by one of the six regional accrediting associations in the United States and has not been licensed by a state board of education to award an associate degree or higher may use the credit by examination method (Senate Policy 42-50), a national exam (Senate Policy 42-90), or credit by portfolio assessment (Senate Policy 42-97)


The director of admissions is responsible for making decisions and judgments necessary to implement these policies.

E-12 Course Substitution Process in Relation to Degree Requirements

42-90 Other Means of Credit Acquisition

42-92 Advanced Placement Program of the College Board

A student who does advanced work in a secondary school may take Advanced Placement Examinations, which are based on college-level studies. Penn State cooperates with the College Board in this program.

Credit may be awarded for Advanced Placement Examinations depending upon the grades earned on the examination. For some examinations, the amount of credit awarded varies with an
earned grade of three, four, or five. The schedule of credit awarded for Advanced Placement Examinations may be revised annually upon review by the faculty.

Limitations on credits earned through the Advanced Placement Examinations are as follows:

1. The student’s academic program determines how credits earned apply to degree requirements.
2. A student who has earned credit for a particular course through AP examinations may elect to take the same course at Penn State (unless restricted by placement policies of the unit offering the course), but the duplicate credit cannot be used to meet any additional degree requirements. However, the grade earned in the Penn State course will count towards the student’s grade point average.

E-6 Advanced Placement Placement Program of the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB)

42-94 College-Level Examination Program of the College Board

A student, before or after admission to degree candidacy, may participate in the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP). Penn State cooperates with the College Board in this program.

Credit may be awarded for the CLEP Examinations depending upon the score earned on the examination. A student who has earned a score equivalent to the fiftieth percentile or higher for performance on the CLEP Examination may receive credit as indicated in the schedule of credits. The schedule of credit awarded for CLEP Examinations may be revised annually upon review by the faculty.

Limitations on credits earned through the CLEP Examinations are as follows:

1. The student’s academic program determines how credits earned apply to degree requirements.
2. A student who has earned credit for a particular course through CLEP examinations may elect to take the same course at Penn State (unless restricted by placement policies of the unit offering the course), but the duplicate credit cannot be used to meet any additional degree requirements. However, the grade earned in the Penn State course will count towards the student’s grade point average.
3. Students must meet residency requirements as outlined in Senate Policy 83-80.

E-7 College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) of the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB)
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42-96 International Secondary Schooling and International Baccalaureate Program

A student who has enrolled in foreign secondary schools or in the International Baccalaureate Program and who has taken course work that is equivalent to college-level studies may receive credit for such work if they meet the following criteria:

1. Foreign Secondary Schooling. A person who does advanced work in a secondary school in another country may receive consideration for transfer credit when the examinations taken are based on college-level studies. Credit may be awarded for advanced work in foreign secondary schools. The number of credits awarded will reflect the introductory sequence in that subject at Penn State. The schedule of credit awarded for examinations may be revised annually upon review by the faculty.

2. International Baccalaureate. A person who does work based on college-level studies in an International Baccalaureate (IB) program in a secondary school may take the higher-level examinations. Credit may be awarded for higher-level examinations of the international baccalaureate depending upon the grades earned on the examination. Subjects examined at the higher level with an earned grade of 5 or higher will be considered for transfer credit. The number of credits awarded will reflect the introductory sequence in that subject at Penn State. The schedule of credit awarded for IB Examinations may be revised annually upon review by the faculty.

Limitations on credits earned through advanced-level foreign secondary schooling and the International Baccalaureate examinations are as follows:

1. The student’s academic program determines how credits earned apply to degree requirements.
2. A student who has earned credit for a particular course through IB examinations or advanced-level foreign secondary schooling may elect to take the same course at Penn State (unless restricted by placement policies of the unit offering the course), but the duplicate credit cannot be used to meet any additional degree requirements. However, the grade earned in the Penn State course will count towards the student’s grade point average.

42-97 Credit by Portfolio Assessment

Any academic unit may award undergraduate credit by portfolio assessment based on prior learning for specific courses offered by that unit. An undergraduate student interested in receiving credit for college-level learning may complete a portfolio that demonstrates mastery of the course objectives and be awarded credit. The student’s petition for the award of credit by portfolio assessment must meet the following criteria:

1. The academic unit offering the course determines whether and how it will make Credit by Portfolio Assessment available. Credit may be awarded following an evaluation by individuals with expertise in the subject matter to be evaluated, including an individual faculty member, a team of faculty members, and/or other individuals selected by Penn
State faculty. These individuals will determine if the student’s performance merits that credit be awarded and shown on the student’s transcript.

2. Credit is granted for college-level learning obtained during work or other experience, not for the experience itself; the student must document the learning.

3. Credit by Portfolio Assessment does not result in a quality grade (A, A-, etc.) and is not included in the calculation of the student’s grade point average. Credit earned via portfolio assessment is designated on the transcript in the same manner as transfer credit.

4. Credit by Portfolio Assessment is available to all enrolled students (Senate Policy 34-20) and those who have accepted an offer of admission.

5. Credit by Portfolio Assessment is awarded at the undergraduate level for courses numbered 001-499.

6. Credit by Portfolio Assessment shall not be granted for any course previously completed for which a quality letter grade has been assigned unless the course is designated as “repeatable” (Senate Policy 47-80); for any course completed under the audit (Senate Policy 34-68) or satisfactory/unsatisfactory (Senate Policy 49-60) grading schemes; for any credit by transfer (Senate Policy 42-80); or for credit earned by external exam (Senate Policy 42-90); nor can the student then enroll for credit in a course for which credit already has been granted via Credit by Portfolio Assessment.

7. Credit by Portfolio Assessment will be granted in accordance with Senate Policy 83-80. The credit limitation explained by Senate Policy 49-60 does not include credits awarded by portfolio assessment.

8. Credit by Portfolio Assessment shall not be available for any course a student has late dropped.

9. A non-refundable fee will be assessed to recover the costs of providing the service.

E-10 Credit by Portfolio Assessment

42-99 Educational Credit for Training Programs in Non-collegiate Organizations

A student may be granted credit for educational experiences in non-collegiate organizations under the following conditions:

1. Credit may be awarded to a student upon certification of successful course completion of the American Council on Education’s Registry of Credit Recommendations.

2. Responsibility for the decision as to academic area of application and quantity of credit to be awarded rests with the faculty discipline review committees.

3. Guidelines for this decision are drawn from the most recent edition of the National Guide of Educational Credit for Training Purposes published by the American Council on Education.

4. The college with academic authority for the student’s undergraduate program of study determines how credits will apply to the student’s program.
E-9 Educational Credit for Training Programs in Non-collegiate Organizations
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Revisions to Senate Policies 67-10 Division I – Athletic Competition (University Park) and 67-30 Division III and PSUAC – Athletic Competition (non-University Park)

(Legislative)

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

Rationale

Penn State student-athletes continue to generally excel in the classroom and in their respective competitive venues. While rare, circumstances arise that merit close consideration of the individual student-athlete’s situation relative to their academic performance. While this process has worked well to date, the intercollegiate athletics committee has identified an opportunity for process improvement that more clearly elucidates parameters and procedures.

The proliferation of on-line education is well-known. Penn State World Campus continues to be a leader in the provision of on-line education. The intercollegiate athletic committee has also identified an opportunity to update the language of the 67-00 document to more currently reflect possibilities in on-line education while respecting the importance of residential offerings.

Recommendation

We recommend that consideration be given for any credit-eligible course offered by PSU (and approved by the faculty senate) count towards full-time status. We further recommend that the process for appealing athletic eligibility be specified to include involvement of the coach, sport administrator, Morgan Center and FAR.

Please note that the following contains bold text for additions and strikeouts indicating deleted text.

67-10 Division I – Athletic Competition (University Park)

I. General

A. Jurisdiction and Oversight

The University Faculty Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics shall have jurisdiction over all academic matters pertaining to intercollegiate athletics. The Intercollegiate Athletics Committee shall have oversight of the processes determining eligibility of student–athletes for practice and competition, review of athletic schedules, and taking appropriate actions when student-athletes have not met the policies set forth in Faculty Senate Policy 67-10 (referred to as 67-10). The Intercollegiate Athletics Committee shall have overall responsibility for ensuring 67-
10 policies are enforced. A student-athlete who has not met any of the provisions of 67-10 shall be subject to appropriate action(s).

The intent of this Faculty Senate Policy is to stipulate policy where The Pennsylvania State University has an interest in a standard of performance that exceeds that of the NCAA, Big Ten, or other associated athletic conferences.


B. Faculty Athletics Representative

To meet NCAA requirements and to assist the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee in fulfilling its responsibilities, a Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA Division I is appointed. Authority granted this Faculty Athletics Representative is outlined in subsequent provisions of 67-10. The Faculty Athletics Representative Division I is appointed by the President of the University.

II. Eligibility of Athletes*

A. For student-athletes to be eligible to practice and compete they must meet certain status conditions. Conditions for eligibility for practice and eligibility for competition are certified through two different processes.

1. On behalf of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, the Faculty Athletics Representative will certify student-athletes for practice.
2. On behalf of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, the Faculty Athletics Representative will oversee the certification of student-athletes for competition; the final determination of eligibility for competition is determined by the Registrar’s Office.

B. Minimum Grade Point Average

A student-athlete is eligible to represent the University in an intercollegiate athletic contest only if the student meets the minimum cumulative grade point requirements at the beginning of the appropriate semester (in residence) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semesters in Residence</th>
<th>Minimum Cumulative GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A student-athlete who is deemed ineligible for not meeting the minimum cumulative grade point requirements at the beginning of the appropriate semester (in residence) may petition to have his or her eligibility re-evaluated due to a change in the academic record.

A student-athlete who is ineligible due to not meeting the minimum cumulative grade point requirements at the beginning of the appropriate semester (in residence) may petition to have his or her eligibility reconsidered under extenuating circumstances only. Extenuating circumstances are defined as a significant hardship faced by the student and thus impacting the GPA (e.g., death in the family, serious injury or illness, etc.). Extenuating circumstances do not include a student's cumulative GPA being close or near the required GPA. To file a petition based on extenuating circumstances, the student will work with the Morgan Academic Center advisor to complete the required Morgan Academic Center documentation. This documentation must be approved by the head coach, the sport administrator, the Morgan Academic Center Counselor, the Director of the Morgan Academic Center, and the Faculty Athletics Representative to include a detailed statement (including any relevant supporting documentation) regarding the extenuating circumstance. Completed forms should be submitted to the Faculty Athletics Representative who will convene a committee to review the petition. The Faculty Athletics Representative will chair a committee to include the IAC Chair and Vice-Chair. The review committee will adjudicate the request and report the results of any petitions to the IAC at the next meeting. All decisions are final.

C. Enrollment Status

1. Courses offered through World Campus may not be used to establish the minimum requirements for full-time status.

   - Any credit-eligible course offered by Penn State and approved by the Faculty Senate (including residential instruction, residential online instruction, and/or World Campus classes), may be used to establish the minimum requirements for full time status.

2. Degree-seeking students in DUS with conditions, non-degree regular and non-degree conditional students are not eligible to practice or compete.
NCAA Division I athletic program student-athletes must meet the NCAA Division I earned credit requirements unless proceeding under NCAA or Big Ten waiver.

D. Other Eligibility

A graduate student may be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics if the student has completed a baccalaureate degree, has not exceeded the calendar-year limitations on remaining competitive eligibility, and is a full-time student in a degree program, with one exception: students who have graduated, and return to the same institution (University Park Campus) to complete their athletics eligibility within the five-year period, may enroll as a non-degree seeking graduate student, provided the student enrolls in courses that are approved by a particular graduate program as counting toward any graduate degree.

*Detailed student-athlete eligibility requirements are stipulated in the current NCAA Division I Manual, and the Handbook of the Big Ten Conference as applicable.

III. Grants-in Aid

A. A student-athlete may receive from the athletic department a grant-in-aid that includes all or part of the educational expenses associated with tuition, fees, room, board, required course-related books, and cost of attendance.

B. Grants-in-aid may not be cancelled during the award period unless one of the prescribed NCAA exceptions applies.

IV. Athletic Contests

A. A student-athlete who represents the University in an athletic contest shall be excused from class and provided with an official excuse form.

B. No student-athlete shall be allowed to represent the University in an athletic contest unless the student has been officially approved for participation.

C. A list of student-athletes expecting to participate in the contest must be submitted to the Faculty Athletics Representative at least twenty-four hours in advance of the contest.

V. Athletic Schedules

A. All schedules of athletic competitions must be submitted to the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee through the Faculty Athletic Representative for approval.
Competitions that involve varsity teams or individual team members serving as official representatives of the University and that are scheduled annually must be approved at the time season schedules are approved by the IA Committee. Example competitions include annual invitational meets, regional conference tournaments, and NCAA regional competitions.

It is the responsibility of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee to ensure that all intercollegiate athletic competition schedules are within established university regulations and policies.

1. Schedules for all athletic contests scheduled during the fall semester must be submitted to the Faculty Athletic Representative no less than two weeks prior to the regularly scheduled April meeting of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee.

2. Schedules for all athletic contests scheduled during the spring semester must be submitted to the Faculty Athletic Representative no less than two weeks prior to the regularly scheduled September meeting of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee.

3. Regular season, non-conference* athletic travel or competition shall not take place during official university final exam periods.

4. Regular season, non-conference* athletic travel or competition shall not take place on official university study days.

5. Waivers, submitted in writing to the Faculty Athletics Representative requesting approval for non-conference* competitions scheduled on a study day, will be considered by the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee. Waiver requests must be received no less than 15 weeks prior to the anticipated competition and must include:
   1. full rationale for the need to schedule a competition on a study day, including reasons alternate dates are not possible;
   2. actual study day hours occupied for the competition, including preparations, travel, completion, and post competition activities;
   3. current team academic performance measures including team cumulative GPA, recent semester GPA, and academic progress rate;
   4. team academic progress rate ranking as compared to Big Ten competitors and all Penn State intercollegiate athletics teams;
   5. de-identified individual Penn State student athlete cumulative GPA of those student athletes who will participate in the study day competition in question;
   6. a specific plan that replaces official university study day hours lost to the competition in question with alternative, supervised study hours;
   7. a plan to avoid future competitions on official university study days; and
   8. the number of team missed class days scheduled for the semester in question.

6. Where a team competition schedule that has been approved by the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee must be revised due to unforeseen circumstances:
   1. If a team competition schedule revision results in no increase, or a decrease, beyond the approved schedule missed class time, the Faculty Athletics Representative must be notified of the schedule change.
   2. If a team competition schedule revision results in an increase in the missed class days previously approved, but there are fewer than eight (8) missed class days in the revised schedule, the Faculty Athletics Representative must review the schedule change.
3. If a team competition schedule revision results in an increase resulting in greater than eight (8) missed class days in the revised schedule, the Faculty Athletics Representative will review the schedule change in collaboration with the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, or its designated scheduling review subcommittee, and provide a decision.

4. The Intercollegiate Athletics Committee must be notified of all team schedule revisions where missed class days exceed eight (8) in a summary report by the Faculty Athletics Representative or Intercollegiate Athletics Committee designated scheduling review subcommittee.

* “Non-conference” means that contest arrangements, including time and date of the competition, are under the control of Penn State University and not the Big Ten, NCAA, USCAA, or other outside agency.

- Every effort must be made by Intercollegiate Athletics to avoid league (Big Ten, NCAA, etc.) scheduled contests and associated travel on university scheduled final exam days and study days. Where league contests are scheduled during official university final exam periods or study days, Intercollegiate Athletics is strongly encouraged to replace official university study day hours lost to the competition in question with alternative, supervised study hours.

**B.** Where Intercollegiate Athletics competition contracts include, or may include, competitions during official university exam periods or on study days, the competition date(s) must be approved by the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee prior to execution of the contract.

**C.** Athletic teams or individual team members may be absent from the University for no more than eight (8) class days in one semester. The number of class days missed by each Intercollegiate Athletics team shall be kept on record by the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee and Intercollegiate Athletics It shall be the joint responsibility of those bodies to enforce these limitations.

1. One full class day absence is counted if student athletes are absent from classes beginning prior to 12:00 pm.
2. One half class day absence is counted if student athletes are absent from Monday, Wednesday or Friday classes beginning between 12:00 pm and 2:15 p.m.
3. One half class day absence is counted if student athletes are absent from Tuesday or Thursday classes beginning between 12:00 pm and 2:50 p.m.
4. No absence is counted when student-athlete absences begin Monday, Wednesday or Friday after 2:15 p.m.
5. No absence is counted when student-athlete absences begin Tuesday or Thursday after 2:50 p.m.
6. No absence is counted for absences due to championship competitions.

**D.** Participation in special events outside approved scheduled events by varsity teams or individual team members (such as football bowl games) must be approved by the IA Committee
at least ten days prior to participation. As in all events, NCAA and/or other athletic conference regulations and University regulations will be followed.

**E. Team practice times must be arranged so as to allow student-athletes flexibility in scheduling and attending classes each semester.** Expected team practice times should be made available prior to student-athlete class preferential scheduling for the semester affected – typically February 1 for Fall, and September 1 for Spring. Every effort should be made to adjust team practice times to avoid conflict with student-athlete class schedules.

1. Morning team practices should conclude with sufficient time to allow 3rd period (10:10 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.) class attendance on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.
2. Morning team practices should conclude with sufficient time to allow 14th period (10:35 a.m. to 11:50 a.m.) class attendance on Tuesday and Thursday.
3. Afternoon team practices should begin sufficiently after 6th period concludes (2:15 p.m.) on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday to allow class attendance.
4. Afternoon team practices should begin sufficiently after 16th period concludes (2:50 p.m.) on Tuesday and Thursday to allow class attendance.
5. Morning Team practices should not be scheduled during both Fall and Spring semesters.
6. Significant departures from the practice guidelines listed above must be approved by the University Park Faculty Athletics Representative. The Faculty Athletics Representative will provide an annual report of cases where significant departures have occurred and submit for review by Intercollegiate Athletics Committee.

---

**67-30 Division III and PSUAC – Athletic Competition (non-University Park)**

**I. General**

**A. Jurisdiction and Oversight**

The University Faculty Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics shall have jurisdiction over all academic matters pertaining to intercollegiate athletics. The Intercollegiate Athletics Committee shall have oversight of the processes determining eligibility of student-athletes for practice and competition, approval of athletic schedules, and taking appropriate actions when student-athletes have not met the policies set forth in Faculty Senate Policy 67-30 (referred to as 67-30). The Intercollegiate Athletics Committee shall have overall responsibility for ensuring 67-30 policies are enforced. A student-athlete who has not met any of the provisions of 67-30 shall be subject to appropriate action(s).

The intent of this Faculty Senate Policy is to stipulate policy where The Pennsylvania State University has an interest in a standard of performance that exceeds that of the NCAA, Big Ten, or other associated athletic conferences.

B. Faculty Athletics Representative

To meet NCAA requirements and to assist the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee in fulfilling its responsibilities, Faculty Athletics Representatives are appointed.

1. A Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA Division III is appointed by each of the Chancellors of the respective campus locations.
2. A Faculty Athletics Representative for Penn State University Athletics Conference (PSUAC) athletics programs is appointed by the Vice-President of Commonwealth Campuses.

Authority granted to the respective Faculty Athletics Representatives is outlined in subsequent provisions of 67-30.

II. Eligibility of Athletes*

A. For student-athletes to be eligible to practice and compete they must meet certain status conditions. Conditions for eligibility for practice and eligibility for competition are certified by the applicable Division III or PSUAC Faculty Athletics Representative, on behalf of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee.

B. Minimum Grade Point Average

A student-athlete is eligible to represent the University in an intercollegiate athletic contest only if the student meets the minimum cumulative grade point requirements at the beginning of the appropriate semester (in residence) as follows:

**Semesters in Residence – Minimum Cumulative GPA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semesters in Residence</th>
<th>Minimum Cumulative GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A student-athlete who is deemed ineligible for not meeting the minimum cumulative grade point requirements at the beginning of the appropriate semester (in residence) may petition the Faculty Athletics Representative to have his or her eligibility re-evaluated due to a change in the academic record.

C. Enrollment Status

1. NCAA Division III
   1. Student-athletes shall be enrolled in at least a minimum full-time program of studies.
   2. A student-athlete enrolled in a two-year degree program shall be eligible only if that student-athlete was admitted to the institution under the same standards as four-year degree-seeking students and if the two-year degree program is not a terminal program.
   3. Student-athletes in their final semester may schedule fewer than the minimum requirements for full-time status if they need fewer than twelve credits to meet graduation requirements.
   4. A full-time graduate student (attained a baccalaureate degree and scheduling a minimum of nine credits), or a student enrolled in a second baccalaureate degree program at the same institution (campus), with competitive eligibility remaining, may also practice and compete.
   5. Up to 3 credits of coursework offered through World Campus may be used to establish the minimum requirements for full-time status.
   6. If a student-athlete drops below full-time status any time during the semester (except as noted above) that student will be immediately ineligible to practice or compete.
   7. Degree-seeking students in DUS with conditions, non-degree regular and non-degree conditional students are not eligible to practice or compete.

2. Penn State University Athletic Conference
   a. Only full-time students are eligible to practice and participate in intercollegiate athletic contests.
   b. Exceptions to full-time status may be made for baccalaureate and associate degree student-athletes during their final semester if they need less than twelve credits to meet graduation requirements.
   c. If a student-athlete drops below full-time status any time during the semester (except as noted above) that student will be immediately ineligible to practice or compete.

3. Student-athletes may represent the University in an intercollegiate athletic contest only if the student-athlete has acquired the designated number of credits at the beginning of the appropriate semester (in residence) as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semesters in Residence</th>
<th>Minimum Number Credits Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A student-athlete who is deemed ineligible for not meeting the designated number of credits at the beginning of the appropriate semester (in residence) may petition the Faculty Athletics Representative to have his or her eligibility re-evaluated due to a change in the academic record.

**D. Other Eligibility**

1. **Transfer Students**

Student-athletes transferring to campus locations that compete in NCAA Division III athletics must comply with NCAA Division III transfer regulations. Student-athlete transferring to campus locations that compete in PSUAC athletics must comply with the eligibility requirements that govern the athletic contests at that location.

2. **Graduate Students**

A graduate student may be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics if the student has completed a baccalaureate degree, has not exceeded the limitations on competitive eligibility, and is a full-time student in a degree program, with one exception: students who have graduated, and return to the same institution (Penn State Campus) to complete their athletics eligibility within the five-year period, may enroll as a non-degree seeking graduate student, provided the student enrolls in courses that are approved by a particular graduate program as counting toward any graduate degree.

*Detailed student-athlete eligibility requirements are stipulated in the current NCAA Division III Manual, the PSUAC Athletic Conference Policy Manual, and the applicable athletic conference manuals that governs the athletic contents in which the student athlete expects to compete.*

**III. Athletic Contests**

A. A student-athlete who represents the University in an athletic contest shall be excused from class and provided with an official excuse form.
B. No student-athlete shall be allowed to represent the University in an athletic contest unless the student has been officially approved for participation.

C. A list of student-athletes expecting to participate in the contest must be maintained by each campus athletics department. This list is to be available for review by the appropriate Faculty Athletics Representative, the Committee on Campus Athletics, or the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, upon request.

IV. Athletic Schedules

A. All schedules of athletic competitions must be submitted to the Committee on Campus Athletics through the Faculty Athletic Representative for approval. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Campus Athletics, on behalf of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, to ensure that all athletic competition schedules are within established university regulations and policies.

1. Schedules for all athletic contests scheduled during the fall semester must be submitted to the applicable Faculty Athletic Representative no less than two weeks prior to the first regularly scheduled fall semester meeting of the Committee on Campus Athletics.

2. Schedules for all athletic contests scheduled during the spring semester must be submitted to the applicable Faculty Athletic Representative no less than two weeks prior to the first regularly scheduled spring semester meeting of the Committee on Campus Athletics.

3. Regular season, non-conference* athletic travel or competition shall not take place during official university final exam periods.

4. Regular season, non-conference* athletic travel or competition shall not take place on official university study days.

5. Waivers, submitted in writing to the applicable campus/PSUAC Faculty Athletics Representative requesting approval for non-conference* competitions scheduled on a study day, will be considered by the Committee on Campus Athletics. Waiver requests must be received with the applicable fall and/or spring schedules as noted in a. or b. above and must include:
   1. full rationale for the need to schedule a competition on a study day, including reasons alternate dates are not possible;
   2. actual study day hours occupied for the competition, including preparations, travel, completion, and post competition activities;
   3. a specific plan that replaces official university study day hours lost to the competition in question with alternative, supervised study hours;
   4. a plan to avoid future competitions on official university study days; and
   5. the number of team missed class days scheduled for the semester in question.

6. Where a team competition schedule that has been approved by the Committee on Campus Athletics must be revised due to unforeseen circumstances:
   1. If a team competition schedule revision results in no increase, or a decrease, beyond the approved schedule missed class time, the applicable campus/PSUAC Faculty Athletics Representative must be notified of the schedule change.
   2. If a team competition schedule revision results in an increase in the missed class days previously approved, but there are fewer than eight (8) missed class days in
the revised schedule, the applicable campus/PSUAC Faculty Athletics Representative must review the schedule change.

3. If a team competition schedule revision results in an increase resulting in greater than eight (8) missed class days in the revised schedule, the applicable campus/PSUAC Faculty Athletics Representative will review the schedule change in collaboration with the Committee on Campus Athletics and provide a decision.

4. The Committee on Campus Athletics and the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee must be notified of all team schedule revisions where missed class days exceed eight (8) in a summary report by the applicable campus/PSUAC Faculty Athletics Representative.

* “Non-conference” means that contest arrangements, including time and date of the competition, are under the control of the applicable Penn State University campus and an applicable Division III conference, the PSUAC, NCAA, USCAA, or other outside agency.

7. Every effort must be made by to avoid league (applicable conference, PSUAC, NCAA, etc.) scheduled contests and associated travel on university scheduled final exam days and study days. Where league contests are scheduled during official university final exam periods or study days, campus athletics programs are strongly encouraged to replace official university study day hours lost to the competition in question with alternative, supervised study hours.

B. Where competition contracts include, or may include, competitions during official university exam periods or on study days, the competition date(s) must be approved by the Committee on Campus Athletics, on behalf of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, prior to execution of the contract.

C. Athletic teams or individual team members may be absent from the University for no more than eight (8) class days in one semester. The number of class days missed by each team shall be kept on record by the Committee on Campus Athletics and each Division III and PSUAC campus athletic department and Faculty Athletics Representative. It shall be the joint responsibility of those bodies to enforce these limitations.

1. One full class day absence is counted if student athletes are absent from classes beginning prior to 12:00 pm.
2. One half class day absence is counted if student athletes are absent from classes beginning between 12:00 pm and 5:00 p.m.
3. No absence is counted when student-athlete absences begin after 5:00 p.m.
4. No absence is counted for absences due to championship competitions.

Start time to determine missed class time shall be based on the class dismissal time as stipulated on the schedule and not on the contest start time. Dismissal time is determined by the appropriate athletic department personnel (i.e. coaches and athletic directors) in consultation with the applicable campus/PSUAC Faculty Athletics Representative.
D. Participation in special events outside approved scheduled events by teams or individual team members must be approved by the Committee on Campus Athletics, in consultation with the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, at least ten days prior to participation. As in all events, NCAA Division III and/or other athletic conference regulations and University regulations will be followed.

E. Team practice times should be arranged so as to allow student-athletes flexibility in scheduling and attending classes each semester. If possible, team practice times should be made available prior to student-athlete class preferential scheduling for the semester affected. Every effort should be made to adjust team practice times to avoid conflict with student-athlete class schedules.

1. Morning team practices should conclude with sufficient time to allow 1st period (8:00 a.m. – 8:50 a.m.) class attendance on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.
2. Morning team practices should conclude with sufficient time to allow 13th period (9:05 a.m. – 10:20 a.m.) class attendance on Tuesday and Thursday.
3. Afternoon team practices should begin sufficiently after 8th period concludes (4:25 p.m.) on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday to allow class attendance.
4. Afternoon team practices should begin sufficiently after 17th period concludes (4:20 p.m.) on Tuesday and Thursday to allow class attendance.
5. Morning Team practices should not be scheduled during both Fall and Spring semesters.
6. Significant departures from the practice guidelines listed above must be approved by the applicable Division III or PSUAC campus Athletics Director, in consultation with the campus/PSUAC Faculty Athletics Representative. The applicable campus/PSUAC Faculty Athletics Representative shall provide an annual report of cases where significant departures have occurred and submit for review by Committee on Campus Athletics.

V. Delegation of Authority

A. The Division III Faculty Athletics Representatives shall perform such duties as specified by their respective campus Chancellor.

B. The PSUAC representative shall perform such duties as specified by the Vice-President of Commonwealth Campuses.

C. The Faculty Athletics Representatives shall act on behalf of their respective faculty to certify student-athlete eligibility, to monitor class absences, and to review and approve athletics schedules prior to submission to the Committee on Campus Athletics.

D. Each of the Faculty Athletics Representatives shall report a summary of their activities annually to the Committee on Campus Athletics and biennially to the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee.
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Report on Results Will Vary* and Campus Climate Issues

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

Summary of Charge and Analysis
The Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment was charged with exploring the possibility of commissioning or soliciting a series of role plays to address climate questions on campus. More specifically, we were asked to review Results Will Vary*, a Penn State theatrical production, to determine if it was (or could be) an appropriate framework for addressing campus climate issues. Our Committee determined that the production had the potential to address important climate issues if certain conditions were met. These conditions are described in our recommendations below.

Background
In Fall 2018, the EECE Committee invited Drs. Ann Clements and Sonia DeLuca Fernández to meet with us to discuss Results Will Vary*. They explained that the production emerged out of the need to infuse diversity education into the arts, and vice-versa. Similar productions had been successfully piloted at other universities, so several faculty and staff members with theater backgrounds decided to launch a program at Penn State. In March 2018, they held a call-out and selected the cast. At least half of the cast members were minority or LGBTQ students. The show, which students wrote in ten days, featured vignettes meant to represent student experiences at Penn State, as well as highlight services offered on campus.

The production was piloted in the summer of 2018 at University Park. Approximately 1,400 students attended the performance during the June-July summer session, and another 300 attended it in August.

After each performance, attendees were asked to complete a post-viewing survey. More specifically, they were asked to define consent and describe its importance, identify resources on campus, and articulate the importance of diversity and inclusion at Penn State. Using a five-point scale where 5.0 was the highest, the attendees’ mean score was 4.93 out of 5.0.

The production team is continuing to revise the show based on audience feedback. However, they need to raise significant funds to keep the production going. The current “stand-alone” model is expensive. With this model, the production would run for at least eight weeks with two
performances a day. Most of the cost would go toward renting spaces and paying a cast of ten students. The production would be more economically viable if it was shown for a limited time during New Student Orientation.

Recommendations
Based on our discussions with Dr. Clements and Dr. DeLuca Fernández, the EECE Committee recommends:

1) Results Will Vary* should be performed exclusively during Convocation at University Park. This would guarantee a captured audience of about 6,000-8,000 students and reduce the financial burden, as there would only be one production. All attendees should be given a resource packet, at minimum, the Red Folder.

2) The production team should create a video of the performance that could be used in classrooms across the Commonwealth to reinforce key themes and concepts. All instructors of First Year Seminars should be strongly encouraged to show this video to students during the first weeks of class. These screenings could be followed by an in-class discussion facilitated by trained peer educators. Members of the EECE could collaborate with the production team and peer educators to ensure that the debriefing curriculum adequately addresses campus climate issues.

3) A series of academic scenarios should be added to the performance. These would address climate issues within the classroom (e.g. micro-aggressions, sexism, racism, heterosexism, etc.). EECE could provide guidance on the development of these vignettes.

4) The University should make a commitment to permanently fund the Results Will Vary* production and curriculum. Funding from multiple sources would encourage collaboration.
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Revision to AC-14 “Academic Administrative Evaluation”

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

Rationale
The current version of AC-14 “Definition of Academic Ranks” (formerly AD-14) does not include assessment from faculty in the annual academic administrative evaluations. The committee researched evaluative processes utilized by comparable institutions to initiate this revision. The intent of the annual evaluation from faculty is to enhance administrative performance and encourage development in an atmosphere of shared governance.

Recommendation
The committee recommends that AC-14 “Academic Administrative Evaluation” be modified in the following way:

Please note that additions appear in **bold**.

**PURPOSE:**
To describe the organization and functioning of an academic administrative office, and to provide for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the leadership in carrying out the functions of the office, in light of the organization and other factors which may impinge on the office. To provide assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the operations of that office and its incumbent leadership for the purpose of improving the functioning of the office.

To make recommendations, as deemed appropriate, to the next highest academic administrative officer based on the information developed on the organization and functioning of an academic administrative office and the resulting evaluation of the effectiveness of the leadership of that office. The recommendations are to be directed at the improvement of the office and its leadership. If there are instances where a change in leadership is proposed, this information is to be included. However, it is the prerogative of the next highest administrative officer to make decisions regarding a possible change in leadership.

**DEFINITION:**
For the purpose of this policy, an academic administrative office is one which reports directly or indirectly to either the Executive Vice President and Provost or the Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean of the College of Medicine. In addition to Vice Presidents', Academic Deans, and Chancellors, such offices shall include the following: offices of Assistant and Associate Vice Presidents; Assistant and Associate Deans; Department or Division Heads; Directors of Research Units; and Directors of Academic Affairs at the non-University Park locations.
PROCESS:
Because of the diversity of the University, the specific process for periodic review of academic administrative officers and their offices is not prescribed for each unit.

Each academic administrative officer directly responsible to either the Executive Vice President and Provost or the Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean of the College of Medicine shall, in consultation with either the Executive Vice President and Provost or the Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean of the College of Medicine and the appropriate administrative and faculty groups for this office, develop a process for the review of those academic administrative officers and their offices reporting to him or her within guidelines listed below. [Add] There are two opportunities provided for academic administrative feedback:

1. annual review from the administrative unit faculty; and 2. a more broadly cast assessment that may involve peer reviews from related units.

ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEWS of ADMINISTRATORS
In an effort to enhance performance review and development, each academic administrative officer and their office shall receive feedback from faculty within their unit on an annual basis. The mechanism for collecting the Faculty Reviews of Administrative Effectiveness (FRAE) will be announced and made available to faculty by the administrator's immediate reporting office. Resultant feedback will be provided to the academic administrator. Such feedback is intended to be formative and provide timely input on significant issues within the unit, if any are present.

FIVE YEAR ASSESSMENT [End Add]
The processes shall without exception include mechanisms whereby a central office at the provost’s level, as well as faculty of the pertinent unit shall be informed when the review is started, when the review is completed, and that the next highest academic administrative officer has been informed of the results of the review and has prepared and distributed a summary to faculty and staff in the academic unit.

GUIDELINES:
Academic administrative officers and their offices ordinarily shall be reviewed at regular intervals. The offices of Deans and their Associate or Assistant Deans, as well as Chancellors and the Directors of Academic Affairs, may be scheduled for simultaneous or separate reviews. Such reviews, however, shall be conducted in addition to conventional annual evaluations. The typical period between reviews shall be five years; however, some flexibility is afforded depending upon circumstances. It is always desirable to initiate an exit review when a principal academic office is vacated, e.g., by resignation or retirement, [Add] when significant issues are indicated in the annual review, [End Add] or when significant changes are proposed.

Responsibility for initiating and implementing the periodic review of academic administrative officers and their offices rests with the administrator at the next highest level. Academic members of the unit being reviewed shall be significantly involved in the review process. Appropriate academic members from other related units, and academic administrative peers, are recommended to be included in the review process.
The general results of the review shall be made known to the responsible academic administrative officer by the next highest academic administrative officer. Within 30 days, the administrator under review shall submit a response concerning actions taken, underway, and planned. In general terms that do not violate the confidentiality of the review or the incumbent’s response, the administrator supervising the review shall prepare a summary of the major findings and the incumbent’s objectives and goals for the next five years. This summary shall be distributed to faculty and staff in the academic unit. Confidentiality of personnel evaluations shall be maintained.

As part of the conventional annual review referenced above, each administrator shall submit to his or her supervisor a progress report based on the five-year goals enumerated in his or her most recent AC14 review or if prior to the administrator’s first AC14 review, goals outlined in consultation with his or her supervisor.

**FURTHER INFORMATION:**
For questions, additional detail, or to request changes to this policy, please contact the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

**Most recent changes:**
- May 1, 2018 - Moved from Administrative Policy (AD14) to Academic Policy (AC14). Editorial change - updated name of the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

**Revision History (and effective dates):**
- November 14, 2014 - Both the 'PROCESS' and 'GUIDELINES' sections were updated to reflect recommendations for improvement to the academic administrative evaluation process, as recommended by the University Faculty Senate. Also, policy steward information has been added, in the event that there are questions or requests for changes to the policy.
- September 4, 2007 - Editorial changes; changed 'Campus Executive Officer' to 'Chancellor.'
- June 15, 2006 - Revision History added.
- March 15, 1999 - Both the 'DEFINITION' and 'PROCESS' sections were changed to state that an academic administrative office(r) reports/is responsible to EITHER the Executive Vice President and Provost OR The Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and the Dean of the College of Medicine, as applicable, in carrying out this evaluation process.
- March 17, 1997 - Position Titles updated. Revisions to "Requesting An Exceptional Use" section.
- August 1, 1994 - Academic Administrative Evaluation - The title of Dr. Brighton was corrected from "Executive Vice Provost," to "Executive Vice President and Provost." Also, reference to Directors of Academic Affairs at the "campuses" was revised to "Non-University Park locations."
- February 26, 1988 - Major Revisions.
- November 9, 1983 - Position title changes.
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(Shaded areas in [square brackets] reflect revisions made during Senate meeting.)

Revision to AC-21 “Definition of Academic Ranks”

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

Rationale
The current version of AC-21 “Definition of Academic Ranks” (formerly HR-21) can be misconstrued with regard to the total number of ranks available to non-tenure-line faculty and the relationships between those ranks with regard to the role of terminal and non-terminal degrees. After exhaustive consultation, the committees established that there are three ranks, not four ranks, for non-tenure-line faculty. Clarification to this end improves interpretation of AC-21, especially during implementation.

While the recommended change to AC-21 seeks only to clarify rather than transform AC-21’s original meaning, there are still noteworthy implications of this clarification. The primary implication of this understanding of AC-21 is that there are only three parallel ranks; there are not four ranks, even if titles seem to implicate this interpretation to some. Related implications are associated with making recommendations about promotions. AC-21 currently reads, “only faculty of higher rank than the candidate should make recommendations about promotions.” If the recommendations in this report are followed, then this would imply, for example, where unit-level guidelines permit, faculty who do not have a terminal degree but who have been promoted to Associate [Teaching, Research or Clinical] Professor (i.e., the highest rank available to them) may serve on committees to consider promotion to [Teaching, Research or Clinical] Professor for candidates who do have a terminal degree.

As a matter of course, the committees acknowledge that exceptions to this recommendation are possible. Per AC-21, “If there should be insufficient numbers of higher-ranked fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty, exceptions to this provision may be permitted by the Executive Vice President and Provost at the request of the academic unit.”

Recommendation
The committees recommend that AC-21 “Definition of Academic Ranks” be modified in the following way:

Please note that additions appear in bold.

…

FIXED-TERM RANKS and PROMOTION PROCEDURES:
Fixed-term ranks and titles should follow the guidelines set forth above for teaching, research, and clinical faculty, as well as librarians. Units should have clear rationales for the different
ranks and titles they choose to use and their expectations for faculty to achieve these various ranks.

Rather than use the titles "lecturer" and "instructor" interchangeably for fixed-term appointments, each college should determine for itself which of the two titles it chooses to use, and then use that title consistently for such appointments.

Colleges should have their own guidelines for distinguishing between lecturer/instructor, assistant/associate/full professor positions for designating a third rank beyond that of lecturer or for promoting from one rank to the other, but all units should operate under the following University assumptions:

1. Although there can be exceptions, positions above the first rank are designed to be promotion opportunities, with a recommended period of at least five years in rank as an instructor or lecturer (or, for fixed-term and standing faculty without tenure who hold terminal degrees, assistant teaching/research/clinical professors) before consideration for promotion. Fixed-Term and Standing non-tenure-line faculty should become eligible for promotion to the second rank after five years in rank, and would be permitted to compile their promotion dossiers in their fifth year. There should be no fixed time period for promotion to the third rank. Reviews for promotions should be conducted solely with regard to the merit of the candidate.

2. Reviews for promotion of the full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty shall be conducted by Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committees. Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committees shall be constituted as follows: each of the colleges at University Park shall establish a committee for that college; each of the five stand-alone campuses (Abington, Altoona, Behrend, Berks, Harrisburg) shall establish a committee for that campus; each of the Special Mission Campuses (Great Valley, College of Medicine, and Dickinson Law) shall establish a committee for that campus; and the University College shall establish one committee composed of full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty members, at least two members of that unit's Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committee shall be drawn from another unit's Non-Tenure-Line Promotion Review Committee. Only full-time fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty members in each unit are eligible to serve on and to vote for the members of the review committee in their unit. Only faculty of higher rank than the candidate should make recommendations about promotions. [Add] This implies, for example, [where unit-level guidelines permit,] faculty who do not have a terminal degree but who have been promoted to Associate [Teaching, Research or Clinical] Professor (i.e., the highest rank available to them) may serve on committees to consider promotion to [Teaching, Research or Clinical] Professor for candidates who do have a terminal degree.[End Add] If there should be insufficient numbers of higher-ranked fixed-term and standing non-tenure-line faculty, exceptions to this provision may be permitted by the Executive Vice President and Provost at the request of the academic unit.
3. The promotion procedure itself should include recommendations by both a campus/department faculty committee, (b) the DAA or department/division head, and (c) the approval of the campus chancellor and/or dean of the college.

4. All promotions should be accompanied by a promotion raise, in addition to a merit raise, to be determined and funded by the college.

5. Faculty members who are promoted shall be considered for a multi-year contract. If a multi-year contract is not granted, then factors that shaped this decision shall be communicated to the fixed-term faculty member at the time when a new contract is offered.

6. The exceptions to this policy are the College of Medicine, the Colleges of Law (Dickinson and University Park), and the University Libraries, since their faculty have for many years been hired off the tenure-track and do not create confusion about their relation to tenure-track faculty.
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Overview

Open at Penn State promotes and supports Penn State activities in pursuit of providing openly available scholarly output, including research outputs such as data and publications. Open at Penn State is part of a broad international conversation and is one of many related efforts to promote open access to scholarly research. With Open at Penn State, Penn State works in conjunction with peers in the Big Ten, such as Illinois, Indiana, Purdue, and Rutgers; across the United States, such as Harvard University, MIT, and the University of California System; and internationally, such as Cambridge University, JISC (UK), University of Freiburg, Project Deal (Germany), and the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU).

In March 2017, Provost Nick Jones and Dean of University Libraries and Scholarly Communications Barbara Dewey charged the Penn State Open Access Task Force to investigate and recommend opportunities to promote open and free access to Penn State scholarly output to maximize impact and availability of research and establish Penn State as a leader in the international Open Access Movement. The task force was asked to: 1) draft a policy statement on Open Access for Penn State; 2) recommend procedures for implementing the policy; and 3) recommend a suite of strategies to advance the Open at Penn State Initiative. Recommendations in this report have also been aligned with the university Open Educational Resources (OER) Working Group.1

We ask the University Faculty Senate to endorse this recommended Open Access Policy.

Background

National & International Expectations

Some basic assumptions of the Open Access movement are that:

1. Publicly funded research should be made available to the public.
2. Open Access and Open Source promote timely and innovative research.
3. Open Access and Open Education resources may help address affordability of education.
4. Open Access can help address the academic journal subscription cost inflation crisis.

Penn State Expectations

As one of the nation's largest research institutions, Penn State expects to adopt a leadership position with respect to Open Access. Specific expectations are that Penn State will:

1 https://oer.psu.edu/
1. Ensure that faculty scholarship is available to the Commonwealth, the nation, and the world, in accordance with the university’s land grant status.

2. Better utilize its resources by eliminating the need to pay subscription fees to access research undertaken by its own faculty.

3. Comply with all relevant external requirements (granting agency requirements, federal requirements, contractual obligations) with respect to Open Access.

4. Take an integrated approach to Open Access, Open Data, and Open Source, with integrated systems that allow faculty to comply with one or all of their Open responsibilities in one place.

5. Maintain and/or participate in a leadership-quality Open Access, Open Data, and Open Source repositories, with tight integration of all three repositories.

6. Take a leadership position amongst BTAA and Pennsylvania peer institutions with respect to Open Access, Open Data, Open Educational Resources, and Open Source.
   a. Penn State should become one of the leading BTAA institutions, joining Rutgers, Indiana, Illinois, and Purdue, with an Open Access Policy as well as becoming the first BTAA institution with an integrated approach across the Open ecosystem.

7. Increase the visibility of university research by participating in Open initiatives.

8. Ensure that its Open Access Policy places minimal burden on faculty:
   a. Penn State faculty must not experience increased difficulty in placing articles into journals, regardless of whether those journals have Open Access-friendly policies.
   b. Penn State faculty must not be burdened by the logistics of complying with the policy; processes must be streamlined, automated, transparent, and require minimal effort on the part of faculty.

9. Develop a strategy for leveraging consortia memberships to expand PSU’s Open Access impact, including the development of a framework for reviewing and selecting consortia.

10. Ensure that there is a plan for educating the Penn State community about the proposed Open Access policy, and about related implementation details.

11. Ensure that there is a plan for implementing the policy over time, both at a technical level and at a cultural level.

12. Ensure that there is a plan for sustainably funding any ongoing operations related to communications and compliance with the policy, as well as infrastructure requirements.

13. Create a plan, with specific commitments, with the intention of shifting funding from journal subscriptions to supporting, publishing, and disseminating open access research in support of PSU long term objectives and strategic planning.²

Current National & International Environment

1. Federal grants and other funders may require open research and scholarly outputs.

2. The Budapest OA Initiative, the Bethesda Statement, and the Berlin Declaration are the founding documents of OA. They form the basis of most institutional statements on OA.

3. AAU and APLU Report (Nov. 2017)

² Examples of some experimental OA initiatives are in Table 2 (p. 7) here https://scholarsphere.psu.edu/downloads/6m900nt15x. A 2.5% spending proposal can be found here: https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/14063.
a. Goals: “universities will need to…actively support and promote research data sharing; standard research data management practices will need to be…adopted across research universities to promote interoperability among institutions and retain academic control of data products and sharing”

b. Recommendations: “Establish principles and an efficient process by which researchers hand off the stewardship of the data to the institution...Implement policies to support public access to data. Policies to support data sharing should be consistent with an institution’s research policies, such as those governing the institutional review board, controlled unclassified information, and conflict of interest.”

4. 130 Open Access Policies have been implemented in the United States as of July 2018.3

5. In an increasingly data-driven environment, Open Data has become invaluable to extend the usage of research activities and promoting interdisciplinary research. Many institutions, government agencies, and individual researchers, across many fields of study, have placed data sets online, available with minimal or no licenses, for use by all. As Penn State researchers benefit from these resources, so too is there an obligation to contribute to these resources via national field-specific data repositories or via Penn State's own repository services.

6. In September 2018, Science Europe’s Coalition S adopted a radical open access strategy requiring their $8.8 billion yearly funded research be published in fully Open Access journals with mandated immediate access starting January 1, 2020.4

Current Penn State Environment
Penn State provides many Open Access services to its faculty, staff, and students, mainly based in the University Libraries. These services include:

1. The University Faculty Senate adopted a non-binding Open Access resolution in 2015. This policy does not require deposit of scholarly work, merely encourages it.

2. PSU provides Open Access oriented services, including: the institutional repository (ScholarSphere), Open Access Publishing, Open Educational Resources, Open Data and Open Source services, Penn State Press Unlocked, and the Data Commons, and Copyright expertise/guidance.

3. PSU Libraries also provides other OA support through an Open Access Liaison program that disseminates relevant information to all colleges and campuses across the university.

4. PSU Libraries provides financial support to organizations developing an open scholarly commons, such as arXiv.

5. PSU Libraries subscriptions and memberships reduce the cost of APCs for Penn State affiliates publishing in certain Gold OA journals, such as those published by BioMed Central.

---

3 ROAR MAP: http://roarmap.eprints.org/. A Harvard Open Access Model Policy is available complete with explanatory annotations and is freely available for adoption by other institutes.

4 See https://www.scienc.eu/coalition-s/.
6. Penn State joined the Open Textbook Network in 2017\(^5\) and called for 3-5 participants to author Open Textbooks. The Affordable Course Transformation project is underway, replacing high cost materials with OER and lower cost materials with the support of Libraries.

7. PSU OER Repository\(^6\) (launched in 2007 by the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences) was enhanced in 2017-2018 and the OER Working Group is recommending its adoption as a University-wide supported repository.

8. Penn State has held Open Access Week, an annual event promoting the open access movement, every year for ten years.

Penn State authors and researchers experience a variety of administrative- and publication-related hurdles, including:

1. A confusing and outdated IP policy
2. A confusing and time-consuming article deposit process that fails to make published research immediately accessible
3. Difficulties negotiating with publishers
4. Inconsistent University permissions, policies, and procedures
5. Lack of comprehensive policies and procedures relating to releasing open source code
6. A promotion and tenure process that does not incentivize open publication of scholarly works and continues to promote the types of publications that burden the finances of the university without any concomitant benefit of either free access or free publication.
   a. Penn State Libraries spends $17 million per year on collections – about $13M on licensing databases and electronic journals. None of this collections budget is allocated to permanent access to research or earmarked for efforts to promote structural changes that move scholarly publishing to open publications instead of journal subscriptions. Significant journal subscription cuts would have to be made to redirect funds to permanent structural changes.
   b. The level of spending on academic journals is unsustainable at Penn State; journal cost inflation has been covered by only temporary increases.

Policy
We recommend the University Faculty Senate endorse this comprehensive Open Access Policy, with proposed text below. The recommended policy has the following features:

- The policy ensures that researchers will continue to be free to submit their work to the journals of their choice. The policy does not require submission to an open access journal, but rather will result in an increase in the amount of Penn State research available in an open access repository.
- Because the policy does not require submission to an open access journal, it also does not require researchers to pay article processing charges to make their work open access.


\(^{6}\) [https://open.ems.psu.edu/](https://open.ems.psu.edu/)
• The policy does not transfer copyright ownership of scholarly works to Penn State.
• The policy’s waiver option guarantees that researchers are free to decide for or against open access for each of their publications on a publication-by-publication basis. The policy merely shifts the default from not depositing and closed access to deposit and open access. The granting of waiver requests is automatic under this open access policy.
• The policy increases the availability of Penn State scholarship to the Commonwealth, the nation, and the world, in accordance with the university's land grant status.

Proposed Open Access Policy

Introduction

The Pennsylvania State University is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible. As Pennsylvania's only land-grant university, Penn State is dedicated to making scholarly research available to all stakeholders within the Commonwealth and around the world through its mission of teaching, research, and public service. This policy builds on the recommendations put forth in the Open Access Resolution adopted by the University Senate in April 2015.

Policy

In keeping with its mission, Penn State adopts the following Open Access Policy:

University Researchers grant permission to the University to make available their scholarly articles to the public. Specifically, each University Researcher grants a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of their scholarly articles, in any medium, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit, and to authorize others to do the same. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership of scholarly works to Penn State. Copyright ownership remains with University Researchers, subject to this license. Upon express direction by a University Researcher, application of the license will be waived for a particular article or access to the article will be delayed for a specified period of time.

Scope

University Researchers shall include faculty members and other paid or unpaid researchers—including but not limited to faculty, post-docs, graduate students, and staff—at Penn State who produce research related to their agreements with PSU.

The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a University Researcher except for any articles completed before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the University Researcher entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy.

Deposit

No later than the date of an article’s publication University Researchers will provide an electronic copy of the author’s accepted manuscript to Penn State at no charge in an appropriate format (such as PDF). The University may make the article available to the public in an open access repository.
Interpretation/Changes
The Office of the Provost will be responsible for interpreting this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending policy changes to the Faculty from time to time. The policy will be reviewed after three years and a report presented to the Faculty.

Guidelines - Instructional Materials
Further, units are encouraged to make university-owned instructional materials and other university-owned materials openly available when appropriate, including University-directed works (see IP01). Owners of instructional materials not owned by the university are also encouraged to make these materials openly available. Open availability may include a Creative Commons or other public or open-source license. Whether to release a University-directed work under an open license shall be determined by the Head/Dean of the administrative unit, or their designate.

Guidelines - Other Materials
University Researchers are further encouraged to make presentation slides, presentation notes, unpublished reports, works in progress, data sets, software, software versions and other distinct contributions, and other scholarly communications openly available when appropriate.

We recommend the following:

1. The University Faculty Senate should endorse this comprehensive Open Access Policy. In 2015, the Senate unanimously adopted an Open Access Resolution.
2. The university should revise and modernize its intellectual property (IP) guidelines to facilitate the sharing of faculty-created research and data. The current IP policies and publication-related procedures should be updated to better accommodate, encourage, and value Open Access activities. Intellectual property policy changes will ensure that open licensing of instructional and administrative materials may be achieved quickly and easily.
3. The university should provide a standardized addendum that university researchers may use in their individual negotiations with publishers and should engage in systematic outreach for blanket deposit agreements for university researchers.
4. The university should invest in services to sustain an Open Access program over time in order to ensure that Penn State maintains a leadership position in the Open Access movement. At a minimum, such a service should include:
   a. mediated automated deposit of scholarly articles into appropriate repositories
   b. the creation of data and altmetrics collection processes to measure open access impact including transparent reporting of acquisitions and measurement of open access data and records
   c. a process for communicating with stakeholders
5. Penn State publishing activities should promote publication of open access journals and other open publication formats.
6. The university should consider promotion and tenure guidelines that assign value to research output made available under the Open Access policy.
7. The university should implement procedures to support the ability of Penn State research and operational units to license software they develop under open licenses and contribute to open-source projects.

8. The University Libraries should negotiate Open Access rights to Penn State authored works as part of journal subscription contracts, including but not limited to Read & Publish practices.

9. The university should provide guidance on how to avoid predatory publishers when selecting publication venues and making editorial commitments.

10. The university should invest in services to identify and aggregate information about the research output of Penn State to streamline the technical implementation of the Open Access policy.

11. The university should standardize and streamline administrative procedures to minimize individual researcher time: permissions, available licenses, and Article Processing Charge (APC) payments.
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Introduction and Rationale

Intercollege Graduate Degree Programs (IGDPs) offering the Ph.D. at Penn State are an important mechanism to provide outstanding interdisciplinary research training that prepares future research leaders. Penn State currently has 11 IGDPs offering the PhD; of those, two were particularly highly ranked in the 2006 National Research Council Assessment of Research Doctorate Programs: Plant Biology (ranked at the very top of its field nationally) and Materials Science and Engineering (see Penn State summary here: http://gradschool.psu.edu/prospective-students/nrc/programs-top-ranked-notable-overallpdf/).

In reviewing The Graduate School’s 2008 Report of the Task Force on Interdisciplinary Graduate Education (available at: http://gradschool.psu.edu/about-us/stratplanandtfrpts/tfrptidgredforacgepdf/), the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (SCoRSCA) noted that:

“Existing institutional structure of resource allocation through colleges/departments is limiting to the proliferation, scope and impact of intercollege programs; a mandate to colleges to support and invest in such programs, as well as central resources for incentives are needed.”

Given the importance of IGDPs to interdisciplinary research education at Penn State, and with almost 10 years elapsed since that Graduate School Task Force report, in December 2017 SCoRSCA surveyed IGDP leaders to assess the current state of these important educational programs. To accomplish this, SCoRSCA partnered with The Graduate School to craft a basic survey. The survey included the following questions:

1. How many students do you plan to matriculate each year?
2. Is this the ideal number of incoming students for your program? If not, are you restricted by available funds to support first year students? Are any other issues restricting the number of students in your program?
3. What is the source of funding for 1st year students in your program?
4. Do you use program funds to support all students in subsequent years?
5. Do you use program funds to support students who unexpectedly have no support after the first year? If so, please briefly describe under what conditions you will use program funds for this purpose.
6. Do you have access to funds other than those regularly budgeted for your program to support students? If so, where are these funds coming from?
7. Other than funding, what are the barriers for sustainability and growth of your program?
8. Any suggestions to improve and grow your program?

In FA 2017 this survey was sent to the program chairs of all IGDPs offering the PhD:

1. Agricultural and Biological Engineering
2. Acoustics
3. Bioinformatics and Genomics
4. Bioengineering
5. Ecology
6. Energy, Environmental, and Food Economics
7. Materials Science and Engineering
8. Molecular, Cellular and Integrative Biosciences
9. Neuroscience
10. Integrative and Biomedical Physiology
11. Plant Biology

Ten of the eleven program chairs replied to this survey. The program chairs identified three significant barriers to the long-term sustainability and growth of their programs:

1. **Funding.** Lack of adequate funding is limiting the success of IGDPs (mentioned explicitly by 8 of the 10 responding programs). Because IGDPs do not receive instructional budgets, they do not have teaching assistantships (TAs) to offer first year students (TAs are the primary institutional support mechanism for PhD students). This limitation is frequently compounded by the fact that many departmental programs see IGDPs as competing for resources with the departmental graduate program, and thus do not support faculty members interested in IGDP students (see #2 below). The IDGPs typically assemble first year funding support for PhD students from a variety of sources, including extramural research grants, the Huck Institutes for the Life Sciences (for relevant programs), departmental or college support, The Graduate School (University Graduate Fellowships; other recruitment funds; and assistantships in the case of IGDPs for which the Graduate School serves as the academic home). However, this support is variable across the IGDPs, insufficient for the number of competitive students who apply to most of these programs, and collectively leads to a reliance on extramural funding (particularly beyond year 1). Overreliance on extramural funds due to lack of TAs limits both the growth of these programs, as well as programmatic flexibility, particularly for out-year support (e.g., if a faculty member loses extramural funding).

2. **Status relative to departmental programs.** SCoRSCA was surprised to learn that IGDP students are sometimes viewed as “second class” compared to students in departmentally-based programs. For example, some departments will not use their TAs to support IGDP students being advised by faculty members from their own department. In the case of at least one department, faculty start-up funds are explicitly prohibited from being used for IGDP students. As noted above, this compounds the problem of limited institutional funding provided to IGDPs.
3. **Faculty availability.** Six of the ten responding programs indicated that the limited participation of faculty, particularly funded senior faculty members, is a concern. As the survey was sent only to IGDP chairs, it is unclear why this might be true, and what steps would help remedy this concern.

The survey results were compiled into a preliminary report that that SCoRSCA reviewed in April 2018. After further discussion, the report was shared with the Graduate Council through the Council’s Committee on Graduate Research (CoGR) in late Fall 2018.

After reviewing the survey results, SCoRSCA and CoGR agree the following actions would significantly strengthen interdisciplinary research education through IGDPs at Penn State:

1. Identify sustainable and appropriate funding for IGDPs offering the Ph.D.
2. End departmental and college practices and policies that discriminate against IGDP students.
3. Understand and address the reasons funded senior faculty members have limited participation in some IGDPs.

SCoRSCA and CoGR also note that The Graduate School’s 2008 Task Force report described six “Institutional encumbrances”, three of which (items 1, 2, and 4) identified the same challenges identified in this survey:

1. Stand-alone intercollege programs are often viewed as competing with departmental programs for resources, students and recognition/credit, despite the fact that the “credit” for each IGDP student is assigned formally within the SIS [Student Information System] to the unit of the advisor.
2. Institutional support (e.g., assistantships, fellowships) for students (especially first-year) in intercollege programs is very limited and constraining.

... 4. As intercollege programs do not receive instructional budgets, the primary mechanism for institutional support of graduate students (i.e., TAs) is dissociated from these programs.

The 2008 Report also made one recommendation directly parallel to one of the recommended actions SCoRSCA and CoGR listed above:

1. Collaborative, interdisciplinary graduate education should be a priority reflected in strategic planning at the highest level. As such, Colleges should be given a mandate to more formally promote and support participation and leadership by their academic units and individual faculty in intercollege graduate programs, and to remove disincentives to such participation, and these should be reflected in College strategic plans.

As the Committee was finalizing its report, we received a copy of a comprehensive study of interdisciplinary graduate programs (IDGPs) at multiple institutions conducted by Oregon State University (OSU) entitled “Successful Models for Interdisciplinary Graduate Education in the
US”. While there is much useful information in this report, we highlight here several high-level conclusions that are consistent with the conclusions from our own study:

Factors critical for the success of IDGPs

“Two factors were repeatedly cited as critical for the success of IDGPs: (a) the presence of strong, consistent financial support from the central administration, which could also include contributions from colleges; and (b) a strong, committed, and energetic champion for IDGPs in the graduate school (or college or medical school) in the form of an Associate Dean tasked with this responsibility, and even better, a formal Office of Interdisciplinary Graduate Education.”

Challenges to the Success of IDGPs

“Challenges existed for sustaining IDGPs, other than funding. These included: maintaining faculty engagement, staffing courses specific to IDGPs, competition between degree-granting IDGPs and departmental programs…”

The report also articulated the many important benefits that robust interdisciplinary graduate education programs can bring to the University:

“Institutions with successful IDGPs reported major benefits to their research and training missions. The chief benefits were greatly increased quality, ethnic diversity, and technical backgrounds of incoming students, improved training of students in both “soft” and technical skills through professional development classes and laboratory rotations, increased interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty, increased success with research and training grant proposals, and increased institutional reputation… Student success at the undergraduate level was also promoted by strong IDGPs that attract strong, diverse graduate students because the interdisciplinary graduate students mentor undergraduate researchers, bring an interdisciplinary perspective to the classes they TA, and they act as role models for undergraduate students.”

Recommendation

Given that substantial issues limiting the sustainability and growth of Penn State’s premiere interdisciplinary graduate research education mechanism originally identified nearly 10 years ago remain and constitute serious concerns of the current IGDP leadership, SCoRSCA and CoGR jointly strongly recommend that the Provost establish a University-level Task Force to identify long-term solutions that will address the major issues identified in this report. In particular the Task Force should investigate:

1) programmatic funding of these programs commensurate with their value to the University;

---

1 The task force reviewed practices at 29 institutions, including 11 land grant institutions, and visited 5 institutions, including 4 land grant institutions.
2) the perceived ‘second class’ status of these important educational programs. We further recommend that this Task Force have representation from appropriate University units that control potential funding sources (including, but not limited to, college/department instructional budgets supporting TAs);

3) the feasibility of suggested solutions identified in the 2008 Report such as:

- An endowed graduate college, similar to the Rackham Graduate School at the University of Michigan, should be pursued as a valuable major investment for the University.
- Incentives for academic units to host intercollege, interdisciplinary programs:
  - Establish a central budget from which to allocate funds to academic units willing to provide a “home”, administrative support and academic oversight to IGDPs.

Barriers to Sustainability and Growth of Intercollege Graduate Degree Programs

Advisory/Consultative Report
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PennState
Background and Rationale

• Intercollege Graduate Degree Programs (IGDPs) offering the Ph.D. at Penn State provide important interdisciplinary research training.

• Penn State currently offers 11 IGDPs; several highly ranked nationally.

• Task Force on Interdisciplinary Graduate Education report was published in 2008 so time to assess progress, if any.

• In December 2017 SCoSRCA conducted a survey to assess the current state of these important educational programs.

Main Conclusions from 2017 Survey

There are three significant barriers for long-term sustainability and growth of IGDPs

1. **Funding**
   • Teaching assistantships are an important source of funds to support Ph.D. students. IGDPs do **NOT** receive instructional budgets, so they cannot offer TAs.
   • IGDPs must seek funding from variety of sources, including extramural grants, departmental or college support, and The Graduate School.

2. **Status relative to departmental programs**
   • IGDP students are sometimes viewed as “second class” compared to students in departmentally-based programs

3. **Faculty availability**
   • Limited participation of faculty, particularly funded senior faculty members
Successful Models for Interdisciplinary Graduate Education in the U.S.

Report of the Taskforce on Interdisciplinary Graduate Education Programs.

- Programs evaluated: 29 universities of various sizes, including 11 LGUs.
- Institutions with successful IDGPs reported major benefits to their research and training missions.
- Major factors critical for the success of IDGPs:
  a. A strong, consistent financial support from the central administration and the colleges.
  b. A strong, committed, and energetic champion for IDGPs in the graduate school.
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SCoRSCA and CoGR agree that the following actions are needed

1. Identify sustainable and appropriate funding for IGDPs offering the Ph.D.

2. End departmental and college practices and policies that discriminate against IGDP students.

3. Understand and address the reasons funded senior faculty members have limited participation in some IGDPs.
SCoRSCA and CoGR jointly recommend

The Establishment of a University-level Task Force, with representation from appropriate University units, to:

• Identify long-term solutions to address the need for programmatic funding of these programs commensurate with their value to the University

• Mitigate the perceived “second class” status of these important educational programs.
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Proposed Revisions to Penn State Policy HR68, Postdoctoral Appointments
(Advisory/Consultative)
Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

Introduction and Rationale

The Office of Postdoctoral Affairs, which is part of the Office of the Vice President for Research, conducts workshops and seminars on professional development topics, career explorations, Individual Development Plans, and career preparation for both academic and non-academic jobs. The Office also provides mentoring and education plans for postdoc fellowships and faculty grants.

The Office of Postdoctoral Affairs receives many questions on leave, both paid and unpaid, and about ending appointments prematurely due to performance issues. A task force, with Pallavi Eswara, Dr. Neil Sharkey, Katherine Allen, Kari Allatt and, until her departure as Director of Office of Postdoctoral Affairs, Dr. Suzanne Adair, was formed to address these questions, clarify existing policies, and standardize procedures.

Balancing faculty resources, postdoc expectations, University policy, and benchmarking with the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA), the task force revised HR68. Clarifications included duration of leave, unpaid leave, responsibility for clearing appointment, and grievance procedures. New sections included international appointments, holidays, expanded sections on paid leave and leaves of absence (unpaid), expectations of performance during post-doc training, and termination of position.

At the April 24, 2018 meeting of the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA), Pallavi Eswara (Director, Office of Postdoctoral Affairs) presented the revised HR68 Postdoctoral Appointments policy.

RSCA asked for changes to note the variability in holidays/shutdown periods between campuses, and suggested a few other corrections. After consultation with the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs and with the Office of the Associate Dean for Research, College of Medicine, Ms. Eswara returned on September 18, 2018 to present the revised policy incorporating the requested changes.

Further changes were requested, some of which were quickly incorporated, but others could not be accommodated without further delaying the policy. Considerable time and effort had already been expended on this revised policy, so RSCA voted to send it forward to Senate Council for inclusion on the October 23, 2018 Senate agenda. However, when the revised policy was published in the Senate agenda, some Senators expressed concern and confusion about certain sections of the revised policy, and demanded the opportunity to give more feedback. Upon due consideration, the report was withdrawn.

The task force then addressed the concerns accordingly through more clarifications and wording changes. Many of the issues raised, however, involved current standing policies, not changes or new policies (e.g. 1-year appointments, 4 weeks of paid leave).
Ms. Eswara presented this newly revised policy to the Associate Deans for Research to gather their feedback and, in turn, those Deans solicited feedback from their faculty. She also collected feedback from HR departments in units with postdoctoral fellows. After all the feedback was compiled, further revisions were made to clarify some wording and to modify sections so that they could be used as guidelines, not strict policies.

RSCA discussed the final revised report on March 12, 2019. There were still some concerns about the 5-year total time as a post-doc at PSU. However, there were several arguments for this limit.

1) Post-doctoral positions are defined as temporary training periods by NIH, NSF and the National Postdoc Association.

2) The National Academy of Sciences 2014 Postdoctoral Experience report recommends 5-years (sites.nationalacademies.org/cs/groups/pgasite/documents/webpage/pga_178871.pdf)

3) The current PSU limit is 6 years -- reducing it to 5 years aligns with NIH funding, and the aforementioned NAS report..

4) The limit was benchmarked against our peers, and is more generous than some of our peers, because we do not count time as a post-doc at another institution against the 5 years.

5) Post-doc appointments provide neither opportunities for promotion nor full benefits. There is the option to convert to research professor positions, which cost more, but these allow promotions and eligibility for full benefits.

**Recommendation**

At the March 12, 2019 meeting, the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity voted to endorse the proposed revisions to policy HR68 Postdoctoral Appointments, and to **recommend that the Senate also offer its endorsement of the revised policy.**
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PURPOSE:

To outline the terms and conditions of postdoctoral scholar and postdoctoral fellow appointments. University's policy on postdoctoral appointments.

DEFINITION OF POSTDOCTORAL APPOINTMENTS:

Postdoctoral appointments shall:

1. be full-time, but temporary, one-year appointments which include four (4) weeks of paid leave; 48-week appointments; and
Appendix M
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2. be granted to appointees who recently were awarded a Ph.D. or equivalent doctorate (e.g., Sc.D, M.D., D.D.S., J.D.) in an appropriate field (typically in the last five (5) years) and provide the appointee with training under the supervision of a faculty member of a department; and

3. provide the appointee with training under the supervision of a senior scholar or a department; and

4. involve substantially full-time research or scholarship; and

4. function as a be viewed as preparatory time for careers; for a full-time academic and/or research career; and

5. provide the appointee with the opportunity freedom to meet the expectation of publishing publish the results of her or his research or scholarship during the period of the appointment; and

6. provide the appointee with technical training and opportunities for professional and career development.

DESIGNATED TITLES:

Designated titles for postdoctoral appointments at The Pennsylvania State University are Postdoctoral Fellow and Postdoctoral Scholar. The title of Postdoctoral Fellow will be used only in connection with appointments financed under a Postdoctoral Fellow Program of a granting agency outside the University. The title of Postdoctoral Scholar will be the usual designation for all other postdoctoral appointments.

LENGTH OF APPOINTMENT:

Normally, the initial appointment and renewals are not longer than a six-year period at Penn State, with exceptions granted to meet specific training needs of an individual and only after careful review by the college and appropriate central administrative officer.

Postdoctoral appointments are intended for individuals who have recently completed a Ph.D. or equivalent doctorate typically within five years of completion their degree. Individuals with titles other than postdoctoral fellow or postdoctoral scholar are not covered under this policy.

Appointments are offered as one-year terms with the possibility for renewal. All renewals are contingent upon available funding, satisfactory performance on the part of the postdoctoral scholar/fellow and adherence to all University policies and professional
standards of conduct. No individual shall be appointed to a postdoctoral scholar appointment for more than a total of five years.

If the appointment is not being renewed at the end of the appointment period for any reason, including lack of adequate funding, or the postdoctoral scholar/fellow has reached a maximum of five (5) years in the position, at least 30 days’ notice in advance of the appointment end date must be given. Postdocs are expected to continue performing assigned responsibilities during the notice period.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLEARING APPOINTMENT:

All postdoctoral appointments will be approved by the appropriate dean, and the Office of the Vice President for Research will maintain a current inventory of all appointments.

Prior to extending an offer, the supervising faculty member or department shall demonstrate availability of sufficient funding to cover the twelve (12) month appointment.

INTERNATIONAL APPOINTMENTS:

The University recognizes that there are a significant number of postdoctoral scholars and fellows who are foreign nationals. Supervising faculty members who extend offers to international postdoctoral scholars and fellows must adhere to all applicable federal regulations and University policies regarding their postdoctoral appointments. The individual must be eligible for the appropriate immigration status for the length of the appointment. Faculty and foreign national scholars/fellows should consult with International Scholar Advising, Directorate of International Student and Scholar Advising (JScholarAdv@psu.edu) to ensure compliance with visa requirements regarding offers, renewals, leaves of absence, and exits/terminations. Failure on the part of the postdoctoral scholar/fellow to maintain appropriate work authorizations and/or visa extensions as appropriate will result in termination.

REMUNERATION:

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows should be compensated an amount of no less than the current minimum annual salary provided at https://guru.psu.edu/resources/rates-and-schedules/stipends-for-graduate-assistants

INSURANCE BENEFITS:

Postdoctoral Scholars and Fellows may enroll in an available University-sponsored health plan effective with the date of appointment. Those who enroll will contribute for an available
University-sponsored health plan on the same basis and at the same rates as regular faculty and staff member contributions. Such contributions will be deducted monthly.

In addition, Postdoctoral Scholars and Fellows may enroll in the University's dental and/or vision plan.

Postdoctoral Scholars and Fellows may elect to participate in the Age-graded Life Insurance Plan and elect an amount of coverage equal to their annual stipend not to exceed $50,000. Postdoctoral scholars are not eligible for the University’s mandatory retirement plan; however, they may elect to participate in a supplemental retirement plan through TIAA. See the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs website at http://www.research.psu.edu/offices/office-of-postdoctoral-affairs/postdoc-benefits for coverage details.

HOLIDAYS:

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows are generally eligible to follow the holiday schedules established for their respective campuses. Postdoctoral scholars and fellows will not be expected to perform any duties of the position on official University holidays, including the shutdown period during the December/January holidays at campuses that are closed during that time. If it is necessary for the postdoctoral scholar/fellow to perform their duties on a University holiday, then compensatory time off equivalent to the number of hours worked on the holiday will be provided by the unit. Use of holiday compensatory time off is subject to the approval of the supervising faculty, shall be used prior to other leave, and shall not be paid out at the time of separation. Supervising faculty should provide advanced notice to the postdoctoral scholar/fellow in the event they will be required to work on an official University holiday.

PAID LEAVE:

As part of each one year appointment, postdoctoral scholars/fellows are provided with four (4) weeks or 20 business days of paid leave to cover absences to include, but not be limited to, doctor’s appointments, personal illness, caring for an ill family member, funeral leave, vacation, and other similar situations. The timing and duration of leave must be agreed upon and approved in advance by the postdoc scholar/fellow and supervising faculty member unless circumstance make advanced approval not possible. Unused leave cannot be rolled over from one appointment year to the next or used to extend the appointment at the time of separation from the University. However, unused leave may be used during the last week of the appointment if needed to cover an approved absence. Unused paid leave shall not be paid out to the postdoctoral scholar or fellow at the time of separation.
**SALARY:**

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows should be paid at least the minimum annual salary as noted each July 1.

**LEAVES OF ABSENCE:**

When a postdoctoral scholar or fellow is unable to perform the duties of the position, the four weeks of leave provided by a 48-week appointment can be used to account for the absence. In addition, the department may be able to provide for some work to be done at home (e.g., data analysis), permitting the scholar or fellow to remain in pay status.

Leaves without pay for a reasonable period of time should be considered if they would not inhibit the applicable research project(s).

Guidance for leaves of absence can be sought from the Office of Human Resources Work/Life Office (814-865-9346).

Before a leave of absence is discussed with a foreign national scholar or fellow, the supervisor needs to contact the International Scholars Office (814-865-0423) to insure consistency with federal regulations.

See also the new parent guideline at [http://forms.gradsch.psu.edu/current/newparentaccomodationguideline.pdf](http://forms.gradsch.psu.edu/current/newparentaccomodationguideline.pdf).

Leaves of absence without pay for a reasonable period of time beyond the four (4) weeks of paid leave will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Departments may be able to provide for some work to be completed remotely (e.g., data analysis), permitting the scholar or fellow to remain in pay status.

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows may be eligible for leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act. To the extent that a scholar or fellow is eligible for such leave, it shall run concurrently with paid and unpaid leave under this policy. Whenever a postdoctoral scholar or fellow would like to request a paid or unpaid leave of absence, the scholar or fellow shall contact the Penn State Human Resources, Absence Management Office, absence@psu.edu. The Absence Management Office personnel shall work with the supervising faculty member and the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs at postdocaffairs@psu.edu when vetting and approving such requests.

Before a leave of absence is discussed with an international scholar or fellow, the Penn State Human Resources, Absence Management Office shall contact International Scholar
Advising, Directorate of International Student and Scholar Advising (E-mail: JscholarAdv@psu.edu) to ensure consistency with federal regulations.

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows should refer to New Parent Accommodation guidelines (not an actual policy) given at https://www.research.psu.edu/opa/benefits Postdoctoral scholars and fellows may be eligible for parental leave. Please contact the Absence Management Office to discuss the parameters for parental leave for postdoctoral scholars and fellows.

EXPECTATIONS OF PERFORMANCE:

Every scholar and fellow is expected to exhibit and promote the highest ethical, moral, and professional standards as researchers, future faculty, professionals, and leaders in their respective fields. All postdocs should receive Responsible Conduct of Research training through their faculty mentor, department and/or college. Research misconduct as per https://guru.psu.edu/gfug/appendices/app05-1617.html and https://www.research.psu.edu/researchmisconduct is regarded as a serious offense, raising grave doubt that the scholar or fellow is worthy of continued membership in the postdoctoral community at the University.

In addition to demonstrating satisfactory research progress, fulfillment of assigned duties, and adherence to all University policies, postdocs must maintain proper ethical, moral and professional standards. The primary duties of scholars and fellows are research and scholarship. However, scholars and fellows seeking additional experiences in other areas such as teaching, or consulting should consult with their supervising faculty members prior to accepting any such additional duties. Supervising faculty have the discretion to approve or deny such requests based on the funding criteria, performance and individual circumstance.

It is strongly recommended and expected that all scholars and fellows be provided a written outline of the expectations of the supervising faculty member at the beginning of their appointment. To the extent possible this document should include a description of specific responsibilities. The document should be the first step in developing an Individualized Development Plan (IDP) for the scholar/fellow in order to guide their professional development during their time at the University (See Appendix A). The IDP is extremely helpful in guiding postdoctoral and early career researchers and is required by a growing number of federal funding agencies.

Scholars/fellows should also receive an annual evaluation at the end of each appointment year (See Appendix B). This evaluation will include a written assessment of their
performance, which is to be discussed by the scholar/fellow and the supervising faculty member.

Although it is expected that all scholars and fellows demonstrate satisfactory performance in their research, fulfill all responsibilities outlined by the faculty member, demonstrate professional and ethical standards of behavior, and adhere to all University policies, there are occasions when improvement in one or more of these areas is needed. Failure to meet the expectations identified by the supervising faculty member may result in actions including the implementation of a Plan for Improvement (PFI) and/or sanctions, which may include termination of the appointment. If a supervising faculty member determines that the performance and/or behavior of a scholar or fellow is not meeting expectations, the faculty member should notify and consult with the college’s associate dean for research and unit Human Resources Strategic Partner or Consultant. The supervisor should then meet with the scholar or fellow to notify them that their performance and/or behavior is a concern and develop a PFI (See Appendix C). Once a PFI has been implemented, it is the responsibility of the scholar or fellow to adhere to all parameters outlined in the plan and of the supervising faculty member to monitor and document the scholar or fellow’s progress accordingly. If the scholar or fellow has not demonstrated satisfactory improvement and not met expectations within the time allotted, the faculty member will provide a final written assessment of their performance, along with a termination letter, indicating the specific date that the appointment will end.

All Plans for Improvement must be reviewed and approved by the work unit Human Resources office prior to being implemented with the scholar or fellow. The Penn State Human Resources will consult with other University offices as needed (e.g. Office of Postdoctoral Affairs, Affirmative Action Office, Employee Relations, Office of General Counsel) prior to giving approval to the faculty member to implement the PFI with the scholar or fellow.

TERMINATIONS:

Postdoctoral appointments can be terminated prior to the completion of the contract term for the following reasons:

a) Voluntary resignation.

In the case of a voluntary resignation by the postdoctoral scholar/fellow, the University requests that the postdoctoral scholar/fellow provide a minimum of 30 days’ notice to the faculty supervisor and follow the appropriate exit procedures within the research group and department.
b) Unsatisfactory performance or behavior; research misconduct; or violation of University policy.

If a faculty supervisor is considering termination of a postdoctoral scholar/fellow, they must consult with their unit HR Strategic Partner and/or the Associate Dean of Research, who may consult with other appropriate offices. If the postdoctoral scholar/fellow is being terminated prior to the end of the appointment period due to unsatisfactory performance and/or an unsuccessful performance improvement plan, the postdoctoral scholar/fellow must be given advanced notice. The number of days of notice will be decided on a case-by-case basis.

If the postdoctoral scholar/fellow is being terminated prior to the end of the appointment period due to unsatisfactory behavior, research misconduct, or violation of University policy, the number of days of notice will be determined on a case-by-case basis. In certain cases where the behavior is deemed egregious by the University, termination of the appointment may be effective immediately.

Decisions to terminate postdoctoral scholar/fellow appointments involuntarily for cause must be approved in advance by the college or work unit budget executive or designee. Under any termination of appointment, postdoc scholars/fellows must adhere to University policy HR102 Separation and Transfer Protocol regarding the submission of keys, research equipment and materials, research data and all other University property.

International postdoctoral scholars/fellows must contact the Directorate of International Student and Scholar Advising in the University Office of Global Programs to determine their visa status as a result of the termination.

APPOINTMENTS:

IBIS Forms "GFSA" for appointments, and "GRAD" for changes and reappointments, must be completed in accordance with the approval paths established by your Financial Officer. Postdoctoral Scholars and Fellows should receive an appointment letter outlining the details of their appointment.

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE:

Postdoctoral scholars/fellows fellows or scholars should always attempt to resolve problems concerning their professional situation by discussing the matter with their supervisor. If there is a reason for the postdoctoral fellow or scholar to believe that this avenue is inappropriate, he or she may seek recourse through the department or division or program head, or from the associate or assistant dean of their college or division. The fellow or scholar may also seek advice from the ombudsman HR unit and the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs.
Occasionally, there are disagreements between postdoctoral fellows/scholars and their supervisors that cannot be resolved in the administrative structure of the department, division, program or college. Such problems may involve alleged violations of academic freedom, professional ethics, and procedural fairness and consistency. There may be disagreements concerning authorship credit or intellectual property ownership. If a resolution of such problems cannot be achieved at the department, division, or program level, the following procedures are to be followed. *This procedure is not to be utilized for instances of unsatisfactory performance or behavior by the postdoctoral scholar or fellow.* If for some reason the proper jurisdiction is not clear, then the Vice President for Research shall decide on the appropriate procedure.

1. For disagreements that are unresolved at the department or program level, a grievance process will be initiated when the postdoctoral scholar or fellow files a written grievance with the dean of his or her college. The parties to the grievance process shall be the person(s) filing the grievance and the person(s) responsible for the act or omission that gave rise to the grievance.

2. In response to the grievance, the College Dean appoints and convenes a Hearing Committee consisting of five members. From that time until the hearing ends, the College Dean refrains from involvement in the dispute. The Hearing Committee consists of two postdoctoral scholars or fellows, two faculty members, and an administrator who will serve as chairperson. All members of the Hearing Committee will be from outside the academic department or unit in which either the postdoctoral scholar or faculty member who is involved in the grievance participates.

3. Each party is allowed up to three disqualifications from this committee without cause. An indefinite number of disqualifications is allowed with cause, as determined by the College Dean. The College Dean makes additional appointments as necessary to fully staff the Hearing Committee.

4. The Hearing Committee attempts to resolve the disagreement within 30 calendar days of receiving the complaint.

5. The hearing is not public. During the hearing, either party may have present an adviser, who must be a postdoctoral scholar/fellow, faculty, or a staff member of the University. In light of the nature and spirit of the proceeding, representation by legal counsel is prohibited.

6. The Hearing Committee may have present at the hearing such assistance as it deems necessary.

7. The Hearing Committee is not bound by strict rules of evidence and may admit any relevant evidence.

8. The hearing is audio recorded, and a recording of the hearing is kept through any appeal processes. The parties involved may request to listen to the tape and take written notes until it is destroyed, however, copies are not provided.

9. The parties are afforded an opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary and other evidence. The department or program involved makes all reasonable efforts to cooperate with the committee in securing witnesses and making available documentary and other evidence.

10. Each party has the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. Expenses incurred in obtaining a witness will be the responsibility of the party requesting the witness.
11. The Hearing Committee’s findings are based solely on the hearing record. In cases where issues involve authorship, the Hearing Committee should adhere to the spirit of Policy RA13 IP02.

12. The Hearing Committee submits its findings and recommendations in writing to the College Dean and to the parties involved. Based solely on the record of the hearing, the College Dean may endorse all, part, or none of the Hearing Committee’s recommendations. In coming to a decision, the College Dean may consult with the Vice President for Research. A written notice of the decision of the College Dean is provided to the Hearing Committee and the parties involved within three weeks of receipt by the College Dean of the Hearing Committee’s recommendations. If the College Dean does not endorse all of the findings and adopt all the recommendations of the Hearing Committee, an explanation will be included in the written notice. The decision by the College Dean shall be final, but does not preclude existing independent avenues of appeal (e.g., Faculty Rights and Responsibilities). The record of this decision, along with supporting documents, shall be submitted to the Office of General Counsel and the Vice President for Research and kept by the Vice President for Research for not less than five years from the date of the resolution of the complaint.

13. After the final decision, all efforts should be made to reconcile the situation within the research group. In the rare case where irreconcilable differences exist even after the resolution, and where the decision is made against the faculty member, it will be the responsibility of the College Dean to find another similar position in the University for the postdoctoral fellow or scholar, and, if necessary, to provide bridge funding for this position for up to six months.

**TAX-DEFERRED ANNUITIES:**

Retirement savings options available to Postdoctoral Scholars and Fellows are limited to contributions to either a Traditional or Roth Individual Retirement Account (IRA). Traditional IRAs offer the opportunity to reduce federal taxable income, subject to IRS limitations, when federal income tax returns are filed. IRA enrollment and payments options are done on an individual basis and are unrelated to University benefit programs. Traditional and Roth IRAs are available from insurance companies and mutual fund companies as well as most banks.

**POLICY EXCEPTIONS:**

This policy applies to all individuals designated as postdoctoral scholars and fellows. In extenuating circumstances, exceptions to this policy may be requested to meet specific training or personnel needs. All such requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Any request for an exception must be submitted by the principal investigator or supervising faculty member to the college/unit’s associate dean for research and unit human resources office for review and, if appropriate, forwarded to the director of the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs (OPA) for approval. The director of the OPA will consult with the Vice President for Research if necessary and notify the college’s associate dean for
research and unit human resources office of the final decision. If the request is denied, there is no further level of appeal and the decision will stand.
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PURPOSE:

To outline the terms and conditions of postdoctoral scholar and postdoctoral fellow appointments.

DEFINITION OF POSTDOCTORAL APPOINTMENTS:

Postdoctoral appointments shall:

1. be full-time, but temporary, one-year appointments which include four (4) weeks of paid leave;

2. be granted to appointees who recently were awarded a Ph.D. or equivalent doctorate (e.g., Sc.D, M.D., D.D.S., J.D.) in an appropriate field (typically in the last five (5) years) and provide the appointee with training under the supervision of a faculty member of a department;

3. involve substantially full-time research or scholarship; and

4. function as a preparatory time for careers; and

5. provide the appointee with the opportunity to the results of her or his research or scholarship during the period of the appointment; and

6. provide the appointee with technical training and opportunities for professional and career development.

DESIGNATED TITLES:

Designated titles for postdoctoral appointments at The Pennsylvania State University are Postdoctoral Fellow and Postdoctoral Scholar. The title of Postdoctoral Fellow will be used only in connection with appointments financed under a Postdoctoral Fellow Program of a granting agency outside the University. The title of Postdoctoral Scholar will be the usual designation for all other postdoctoral appointments.

LENGTH OF APPOINTMENT:

Postdoctoral appointments are intended for individuals who have recently completed a Ph.D. or equivalent doctorate typically within five years of completion their degree. Individuals with titles other than postdoctoral fellow or postdoctoral scholar are not covered under this policy.
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Appointments are offered as one-year terms with the possibility for renewal. All renewals are contingent upon available funding, satisfactory performance on the part of the postdoctoral scholar/fellow and adherence to all University policies and professional standards of conduct. No individual shall be appointed to a postdoctoral scholar appointment for more than a total of five years.

If the appointment is not being renewed at the end of the appointment period for any reason, including lack of adequate funding, or the postdoctoral scholar/fellow has reached a maximum of five (5) years in the position, at least 30 days’ notice in advance of the appointment end date must be given. Postdocs are expected to continue performing assigned responsibilities during the notice period.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLEARING APPOINTMENT:

All postdoctoral appointments will be approved by the appropriate dean, and the Office of the Vice President for Research will maintain a current inventory of all appointments.

Prior to extending an offer, the supervising faculty member or department shall demonstrate availability of sufficient funding to cover the twelve (12) month appointment.

INTERNATIONAL APPOINTMENTS:

The University recognizes that there are a significant number of postdoctoral scholars and fellows who are foreign nationals. Supervising faculty members who extend offers to international postdoctoral scholars and fellows must adhere to all applicable federal regulations and University policies regarding their postdoctoral appointments. The individual must be eligible for the appropriate immigration status for the length of the appointment. Faculty and foreign national scholars/fellows should consult with International Scholar Advising, Directorate of International Student and Scholar Advising (JScholarAdv@psu.edu) to ensure compliance with visa requirements regarding offers, renewals, leaves of absence, and exits/terminations. Failure on the part of the postdoctoral scholar/fellow to maintain appropriate work authorizations and/or visa extensions as appropriate will result in termination.

REMUNERATION:

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows should be compensated an amount of no less than the current minimum annual salary provided at https://guru.psu.edu/resources/rates-and-schedules/stipends-for-graduate-assistants
INSURANCE BENEFITS:

Postdoctoral Scholars and Fellows may enroll in an available University-sponsored health plan effective with the date of appointment. Those who enroll will contribute for an available University-sponsored health plan on the same basis and at the same rates as regular faculty and staff member contributions. Such contributions will be deducted monthly.

In addition, Postdoctoral Scholars and Fellows may enroll in the University's dental and/or vision plan.

Postdoctoral Scholars and Fellows may elect to participate in the Age-graded Life Insurance Plan and elect an amount of coverage equal to their annual stipend not to exceed 50,000. Postdoctoral scholars are not eligible for the University’s mandatory retirement plan; however, they may elect to participate in a supplemental retirement plan through TIAA. See the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs website for coverage details.

HOLIDAYS:

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows are generally eligible to follow the holiday schedules established for their respective campuses. Postdoctoral scholars and fellows will not be expected to perform any duties of the position on official University holidays, including the shutdown period during the December/January holidays at campuses that are closed during that time. If it is necessary for the postdoctoral scholar/fellow to perform their duties on a University holiday, then compensatory time off equivalent to the number of hours worked on the holiday will be provided by the unit. Use of holiday compensatory time off is subject to the approval of the supervising faculty, shall be used prior to other leave, and shall not be paid out at the time of separation. Supervising faculty should provide advanced notice to the postdoctoral scholar/fellow in the event they will be required to work on an official University holiday.

PAID LEAVE:

As part of each one year appointment, postdoctoral scholars/fellows are provided with four (4) weeks or 20 business days of paid leave to cover absences to include, but not be limited to, doctor’s appointments, personal illness, caring for an ill family member, funeral leave, vacation, and other similar situations. The timing and duration of leave must be agreed upon and approved in advance by the postdoc scholar/fellow and supervising faculty member unless circumstance make advanced approval not possible. Unused leave cannot be rolled over from one appointment year to the next or used to extend the appointment at the time of separation from the University. However, unused leave may be used during the last week of the appointment if needed to cover an approved absence. Unused paid leave shall not be paid out to the postdoctoral scholar or fellow at the time of separation.
LEAVES OF ABSENCE:

Leaves of absence without pay for a reasonable period of time beyond the four (4) weeks of paid leave will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Departments may be able to provide for some work to be completed remotely (e.g., data analysis), permitting the scholar or fellow to remain in pay status.

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows may be eligible for leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act. To the extent that a scholar or fellow is eligible for such leave, it shall run concurrently with paid and unpaid leave under this policy. Whenever a postdoctoral scholar or fellow would like to request a paid or unpaid leave of absence, the scholar or fellow shall contact the Penn State Human Resources, Absence Management Office, absence@psu.edu. The Absence Management Office personnel shall work with the supervising faculty member and the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs at postdocaffairs@psu.edu when vetting and approving such requests.

Before a leave of absence is discussed with an international scholar or fellow, the Penn State Human Resources, Absence Management Office shall contact International Scholar Advising, Directorate of International Student and Scholar Advising (E-mail: jscholarAdv@psu.edu) to ensure consistency with federal regulations.

Postdoctoral scholars and fellows should refer to New Parent Accommodation guidelines (not an actual policy) given at https://www.research.psu.edu/opa/benefits Postdoctoral scholars and fellows may be eligible for parental leave. Please contact the Absence Management Office to discuss the parameters for parental leave for postdoctoral scholars and fellows.

EXPECTATIONS OF PERFORMANCE:

Every scholar and fellow is expected to exhibit and promote the highest ethical, moral, and professional standards as researchers, future faculty, professionals, and leaders in their respective fields. All postdocs should receive Responsible Conduct of Research training through their faculty mentor, department and/or college. Research misconduct as per https://guru.psu.edu/gfug/appendices/app05-1617.html and https://www.research.psu.edu/researchmisconduct is regarded as a serious offense, raising grave doubt that the scholar or fellow is worthy of continued membership in the postdoctoral community at the University.

In addition to demonstrating satisfactory research progress, fulfillment of assigned duties, and adherence to all University policies, postdocs must maintain proper ethical, moral and professional standards. The primary duties of scholars and fellows are research and scholarship. However, scholars and fellows seeking additional experiences in other areas such as teaching, or consulting should consult with their supervising faculty members prior to accepting any such
additional duties. Supervising faculty have the discretion to approve or deny such requests based on the funding criteria, performance and individual circumstance.

It is strongly recommended and expected that all scholars and fellows be provided a written outline of the expectations of the supervising faculty member at the beginning of their appointment. To the extent possible this document should include a description of specific responsibilities. The document should be the first step in developing an Individualized Development Plan (IDP) for the scholar/fellow in order to guide their professional development during their time at the University (See Appendix A). The IDP is extremely helpful in guiding postdoctoral and early career researchers and is required by a growing number of federal funding agencies.

Scholars/fellows should also receive an annual evaluation at the end of each appointment year (See Appendix B). This evaluation will include a written assessment of their performance, which is to be discussed by the scholar/fellow and the supervising faculty member.

Although it is expected that all scholars and fellows demonstrate satisfactory performance in their research, fulfill all responsibilities outlined by the faculty member, demonstrate professional and ethical standards of behavior, and adhere to all University policies, there are occasions when improvement in one or more of these areas is needed. Failure to meet the expectations identified by the supervising faculty member may result in actions including the implementation of a Plan for Improvement (PFI) and/or sanctions, which may include termination of the appointment. If a supervising faculty member determines that the performance and/or behavior of a scholar or fellow is not meeting expectations, the faculty member should notify and consult with the college’s associate dean for research and unit Human Resources Strategic Partner or Consultant. The supervisor should then meet with the scholar or fellow to notify them that their performance and/or behavior is a concern and develop a PFI (See Appendix C). Once a PFI has been implemented, it is the responsibility of the scholar or fellow to adhere to all parameters outlined in the plan and of the supervising faculty member to monitor and document the scholar or fellow’s progress accordingly. If the scholar or fellow has not demonstrated satisfactory improvement and not met expectations within the time allotted, the faculty member will provide a final written assessment of their performance, along with a termination letter, indicating the specific date that the appointment will end.

All Plans for Improvement must be reviewed and approved by the work unit Human Resources office prior to being implemented with the scholar or fellow. The Penn State Human Resources will consult with other University offices as needed (e.g. Office of Postdoctoral Affairs, Affirmative Action Office, Employee Relations, Office of General Counsel) prior to giving approval to the faculty member to implement the PFI with the scholar or fellow.
TERMINATIONS:

Postdoctoral appointments can be terminated prior to the completion of the contract term for the following reasons:

a) Voluntary resignation.

In the case of a voluntary resignation by the postdoctoral scholar/fellow, the University requests that the postdoctoral scholar/fellow provide a minimum of 30 days’ notice to the faculty supervisor and follow the appropriate exit procedures within the research group and department.

b) Unsatisfactory performance or behavior; research misconduct; or violation of University policy.

If a faculty supervisor is considering termination of a postdoctoral scholar/fellow, they must consult with their unit HR Strategic Partner and/or the Associate Dean of Research, who may consult with other appropriate offices. If the postdoctoral scholar/fellow is being terminated prior to the end of the appointment period due to unsatisfactory performance and/or an unsuccessful performance improvement plan, the postdoctoral scholar/fellow must be given advanced notice. The number of days of notice will be decided on a case-by-case basis.

If the postdoctoral scholar/fellow is being terminated prior to the end of the appointment period due to unsatisfactory behavior, research misconduct, or violation of University policy, the number of days of notice will be determined on a case-by-case basis. In certain cases where the behavior is deemed egregious by the University, termination of the appointment may be effective immediately.

Decisions to terminate postdoctoral scholar/fellow appointments involuntarily for cause must be approved in advance by the college or work unit budget executive or designee. Under any termination of appointment, postdoc scholars/fellows must adhere to University policy HR102 Separation and Transfer Protocol regarding the submission of keys, research equipment and materials, research data and all other University property.

International postdoctoral scholars/fellows must contact the Directorate of International Student and Scholar Advising in the University Office of Global Programs to determine their visa status as a result of the termination.

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE:

Postdoctoral scholars/fellows should always attempt to resolve problems concerning their professional situation by discussing the matter with their supervisor. If there is a reason for the postdoctoral fellow or scholar to believe that this avenue is inappropriate, he or she may seek
recourse through the department or division or program head, or from the associate or assistant
dean of their college or division. The fellow or scholar may also seek advice from the college or
division HR unit and the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs.

Occasionally, there are disagreements between postdoctoral fellows/scholars and their
supervisors that cannot be resolved in the administrative structure of the department, division,
program or college. Such problems may involve alleged violations of academic freedom,
professional ethics, and procedural fairness and consistency. There may be disagreements
concerning authorship credit or intellectual property ownership. If a resolution of such problems
cannot be achieved at the department, division, or program level, the following procedures are to
be followed. This procedure is not to be utilized for instances of unsatisfactory performance or
behavior by the postdoctoral scholar or fellow. If for some reason the proper jurisdiction is not
clear, then the Vice President for Research shall decide on the appropriate procedure.

1. For disagreements that are unresolved at the department or program level, a grievance
   process will be initiated when the postdoctoral scholar or fellow files a written grievance
   with the dean of his or her college. The parties to the grievance process shall be the
   person(s) filing the grievance and the person(s) responsible for the act or omission that
gave rise to the grievance.

2. In response to the grievance, the College Dean appoints and convenes a Hearing
   Committee consisting of five members. From that time until the hearing ends, the College
   Dean refrains from involvement in the dispute. The Hearing Committee consists of two
   postdoctoral scholars or fellows, two faculty members, and an administrator who will
   serve as chairperson. All members of the Hearing Committee will be from outside the
   academic department or unit in which either the postdoctoral scholar or faculty member
   who is involved in the grievance participates.

3. Each party is allowed up to three disqualifications from this committee without cause.An
   indefinite number of disqualifications is allowed with cause, as determined by the
   College Dean. The College Dean makes additional appointments as necessary to fully
   staff the Hearing Committee.

4. The Hearing Committee attempts to resolve the disagreement within 30 calendar days of
   receiving the complaint.

5. The hearing is not public. During the hearing, either party may have present an adviser,
   who must be a postdoctoral scholar/fellow, faculty, or a staff member of the University.In
   light of the nature and spirit of the proceeding, representation by legal counsel is
   prohibited.

6. The Hearing Committee may have present at the hearing such assistance as it deems
   necessary.

7. The Hearing Committee is not bound by strict rules of evidence and may admit any
   relevant evidence.

8. The hearing is audio recorded, and a recording of the hearing is kept through any appeal
   processes. The parties involved may request to listen to the tape and take written notes
   until it is destroyed, however, copies are not provided.

9. The parties are afforded an opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary
   and other evidence. The department or program involved makes all reasonable efforts to
cooperate with the committee in securing witnesses and making available documentary and other evidence.

10. Each party has the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. Expenses incurred in obtaining a witness will be the responsibility of the party requesting the witness.

11. The Hearing Committee’s findings are based solely on the hearing record. In cases where issues involve authorship, the Hearing Committee should adhere to the spirit of Policy IP02.

12. The Hearing Committee submits its findings and recommendations in writing to the College Dean and to the parties involved. Based solely on the record of the hearing, the College Dean may endorse all, part, or none of the Hearing Committee’s recommendations. In coming to a decision, the College Dean may consult with the Vice President for Research. A written notice of the decision of the College Dean is provided to the Hearing Committee and the parties involved within three weeks of receipt by the College Dean of the Hearing Committee’s recommendations. If the College Dean does not endorse all of the findings and adopt all the recommendations of the Hearing Committee, an explanation will be included in the written notice. The decision by the College Dean shall be final, but does not preclude existing independent avenues of appeal. The record of this decision, along with supporting documents, shall be submitted to the Office of General Counsel and the Vice President for Research and kept by the Vice President for Research for not less than five years from the date of the resolution of the complaint.

13. After the final decision, all efforts should be made to reconcile the situation within the research group. In the rare case where irreconcilable differences exist even after the resolution, and where the decision is made against the faculty member, it will be the responsibility of the College Dean to find another similar position in the University for the postdoctoral fellow or scholar, and, if necessary, to provide bridge funding for this position for up to six months.

POLICY EXCEPTIONS:

This policy applies to all individuals designated as postdoctoral scholars and fellows. In extenuating circumstances, exceptions to this policy may be requested to meet specific training or personnel needs. All such requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Any request for an exception must be submitted by the principal investigator or supervising faculty member to the college/unit’s associate dean for research and unit human resources office for review and, if appropriate, forwarded to the director of the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs (OPA) for approval. The director of the OPA will consult with the Vice President for Research if necessary and notify the college’s associate dean for research and unit human resources office of the final decision. If the request is denied, there is no further level of appeal and the decision will stand.
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Policy [IP02] Coauthorship of Scholarly Reports, Papers and Publications (Formerly Policy RA13)
PART 1: OUR CHARGE, OUR WORK, AND OUR PROGRESS

In the fall of 2017, Senate leadership formed the Special Committee on Tenure and Equity in response to the Committee on Faculty Affairs’ concern with increasing gender disparities in Penn State’s Tenure Flow Report. Our charge was to analyze the Tenure Flow Reports for 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 and recommend ways to reduce any gender inequities.

This committee met on a regular basis during the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 academic years. Though the 2017-2018 report was not available when we did our research, we analyzed 20 tenure flow reports from 1998-2017. In addition, we examined the extant research on the patterns in and causes of tenure inequities, identified the data required to provide consistent and thorough analyses and researched best practices for reducing tenure inequities.

After meeting with the Office of Planning and Assessment (OPA), we discovered that this office could not provide us with the detailed data necessary to complete our charge. See Part IV for detailed data needs. Therefore, we believe that the most critical step in analyzing tenure inequities and providing recommendations to address them is for the University to immediately begin gathering the necessary data. In addition to analyzing gender disparities, the University should break down tenure flow reports by race, ethnicity, nationality, gender identity and sexual orientation, rather than the all-encompassing “minority” category.

If they do not already, they should also parse out international scholars from U.S. scholars of color, e.g. Asian American and Asian national scholars should not be conflated, nor should African and Caribbean immigrant scholars be conflated with African American scholars. This analysis should occur across departments, colleges, and campuses, though some data may be more difficult to parse due to the small numbers involved. OPA also needs to gather data on faculty who are “counseled out” or encouraged to leave before coming up for tenure and promotion. We also need to know how community and campus climate impacts pre-tenure attrition.

All faculty in the Penn State system face a gendered workload disparity, with women carrying a larger service load. However, the unique structure of Penn State presents certain challenges. Tenure-line faculty on the commonwealth campuses have distinct requirements regarding teaching and service loads. They often have a greater number of course preparations, students that require more assistance, a larger number of advisees, and increased service work. Campuses
also vary in the travel support they are able to provide for attendance at professional conferences and for research.

While an analysis follows of the disparities that exist based on current data, it is critical that the University refine its data collection for the tenure flow report. Without accurate information, recommendations for best practices will have limited success.

**Part 2: The National Picture on Tenure and Equity**

Accumulating evidence from many different universities and countries suggests that women and people of color of all genders face several forms of bias and structural barriers that can impact success in an academic setting. As a result, women and people of color are more likely than white men to accept non-tenure track positions, and among tenure-track faculty, to leave their tenure track positions before their final tenure reviews (Wolfinger, Mason, & Goulden, 2008). More recent data from a TIAA report (Finkelstein, Conley, & Shuster, 2016) continues to show that diversification of the faculty has occurred primarily through part-time and non-tenure stream appointments. Overall, academia in the US still shows marked underrepresentation of faculty of color at all ranks, and of women at the professorial rank (2016 data from NCES).

Broad explanations for the discrepancies in tenure rates among tenure track faculty note differences in job responsibilities, job performance, and inequity in evaluation for promotion and tenure (Weisshaar, 2017), which tend to be influenced by the inter-related areas of work-family balance, gender differences in work style and responsibilities, campus and departmental climate, implicit or explicit gender or racial bias, and university policies that favor white men. These factors lead some tenure-track faculty to voluntarily withdraw from the tenure track before their final tenure reviews, while others are counseled out (AAUP, 2008; Britton, 2017; Burnett, Bilen-Green, McGeorge, & Anicha, 2012; Martinez, L.R., O’Brien, & Hebl. M.R., 2017). This brief review, while not exhaustive, discusses ways in which some of these factors affect faculty success and satisfaction.

**Faculty are evaluated on scholarly productivity, teaching effectiveness, and service.**

The pressure to attain high levels of scholarly productivity in the pre-tenure period while caring for family members, particularly young children, is often noted as a possible reason for female faculty to withdraw from the tenure track before their final tenure and promotion evaluation. The average age at which women obtain PhDs is 33 (Mason, 2009), which puts them in their prime childbearing years. Women who bear children within five years of earning their PhDs are less likely to obtain tenure than men or childless women (Wolfinger, Mason, & Goulden, 2008). Denson, Szelényi, and Bresonis (2018) found that although the stresses of child care are similar across racial and ethnic groups, they may be more salient for faculty of color who experience the additional burden of discrimination.

To assist faculty members in balancing work and family, universities have adopted gender-neutral policies enabling faculty members to stop the tenure clock for major life events such as adding children to their families through birth or adoption. However, these policies alone have not completely mitigated the tenure gap between men and women. Some women hesitate to stop their tenure clocks for fear that doing so may make them appear less committed to their careers.
Research on the effects of stopping the tenure clock are inconsistent. In a study of assistant professors in top-50 Economics departments, Antecol, Bedard, and Stearns (2016) found that stopping the tenure clock did not improve the tenure rate for females, but it did improve the tenure rate for males. On the other hand, Manchester, Leslie, and Kramer (2013) found that stopping the clock improved promotion chances for both men and women. Of course, parental responsibilities do not end after a child’s first year; the availability of high-quality affordable child care, including care for sick children, and flexible work schedules would help faculty to maintain productivity (AAUP, 2001).

Beyond the impact of childbearing, there are several other entrenched factors that disadvantage women. Differences in research and publication styles may disadvantage women faculty and faculty of color. Leahy (2006) found that men are more likely to specialize in their research programs, which contributes to more productivity. Also, men are more likely to receive research grants (Knobloch-Westerwick, Glynn, & Huge, M., 2013), and they are more likely to cite their own work, leading to more visibility in their fields (King, Bergstrom, Correll, Jacquet, & West, 2017). Men’s research is sometimes more highly valued than that of women, a form of implicit bias (O’Meara, Templeton, & Nyunt, 2018). Hengel (2017) found that Economics manuscripts authored by women, despite being more clearly written, underwent peer review for six months longer than manuscripts by men. An empirical study found that graduate students gave higher ratings to research abstracts that they believed were written by men. (Knobloch-Westerwick, Glynn, & Huge, M., 2013). Women who co-author with men may receive less credit for their work than women who co-author with other women (Lundberg & Stearns, 2019; Sarsons, 2017). Lerback and Hanson (2017) found that women are less often invited to review manuscripts for scientific journals, which then limits their networking in the larger scholarly community. An analysis of citations, publications, and editorial work in communications (Chakravartty, Kuo, Grubbs, & McIlwain, 2018) found “ongoing underrepresentation” of work by non-white writers. And finally, research conducted by faculty of color, especially if it deals with diversity issues such as social justice, may be viewed as less legitimate than research in longer-established fields (Denson, Szélenyi & Bresonis, 2018).

Difficulty in obtaining visibility within the discipline can impact later success in tenure and promotion. A Stanford University conference on applied history in March 2018 attracted considerable controversy because the speakers were all white men (Salam, 2018). Historians interviewed about the lack of diversity among the speakers noted that history is a relatively more diverse field than are some other disciplines. The conference organizer, a white man, said that a few women had been invited but all had declined. A recent study by Nittrouer, Hebi, Ashburn-Nardo, Trump-Steele, Lane, and Valian (2018) is relevant to this issue. Nittrouer et al. (2018) examined differences by gender in colloquium speakers at top universities. A comparison of six departments (Biology, Bioengineering, Political Science, History, Psychology, Sociology) showed that “the percentage of men giving talks was higher than the percentage of women giving talks in 15 of the 18 combinations of rank and program” and this difference was statistically significant. On the other hand, the data on the rate of declining invitations showed no gender difference. The data from the study also suggested that if conference organizing committees were chaired by women, there was greater gender balance in the speakers than if the committees were chaired by men.
Women and faculty of color tend to take on more department service, such as serving on search committees and advising student organizations (Britton, 2017; Curtis, 2011; Denson, Szelényi & Bresonis, 2018; Guarino & Borden, 2017). In a study of cis faculty, Hanasono et al. (2018) found that not only did women and faculty of color perform more service work, they were more likely to perform relational service, such as mentoring, recruiting students, and writing letters of recommendation for students, and that these activities were less valued than task-oriented service more often performed by men, such as serving as committee chairs and editing journals. In departments with “critical mass” problems, women and faculty of color are frequently assigned to tasks in which diversity is valued or required (Parker & Schroeder, 2016), adding to their already high service loads.

Women and faculty of color spend more time teaching than their white male colleagues (Burnett, Bilen-Green, McGeorge, & Anicha, 2012; Curtis, 2011; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009). Average student evaluations differ by faculty group. A white heterosexual male can offer a critique of patriarchal societies without being called biased, whereas a woman who does the same thing may be labeled “biased” or “angry” or worse. Similarly, a person of color who critiques U.S. culture may be seen as “bashing” U.S. culture (Laube, Massoni, Sprague, & Ferber, 2007). Women faculty are more likely to be evaluated on their personality (warmth and sensitivity) and appearance, and to be referred to as teachers instead of professors (Laube, Massoni, Sprague, & Ferber, 2007; Mitchell & Martin, 2018). There also seems to be a bonus for men faculty who often receive higher student evaluations just for being men. For example, Mitchell and Martin (2018) found that students rated an online course more favorably when they believed it was taught by a man, and that men and women are evaluated on somewhat different criteria. Smith and Hawkins (2011) found that black faculty received lower student evaluations than white faculty. Faculty of color often have to work harder to prove their credibility to students and colleagues and to overcome perceptions that they were hired to fulfill an affirmative action diversity requirement (Kelly, Gayles, & Williams, 2017).

The issues discussed above, such as inequitable teaching assignments and service responsibilities, contribute to a perception that there is a gender and racially biased climate. However, gender harassment, hostility, incivility, overt expressions of bias, implicit bias, and microaggressions also contribute to this perception and reality. While not confined to any specific academic discipline, The National Academies of Sciences·Engineering·Medicine (2018) found that in Science, Engineering, and Medicine, gender harassment, defined as “sexist hostility and crude behavior” (p. 1), was the most common form of sexual harassment, and over time, can have effects as powerful as sexual coercion. The report also stated that

Four factors increase the likelihood that women in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine will be targeted with sexual harassment: male-dominated work settings; hierarchies that concentrate power in individuals and male students, junior faculty, and others dependent on them for funding, research direction, mentorship, and career advancement; symbolic legal compliance policies and procedures that are ineffective at preventing harassment; and uninformed leadership at all levels lacking the tools, intention, and/or focus needed to undertake the key actions necessary to reduce and prevent sexual harassment (p. 2).
Implicit bias can have a cumulative effect on women. A report by the Georgia Tech Promotion and Tenure ADVANCE Committee (2003) listed several examples of situations that would affect women:

- limited access to senior staff because of family commitments, evening or weekend meetings; less use of titles by leadership during important events, males referred to by first and last name, females by first name only; allowing humor discrediting women to go unchallenged because it is intermittent; giving greater credit to a male colleague on work done as a team; discounting female’s work as that of an “assistant”, not a full partner or leader; and not acknowledging a woman’s comments during group meetings or cutting off comments before completed (p. 7).

Faculty members who are minorities in their departments, whether because of gender, race or ethnicity, face additional forms of stress, such as exclusion, microaggressions, overt hostility, tokenism, and challenges to their expertise (Casado Pérez, 2018). For example, when there are relatively few women in a department, they may miss out on informal networking that their male colleagues enjoy when they socialize over drinks or travel to conferences together (Parker & Schroeder, 2016). Faculty who are in the minority in their departments may be treated less as individuals and more as representatives of their group (Casado Pérez, 2018).

Sue (2014, as cited in Berk, 2017a, p. 64) defines microaggressions as “brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative slights, invalidations, and insults to an individual or group because of their marginalized status in society.” Berk (2017b) provides examples and strategies to deal with microaggression and implicit bias. The cumulative effects of microaggressions include, but are not limited to, feelings of isolation, physical and mental health problems, reduced productivity, and biased performance reviews (Berk, 2017a). Hostility can also be blatant. Yancy (2018) provides several examples of hateful messages that he received in response to an op-ed he wrote in The New York Times.

The challenges that faculty face as they pursue promotion and tenure vary among disciplines and institutions, but faculty at several Research I universities acknowledge the problem and are attempting to grapple with it, e.g. Georgia Tech (Promotion and Tenure ADVANCE Committee, 2003), Harvard (Parker & Schroeder, 2016), and MIT (Kochan, 2010). Evidence presented below suggests that Penn State needs to gather additional data on equity and make it more readily available to those seeking to ameliorate equity discrepancies.

**Part 3: How Penn State is Doing: Analysis of the Statistical Data We Have from Tenure Flow Reports from 1990-2010**

**Cohort Tenure Rates** There are disparities in the seven-year tenure rates across categories: men, women, minority and non-minority. (To our knowledge, minority represents Asian, Latinx/Hispanic, Black/AA, Native American, and Other/Mixed Race.) Tenure rates for the incoming cohorts - entrants (ranging from n=91 to n= 190)- ranges from 47% to 63% over the
‘tenure-granted’ years of 1991-2010 (Table 1). Women have rates that dip as low as 34% in some years, while the minimum for men is 53%. Minorities have rates that are as low as 29% in some years while non-minority is only as low as 48%. However, this 29% does seem to be an anomaly, and the following year has a very high tenure rate of 74% for minority faculty (Table 1). There was no statistical analysis performed on these differences, and we note that the sample size for minority and women are lower than for men/non-minorities.

Note that these are not the number of people who reach a final tenure decision, this is a percentage of the incoming cohort who started 6 years prior. Overall, men and non-minorities have higher tenure rates (Figure 1).

### Table 1: Percentage of incoming cohort reaching tenure (females, males, minorities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year (year began)</th>
<th>Number of Entrants - All</th>
<th>Percent Tenured - All</th>
<th>Number of Female Entrants</th>
<th>Percent Females Tenu red</th>
<th>Number of Male Entrants</th>
<th>Percent Males Tenu red</th>
<th>Number of Minority Entrants</th>
<th>Percent Minorities Tenu red</th>
<th>Number of Non-minority Entrants</th>
<th>Percent Non-minority Tenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Tenure Rate</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Tenure Rate</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Tenure Rate</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Tenure Rate</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Tenure Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Percentages of incoming cohorts tenured over time.

However, those who make it through the six years before tenure are usually admitted equitably without statistical favor. If the faculty are able or choose to stay on the tenure track through the allotted time for junior faculty, there does not seem to be a discrepancy in who receives tenure
and who does not. In fact, Penn State seems to have a very high tenure rate at this level. The data that was available here is limited to the following years:

**TOTAL DECISIONS FOR 6th YEAR TENURE**

**1998-1999:** 46 total: 27/26 (men); 19/19 (women); 8/8 (minority)

**1999-2000:** 70 total: 48/51 (men); 18/19 (women); 7/9 (minority)

**2001-2002:** 54 total: 38/39 (men); 16/16 (women); 11/12 (minority)

**2003-2004:** 50 total: 49/50 (men); 24/22 (women); 12/12 (minority)

In addition, yearly reviews are all-around positive for all groups (Tables 2 and 3)

**Table 2: Positive Yearly Reviews by College Dean, 2009-10 Cohort**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review History</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Years 5 + 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive recommendations</td>
<td>116 (99%)</td>
<td>68 (97%)</td>
<td>82 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female positive recommendations</td>
<td>55 (100%)</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>34 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male positive recommendations</td>
<td>61 (98%)</td>
<td>44 (96%)</td>
<td>48 (89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority positive recommendations</td>
<td>57 (100%)</td>
<td>26 (96%)</td>
<td>29 (94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-minority positive recommendations</td>
<td>59 (98%)</td>
<td>42 (98%)</td>
<td>53 (91%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: two women were rejected at the university level when OK’ed by their college dean. (94%). (we don’t know if it was early tenure or not, however). Women were not minorities.

**Table 3: Positive Yearly Reviews by College Dean, 2008-09 Cohort**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review History</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Years 5 + 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive recommendations</td>
<td>127 (100%)</td>
<td>65 (98%)</td>
<td>79 (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female positive recommendations</td>
<td>54 (100%)</td>
<td>29 (100%)</td>
<td>36 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male positive recommendations</td>
<td>73 (100%)</td>
<td>36 (97%)</td>
<td>43 (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority positive recommendations</td>
<td>54 (100%)</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
<td>32 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-minority positive recommendations</td>
<td>73 (100%)</td>
<td>40 (98%)</td>
<td>47 (98%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Women as a percentage of cohorts.

As their cohorts progress, women comprise a smaller percentage of the cohort (Table 4, Figure 2), showing attrition over time. According to figure 2, at year two, women comprise about one third to almost one half of a cohort, this rises or stays the same in four of our cohort examples (green, orange, blues in figure 2), and decreases in two others. This means that more men have left between years two and four as compared to years five and six, generally, for this very small sample of six years. However, we see a big decrease in the percentage of women who comprise a cohort between year four and year five or year six. These numbers seem to decrease, indicating that women are exiting the tenure track at higher rates than men between these years.

Table 4. Women and minorities as a percentage of cohorts over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Data</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Years 5 or 6</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Years 5 or 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>50/113</td>
<td>54/140</td>
<td>47/107*</td>
<td>24/113</td>
<td>27/140</td>
<td>15/107*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>30/90</td>
<td>38/101</td>
<td>29/114*</td>
<td>25/90</td>
<td>36/101</td>
<td>21/114*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>44/93</td>
<td>43/85</td>
<td>52/139</td>
<td>35/93</td>
<td>13/85</td>
<td>28/139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There may be a data error. The percentage of women at years 01-02, 02-03, and 03-04 in the two year mark are all 41%. This is unlikely to occur by happenstance, as they then range to 44%, 33% and 47% at the two year mark. *data available for year 6 only.
These attrition rates may not be the same across disciplines. There could be greater attrition in the Social Sciences (Tables 5 and 6).

Table 5. Tenure Rates by Group and by Disciplinary Category, 2009-10 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review History</th>
<th>Arts and Humanities</th>
<th>Biological Sciences</th>
<th>Physical Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of tenure cases reviewed</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of female cases reviewed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of male cases reviewed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of minority cases reviewed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of non-minority cases reviewed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of cases granted tenure</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of female cases granted tenure</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of male cases granted tenure</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 6. Tenure Rates by Group and by Disciplinary Category, 2008-09 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review History</th>
<th>Arts and Humanities</th>
<th>Biological Sciences</th>
<th>Physical Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of tenure cases reviewed</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of female cases reviewed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of male cases reviewed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of minority cases reviewed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of non-minority cases reviewed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of cases granted tenure</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of female cases granted tenure</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of male cases granted tenure</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of minority cases granted tenure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of non-minority cases granted tenure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Early tenure**

Finally, we find that men are much more likely to receive tenure early. Below are the statistics for those who go up for early tenure.

Fifth year (early) tenure:
Part 4: Data Requirements Necessary for Future Analysis

There are two major data needs. We need the same data we were given in section 3, but for the previous years we do not currently have. The conclusions that can be drawn from section three are limited by the relatively small time frames for which we have data. Extending these years can give us a better longitudinal perspective and allow us to draw better statistical conclusions. We also require data for all of the missing years--missing years are those that are not reported in the tables above. See appendix A for the set of documents that was available for this report.

As noted above, the second data need will help us understand the reasons why individuals, namely women, are leaving Penn State before being tenured. We do not have the following:

We don’t know the reasons for leaving. Are they leaving academia, leaving for what they consider better positions, or leaving because they do not think that tenure is possible at Penn State (e.g. being 'counseled out')? This information, to our knowledge, is not currently being collected, but would be valuable to understanding equity in the tenure process.

Part 5: What Penn State Can Do About It

The Committee recommends the following:

- Penn State needs a comprehensive data collection and analysis strategy to track faculty success across ranks and locations. This should include all needed gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity categories. We recognize that this data is sensitive and may include small numbers at some locations, but it comprises crucial pieces of information for tracking success and development of strategies for intervention and remediation. To be specific, this is the data that Penn State cannot currently provide:

  1. Data that shows tenure and promotion rates by demographic slices, e.g. in terms of gender, race, ethnicity and nationality;

  2. Data that shows who leaves before their tenure and promotion review, parsed by race, ethnicity and nationality;

  3. Data that identifies by demographic slices (see above) who leaves after their 2nd year review and who leaves after their 4th year review but pre-tenure;
4. Data on faculty who are “counseled out” prior to tenure review broken down by gender, race, ethnicity and nationality;

5. Data that parses out by demographic slices who is granted tenure and still chooses to leave broken down by gender, race, ethnicity and nationality

6. Detailed demographic data - race, gender, ethnicity and nationality, etc. - for UP and all Commonwealth Campuses for context and comparison.

- A review of service requirements across colleges and campuses, and a system for equalizing these requirements and ensuring there are not gender or race imbalances in duties.

- A review of teaching requirements across departments and especially campuses. This should include number of distinct preparations and advising loads.

- A review of faculty leave policies in regard to family duties of all kinds. This should include a recognition of the fact that any medical issue (whether recovery time due to childbirth, or gender-related surgeries, for example) may necessitate time off the tenure track in addition to time caring for or dealing with a family emergency.

- A method of assessing and tracking department, college, and campus efforts to create a welcoming environment for all persons.

- A menu of mentoring options for new faculty, but one that does not add to the already heavy service commitments of women and faculty of color.
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Appendix A:
Notes about the Documents Included in the Data Analysis:

1. 1998-1999 faculty-tenure-report- has fifth year tenure statistics by gender/minority
2. 1999-2000 faculty-tenure-report- has fifth year tenure statistics by gender/minority
3. 2000-2001 - doesn’t break down 2, 4, 6 by gender/minority, doesn’t have fifth year tenure
4. 2001-2002 faculty-tenure-report- has fifth year tenure statistics by gender/minority
5. 2002-2003 faculty-tenure-report- has fifth year tenure statistics by gender/minority
7. 2004-2005 faculty-tenure-report
8. 2005-2006 faculty-tenure-report
10. 2007-2008 faculty-tenure-report
11. 2008-2009 faculty-tenure-report – doesn’t break down 2, 4, 6 by gender/minority
12. 2009-2010 faculty-tenure-report – doesn’t break down 2, 4, 6 by gender/minority
13. 2010-2011 faculty-tenure-report – doesn’t break down 2, 4, 6 by gender/minority
14. 2011-2012 faculty-tenure-report – doesn’t break down 2, 4, 6 by gender/minority
15. 2012-2013 faculty-tenure-report – doesn’t break down 2, 4, 6 by gender/minority
18. 2015-2016 faculty-tenure-report – breaks down 2, 4, 6 by gender/minority, adds yearly reviews, breaks down by discipline type
19. 2016-2017 faculty-tenure-report – breaks down 2, 4, 6 by gender/minority, adds yearly reviews, breaks down by discipline type
20. These two files are both online but are the same: 2003-2004_faculty-tenure-decision-tables.2003-2004_faculty-tenure-report
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From: Clark V. Brigger

To: Mary Beth Williams, Chair, Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid

Subj: High School Students Enrolled Nondegree in Credit Courses from Summer 2016 through Spring 2018

In accordance with 1974 Senate action and Academic Administrative Policy and Procedure (AAPPM) A09 governing enrollment of high school students (http://www.psu.edu/oue/aappm/A-9-admission-high-school-students-and-experimental-admissions.html) the attached tables and graphs provide the information the Senate requires annually from the Undergraduate Admissions Office and additional historical data from the two previous academic years. This information is now reported from iTwo, previous years the information was from ISIS.

Table 1  Summary of high school students enrolled in nondegree credit courses
Graphs A, B, C Grade point distributions
Tables 2A, 2B, 2C Enrollment by high school level and admission status of senior level students
Tables 3A, 3B, 3C Enrollment by course description
Table 4  Enrollment by ethnicity
Table 5  Enrollment by gender

Penn State encourages the enrollment of academically prepared students to study college-level coursework prior to high school graduation to begin the pathway to higher education. Penn State’s 20 undergraduate campuses across the Commonwealth provide an excellent opportunity for students to connect with faculty and campus resources close to home. Students who complete college courses at Penn State while in high school are likely to apply to the University and become full-time degree-seeking students. Yield of these dual-enrolled students exceed the average PA applicant yield by approximately 15%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>HS Seniors Offered Admission</th>
<th>HS Seniors Enrolled</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SU15-SP16</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU16-SP17</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU17-SP18</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The peak of high school student enrollment from this cohort was during SU08-SP09 when 1,609 high school students were enrolled at all 20 undergraduate campuses. The total number of high school students enrolled across the system has declined 45% (726 students) from SU08-SP09 to SU17-SP18.
More enrollment information follows in the tables below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>HS Students at campuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SU15-SP16</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU16-SP17</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU17-SP18</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the enrollment decline can be attributed to the demographic decline in the number of students enrolled and graduating from Pennsylvania high schools. Another factor contributing to the decline in enrollments is the Penn State cost of attendance. College-level courses taken during high school were an affordable opportunity for many in SU08-SP09 with state grant funding awarded to Pennsylvania school districts who met approved guidelines. Commonwealth Campuses matched state grants for many students which contributed to a record number of high school student enrollments. Since that funding has been removed, students have found more affordable options either by attending community colleges, taking advanced placement (AP) courses and earning college credits in their high school through partnerships developed by competitor colleges in the area.

Campuses have developed strong partnerships with service area high schools and continue to attract and retain successful high school students through these nondegree courses. Twelve campuses increased their dual enrollment over the past year.

Of the 898 high school students enrolled from SU17-SP18, 47.5% reported ethnicity as White; 3.3% reported ethnicity as Hispanic/Latino; 2.3% reported ethnicity as Black or African American; 2.4% reported ethnicity as Asian; 1.6% reported ethnicity as two or more races, and 42.7% did not report (Table 4). It is not surprising that underrepresented students do not make up more of this cohort due to socio-economic factors.

During SU17-SP18 female high school students represented 59% of the total enrollment compared to 40% male high school students, with eight students (1%) not identifying (Table 5).

Students currently enrolled in high school who have completed their junior year or are in their senior year of high school are reviewed for nondegree enrollment by the Admissions Office at the campus of enrollment. Students who are currently in their junior year or younger may be recommended by the Undergraduate Admissions Office for an exception to enroll as a nondegree student through the Faculty Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid.

Application should be made at the Admissions Office at the campus the student plans to attend by completing a Nondegree Enrollment form. Nondegree Enrollment forms can be accessed on the web: [https://www.registrar.psu.edu/student_forms/nondegree_form.cfm](https://www.registrar.psu.edu/student_forms/nondegree_form.cfm) and are available in some high school guidance offices. The student’s high school guidance counselor must also submit an official high school transcript, SAT/ACT or PSAT/PLAN scores and a statement in support of the student’s enrollment at Penn State. Students who are approved may register for eight credits per semester or session.
**Table 1**

*High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State*

*Enrollment by Campus*

*Summer 2015 to Spring 2018*

*by Academic Year (Summer to Spring)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>SU15-SP16</th>
<th>SU16-SP17</th>
<th>SU17-SP18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuBois</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Allegheny</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont Alto</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Campus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>859</strong></td>
<td><strong>756</strong></td>
<td><strong>898</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GRAPH A
High School Students Enrolled Nondegree in Credit Courses at Penn State
GPA Analysis for Summer 2017 to Spring 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.67 – 4.00</td>
<td>48.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.34 – 3.66</td>
<td>19.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01 – 3.33</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.67 – 3.00</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.34 – 2.66</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 2.33</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01 – 1.99</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO GRADE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GRAPH B
High School Students Enrolled Nondegree in Credit Courses at Penn State GPA Analysis for Summer 2016 to Spring 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.67 – 4.00</td>
<td>50.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.34 – 3.66</td>
<td>17.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01 – 3.33</td>
<td>11.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.67 – 3.00</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.34 – 2.66</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 2.33</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01 – 1.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO GRADE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GRAPH C
High School Students Enrolled Nondegree in Credit Courses at Penn State
GPA Analysis for Summer 2015 to Spring 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.67 – 4.00</td>
<td>47.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.34 – 3.66</td>
<td>16.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01 – 3.33</td>
<td>11.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.67 – 3.00</td>
<td>10.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.34 – 2.66</td>
<td>4.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 2.33</td>
<td>6.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01 – 1.99</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 1.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO GRADE</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2A

High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State
Admissions Status
Summer 2017 to Spring 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Sophomore 1</th>
<th>Junior 2</th>
<th>Senior 3</th>
<th>Seniors Who Applied to PSU</th>
<th>Seniors Offered Admission</th>
<th>Seniors Accepted Offer</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuBois</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Allegheny</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont Alto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Campus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Completed freshman (9th) year in high school
2 Completed sophomore (10th) year in high school
3 Completed Junior (11th) year in high school
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Sophomore 1</th>
<th>Junior 2</th>
<th>Senior 3</th>
<th>Seniors Who Applied to PSU</th>
<th>Seniors Offered Admission</th>
<th>Seniors Accepted Offer</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuBois</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Allegheny</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont Alto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Completed freshman (9th) year in high school
2 Completed sophomore (10th) year in high school
3 Completed Junior (11th) year in high school
Table 2C  
High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State  
Admissions Status  
Summer 2015 to Spring 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Sophomore 1</th>
<th>Junior 2</th>
<th>Senior 3</th>
<th>Seniors Who Applied to PSU</th>
<th>Seniors Offered Admission</th>
<th>Seniors Accepted Offer</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuBois</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Allegheny</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont Alto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Campus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Completed freshman (9th) year in high school  
2 Completed sophomore (10th) year in high school  
3 Completed Junior (11th) year in high school
### Table 3A

**High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State**

**Courses Taken Summer 2017 - Spring 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>BISC 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COMM 150</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GEOSC20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>KINES68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MUSIC100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SCIED140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCTG211</td>
<td>BISC 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COMM 160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GEOSC40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MUSIC121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCM 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 124</td>
<td>BISC 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>COMM 197</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GER 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MUSIC122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOC 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFR 110</td>
<td>BISC 4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>CRIMJ100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GER 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MUSIC131</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOC 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMST 104</td>
<td>BMB 398</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CRIMJ13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GER 301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MUSIC132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOC 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMST 105</td>
<td>CAMS 44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CRIMJ12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>GREEK101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MUSIC5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SOC 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 1</td>
<td>CAMS 45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CRIMJ13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>GREEK102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES91D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MUSIC7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOC 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 45N</td>
<td>CAS 100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>CRIMJ220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GREEK203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KOR 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MUSIC88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOC 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAB 1</td>
<td>CAS 100A</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>CSD 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HDFS 129</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>LARCH125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NUTR 251</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SPAN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAB 110</td>
<td>CAS 100B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>CSD 269</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HDFS 129S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LARCH145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OLEAD100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SPAN 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAB 2</td>
<td>CAS 100S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ECON 102</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>HDFS 229</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>LARCH155</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHI 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SPAN 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAB 3</td>
<td>CAS 137H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ECON 104</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>HDFS 239</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LARCH197</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHI 103</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SPAN 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 100</td>
<td>CAS 175</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EDPSY14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HDFS 287Y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>LARCH60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHI 119</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SRA 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 1</td>
<td>CAS 203</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EDSGN100</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>HDFS 301</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>LATIN203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHI 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STAT 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 168</td>
<td>CAS 301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDSGN100H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HDFS 432</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LING 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHI 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STAT 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 20</td>
<td>CHE 294H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDSGN130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIND1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LLED 297</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>PHI 198</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUST 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 30</td>
<td>CHEM 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDUC 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>MATH 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHI 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>THEA 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 50</td>
<td>CHEM 101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EE 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 110</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>PHI 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>THEA 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 80</td>
<td>CHEM 106</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EGEE 101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HIST 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 140</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>PHOTO100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>THEA 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 100</td>
<td>CHEM 108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMCH 211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MATH 140B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHYS 211</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>WMNST106N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 111</td>
<td>CHEM 110</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>EMCH 212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 140E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHYS 212</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WMNST200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 112</td>
<td>CHEM 111</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>ENGL 135</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HIST 12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MATH 140H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLSC 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 201</td>
<td>CHEM 112</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ENGL 137H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HIST 121</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>MATH 141</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>PLSC 130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 311</td>
<td>CHEM 112H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENGL 15</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>HIST 141</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MATH 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLSC 14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIA 100</td>
<td>CHEM 113</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ENGL 15A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HIST 144</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MATH 21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>PLSC 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRO1</td>
<td>CHEM 210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENGL 15S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HIST 155</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>PSU 14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 100</td>
<td>CHEM 212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENGL 181D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 173</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MATH 220</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PSU 16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 100S</td>
<td>CIVCM211N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENGL 184</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>MATH 230</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PSU 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 243</td>
<td>CMLIT10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENGL 194</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>MATH 232</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PSU 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 250</td>
<td>CMLIT100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENGL 201</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HIST 446</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PSU 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBH 101</td>
<td>CMLIT101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENGL 202C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HORT 352</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 251</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PSU 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBH 143</td>
<td>CMLIT105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENGL 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HPA 101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 251H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PSU 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBH 146</td>
<td>CMLIT108</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENGL 50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>INART1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>PSYCH100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBH 148</td>
<td>CMLIT11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ENGL 97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IST 110</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>MATH 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PSYCH212</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBH 48</td>
<td>CMLIT12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENGR 297</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>IST 140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RHS 100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 11</td>
<td>CMLIT153</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENT 222</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IST 210</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MATH 41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RHS 297</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 110</td>
<td>CMLIT184</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ESC 121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IST 220</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MATH 455</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RLST 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 120N</td>
<td>CMLIT3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ESL 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JAPNS1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 494</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RLST 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 129</td>
<td>CMPSC101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FR 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>JST 124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 497</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RLST 44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 141</td>
<td>CMPSC121</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FR 138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ME 300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RPTM 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 142</td>
<td>CMPSC360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FR 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KINES101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>METEO3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RPTM 120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 240W</td>
<td>COMM 100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FRNSC100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>KINES13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>METEO5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RPTM 210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 297</td>
<td>COMM 110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>GAME 220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MGMT 215</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>RPTM 98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 3</td>
<td>COMM 118</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GEOG 126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MIS 204</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>RUS 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAMS 45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENGL 15</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>IT 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHOTO100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAS 100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>ENGL 15A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JAPNS1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHYS 211</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCTG211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAS 100A</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>ENGL15S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>KINES11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHYS 212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAS 100B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ENGL 184</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KINES13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHYS 250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFR 110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAS 175</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENGL 202C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES47B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHYS 251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG 150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAS 250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENGL 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>KINES57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLSC 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR 151</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHEM 101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENGL 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLSC 111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR 351</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHEM 108</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENGL 50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>KINES61S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLSC 130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMST 105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CHEM 110</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>ENGR 297</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PLSC 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMST 297</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHEM 111</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>FR 296</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLSC 22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 2N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHEM 112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FR 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES90B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PORT 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 45N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHEM 210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GEOG 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KOR 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PSU 16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAB 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>CHNS 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GEOG 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KOR 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PSU 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAB 110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHNS 110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GEOG 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KOR 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PSU 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAB 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CHNS 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GEOSC20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LLED297A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>PSU 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAB 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CHNS 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GEOSC40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PSU 8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CMLIT106</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GER 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 110</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PSYCH100</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CMLIT107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GER 157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 140</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>PSYCH212</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CMLIT108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GER 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 140B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PSYCH221</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CMLIT122</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GER 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MATH 141</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>RHS 100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CMLIT131</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GLIS 101N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RHS 297</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CMLIT3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HDFS 129</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>MATH 21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>RLST 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 112</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CMPSC101</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>HDFS 229</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MATH 22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>RLST 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CMPSC121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HDFS 239</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MATH 220</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RPTM 120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRO1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>CMPSC122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HDFS 249</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 230</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>RUS 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRO497</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CMPSC200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HDFS 287Y</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MATH 231</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCM 200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRO5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CMPSC201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HHD 496</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MATH 231H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOC 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRO6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COCR997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOC 119</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 100</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>COMM 100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HIST 108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SOC 12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 243</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>COMM 150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>HIST 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOC 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBH 101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COMM 205</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HIST 12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MATH 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOC 19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBH 146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COMM250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 121</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MATH 41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SOC 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBH 148</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>CRIMJ100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>HIST 141</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ME 102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOC 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CRIMJ12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HIST 144</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MIS 204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SPAN 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 110</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>CRIMJ13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HIST 152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MUSIC4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SPAN 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 110S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>CRIME222</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 173</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MUSIC5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SPAN 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 102N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ECON 102</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>HIST 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MUSIC7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SPAN 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 129</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>ECON 104</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>HIST 20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>NURS 203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STAT 200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 141</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>EDSDGN100</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>HIST 21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NUTR 251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STAT 250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 142</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>EDSDGN100S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HONOR297</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PERSP997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TAX 949</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 220W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDSDGN130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HPA 57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHIL 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>THEA 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISC 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDTHP115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INART115</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHIL 103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>THEA 105</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISC 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>EMCH 211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTER971</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHIL 108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>THEA 207</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMS 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENGL 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTER984</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHIL 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WILDL103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMS 101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENGL 139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IST 110</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>PHIL 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WMST100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3B
High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State
Courses Taken Summer 2016 - Spring 2017
## Table 3C

### High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State

#### Courses Taken Summer 2015 - Spring 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAS 100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ENGR 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAS 100A</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>FR 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCTG211</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CAS 100B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GAME 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFAM 210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAS 100C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GEOG 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG 113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAS 100H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GEOG 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMST 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAS 100S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GEOSC20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMST 105</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>CHEM 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>GER 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHEM 101</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>GER 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CHEM 110</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>HDFS 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 216N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHEM 111</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>HDFS 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 45N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CHNS 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HDFS 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAB 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>CHNS 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HHD 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAB 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CIVCM211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAB 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CMLIT153</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HIST 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CMLIT191</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CMPSC101</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>HIST 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CMPSC122</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>HIST 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CMPSC122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>COMM 100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HIST 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>COMM 118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 112</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>COMM 150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HIST 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 226</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CRIM 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRO10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CRIM 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRO11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CRIMJ100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>HIST 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRO5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CRIMJ12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>HM 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRO6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EARTH105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INART125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 100</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>EARTH2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTST100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 243</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>ECON 102</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>IST 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBH 119</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ECON 104</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>IST 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBH 143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDPSY14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>IST 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBH 148S</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EDSGN100</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>KINES13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EGEE 102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KINES296B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EMCH 211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES296E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 110S</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ENGL 129</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 120N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENGL 133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENGL 134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 129</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>ENGL 136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 141</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>ENGL 137H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KINES77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 142</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>ENGL 15</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>KOR 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 296E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENGL 15S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>KOR 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISC 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENGL 184</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LING 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISC 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ENGL 192</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LLED 297A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMB 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENGL 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMS 25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENGL 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMS 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENGL 50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>MATH 141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4
**High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State**
*Enrollment by Ethnicity*
**Summer 2015 to Spring 2018**
*by Academic Year (Summer to Spring)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>SU15-SP16</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SU16-SP17</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SU17-SP18</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign (In US on Student or Temporary Visa)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>859</td>
<td></td>
<td>756</td>
<td></td>
<td>898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity collected and reported following federal requirements beginning in 2009.

### Table 5
**High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree in Credit Courses at Penn State**
*Enrollment by Gender*
**Summer 2015 to Spring 2018**
*by Academic Year (Summer to Spring)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>SU15-SP16</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SU16-SP17</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SU17-SP18</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>859</td>
<td></td>
<td>756</td>
<td></td>
<td>898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SENATE COMMITTEE ON CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

One-Semester Experimental Course Offering Procedures

(Informational)

Experimental numbers are available to academic units which wish to offer innovative and experimental courses. As explained in Appendix H (SR 3/17/92), experimental courses may be utilized to appraise the suitability of new content with limited procedural detail or to determine student interest in the course. Such courses are of a non-recurring nature or may have somewhat transient relevancy or interest.

Since the conversion to LionPATH, experimental courses have been rolling from semester-to-semester schedules and any embedded attributes remain attached on the sections unless someone has intervened and removed these attributes. In such a case, students may receive credit for unearned attributes. Furthermore, the retention of the experimental course via the semester roll has allowed the unit access to a course that has not received Faculty Senate approval. In addition to bypassing approval processes which have been in place for many years, there are a number of examples of units exceeding the three-semester limit on experimental offerings.

The purpose of this brief report is to reaffirm the usage guidelines regarding experimental x97 and x98 courses and to update Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs procedures language in dealing with these one-semester offerings for the current day in the current systems.

Procedures for Requesting and Scheduling a One-Semester Experimental Course

With recent systems updates over the past few years (i.e. LionPATH), it is important to clarify and update the procedures to request a one-semester experimental course offering and to clarify the enforcement of a maximum of three offerings in a given topic.

Upon approval of this informational report, the Registrar or its designee will remove all experimental courses from semesters not yet published in the schedule of courses. Henceforth, all experimental courses will be adjusted so they cannot roll with the semester schedule and cannot be directly scheduled by the unit.

In support of a long-standing practice reaffirmed in Appendix H (SR 3/17/92):

- The same course may be offered a maximum of three times. If continuation of the course is desired beyond three semesters, it must then be proposed as a permanent course.
- No more than eight experimental one-semester courses at a given level may be offered by a given unit during one calendar year.
- Academic units are required to seek and gain approval from the Faculty Senate Office for any experimental offering of a course to be made available. All requests must be submitted using the one-semester request form and must include all required information based on the prompts, the title of the course, the name of the faculty member who will offer the course, and a syllabus from the course instructor.
• Faculty Senate will only consider complete requests. It is the responsibility of the College Dean’s approver to check that all fields have been completed properly and must confirm all elements are present in the proposal including the course syllabus prior to forwarding the request to the Faculty Senate Office. Additionally, if a course request includes an honors designation, proper honors approval pathways for the campus or Schreyer Honors College must be followed.
• For all experimental course requests, the requester must allow a minimum of 5 days for processing once a complete request has been received by the Faculty Senate Office. Once a confirmation of completed processing is sent from the Faculty Senate Office to the submitter and the College, Division, or appropriately designated unit, the scheduler has ten (10) business days to confirm the course and title have been added to the schedule of courses. After ten (10) business days has expired, the course will no longer be available for scheduling; if the unit wishes to continue pursuing the experimental course at this time, a new request must be submitted.
• Experimental special topics courses may not include stated prerequisites, concurrent courses, or corequisite courses; any required preparation (including prerequisites) must be entered into the notes on the course section. Requirements indicated in the notes will not be enforceable in LionPATH; thus, it is the unit’s responsibility to enforce (i.e. via course control).
• If there is a cross-listed companion course, both courses must be requested and approved simultaneously.
• No course attributes may be added without Faculty Senate Office approval.
• Single-domain general education courses, writing across the curriculum courses, and US and/or IL cultures attributes are not allowed as attributes on experimental courses.
• One-semester integrative studies courses may be requested; if linked courses are proposed, both courses must be requested separately and be present in the approval queue simultaneously. One-semester integrative studies courses must include a full explanation addressing the general education learning objectives and single-domain criteria as requested in the one-semester integrative studies request form.
• Any experimental course sections added to the schedule of courses without Faculty Senate approval will be removed administratively.
• The Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs may revisit these procedures yearly or on an as needed basis.
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ELECTIONS COMMISSION

Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2019-2020

(Informational)

Abington
SENATORS (5)

Term Expires 2021
Hoffman, Robert

Term Expires 2022
Le, Binh P.
Volk Chewning, Lisa

Term Expires 2023
Calore, Gary
Ozment, Judith

Agricultural Sciences
SENATORS (9)

Term Expires 2020
Elias, Ryan J.

Term Expires 2021
Glenna, Leland
Perkins, Daniel F.

Term Expires 2022
Boyer, Elizabeth
Maximova, Siela
Shannon, Robert D.

Term Expires 2023
Harte, Federico
Marshall, Megan
Weld, Jennifer
Altoona
SENATORS (6)

Term Expires 2020
Brunsden, Victor W.

Term Expires 2021
Pyeatt, Nicholas
Rowland, Nicholas J.

Term Expires 2022
McKinney, Karyn D.

Term Expires 2023
Hayford, Harold S.
Seymour, Elizabeth M.

Arts and Architecture
SENATORS (6)

Term Expires 2021
Clements, Ann C.
Kalisperis, Loukas

Term Expires 2022
Costanzo, Denise
Szczygiel, Bonj

Term Expires 2023
Davis, Felecia
Kenyon, William C.

Berks
SENATORS (5)

Term Expires 2020
Ansari, Mohamad A.
Maurer, Clifford

Term Expires 2021
Bartolacci, Michael
Zambanini, Robert A.

Term Expires 2023
Snyder, Stephen J.
Business
SENATORS (5)

Term Expires 2020
Guay, Terrence
Thomchick, Evelyn A.

Term Expires 2021
Liechty, John

Term Expires 2022
Posey, Lisa L.
Tyworth, Michael

Communications
SENATORS (3)

Term Expires 2020
Jordan, Matthew

Term Expires 2021
Shea, Maura E.

Term Expires 2023
Simmons, Cynthia

Earth and Mineral Sciences
SENATORS (7)

Term Expires 2020
Robinson, Brandi

Term Expires 2021
Blanford, Justine
King, Brian

Term Expires 2022
Mathews, Jonathan
Najjar, Raymond

Term Expires 2023
King, Elizabeth F.
Taylor, Ann H.
Education
SENATORS (6)

Term Expires 2020
   Bryan, Julia

Term Expires 2021
   Reid-Walsh, Jacqueline J.

Term Expires 2022
   Kirby, Joshua
   Prescod, Diandra

Term Expires 2023
   Coduti, Wendy
   Riccomini, Paul J.

Engineering
SENATORS (14)

Term Expires 2020
   Koudela, Kevin
   Melton, Robert G.
   Suliman, Samia

Term Expires 2021
   Eden, Timothy
   Pauley, Laura L.
   Reichard, Karl

Term Expires 2022
   Handley, Meredith
   Laman, Jeffrey A.
   Messner, John
   Sinha, Alok

Term Expires 2023
   Hodgdon, Kathleen K.
   Lang, Teresa
   Wolfe, Douglas E.
   Zhang, Qiming
Erie
SENATORS (8)

Term Expires 2020
- Blakney, Terry
- Troester, Rodney I.

Term Expires 2021
- Kahl, David
- Noce, Kathleen J.

Term Expires 2022
- Evans, Edward
- Fairbank, James
- Mangel, Lisa A.

Term Expires 2023
- Warren, Alfred

Great Valley
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2020
- Jablokow, Kathryn W.

Term Expires 2021
- DeFranco, Joanna

Harrisburg
SENATORS (7)

Term Expires 2020
- Sprow Forté, Karin
- Tavangarian, Fariborz

Term Expires 2021
- Strickland, Martha
- Thompson, Paul

Term Expires 2022
- Subramanian, Rajarajan

Term Expires 2023
- Priesman, Emily
- Rhen, Linda
Health and Human Development
SENATORS (9)

Term Expires 2020
Duffey, Michele L.

Term Expires 2021
Hardyk, Andrew
Stine, Michele

Term Expires 2022
Shearer, Gregory

Term Expires 2023
Czymoniewicz-Klippel, Melina
Jones, Maureen C
Kramer, Lauren
Rutherford Siegel, Susan
Sharma, Amit

Information Sciences and Technology
SENATORS (3)

Term Expires 2020
Glantz, Edward J.

Term Expires 2021
Forster, Peter

Term Expires 2022
Fusco, David

International Affairs
SENATORS (1)

Term Expires 2022
Jett, Dennis C.
Liberal Arts
SENATORS (20)

Term Expires 2020
Abel, Jonathan
Bérubé, Michael
Casper, Gretchen
Furfaro, Joyce A.
Morello, Henry J.

Term Expires 2021
Decker, Alicia
Liu, Xin
Nelson, Keith E.
Young, Cynthia
Zorn, Christopher

Term Expires 2022
Eckhardt, Caroline D.
Jolly, Rosemary J
Michels, Margaret
Robicheaux, Timothy
Townsend, Sarah

Term Expires 2023
Browne, Stephen H.
Eburne, Jonathan
Hardy, Melissa
Linn, Suzanna
Page Jr., B. Richard

Dickinson Law
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2020
Butler, William E.

Term Expires 2023
Skladany, Martin
Libraries
SENATORS (3)

Term Expires 2020
Hughes, Janet A.

Term Expires 2021
Novotny, Eric

Term Expires 2022
Phillips, Kathleen

Military Sciences
SENATORS (1)

Term Expires 2020
Allerheiligen, Nathan

Medicine
SENATORS (30)

Term Expires 2020
Bosha, Philip
Kaag, Matthew
Lowden, Max
Peng, Xuwen
Robertson, Gavin
Ruggiero, Francesca
Truica, Cristina
Wong, Jeffrey

Term Expires 2021
Liu, Dajiang
Ropson, Ira J.
Saunders, Brian
Specht, Charles
Stephens, Mark
Wang, Ming
Williams, Nicole

Term Expires 2022
Acharya, Vinita
Davis, Dwight
Fausnight, Tracy B.
Freiberg, Andrew S.
Han, David C.
Mulder, Kathleen
Thomas, Gary
Vrana, Kent E.

Term Expires 2023
Abendroth, Catherine
Chetlen, Alison
Karpa, Kelly
Kass, Lawrence E.
Neves, Rogerio I.
Palmer, Timothy W.
Whitcomb, Tiffany

Nursing
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2021
Snyder, Melissa

Term Expires 2022
Kitko, Lisa

Penn State Law
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2021
Farmer, Susan Beth

Term Expires 2023
Scott, Geoffrey

Science
SENATORS (14)

Term Expires 2020
Banyaga, Augustin
Fox, Derek
Strauss, James A.

Term Expires 2021
Keiler, Kenneth C.
Larson, Daniel J.
Robinett, Richard W.
Term Expires 2022
Masters, Katherine M.
Mocioiu, Irina
Sigurdsson, Steinn
Van Hook, Stephen J.

Term Expires 2023
Byrne, Christopher
Nousek, John A.
Shen, Wen
Williams, Mary Beth

Retired Faculty Senators
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2020
Clark, Mary Beth

Term Expires 2022
Blood, Ingrid M.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

Beaver
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2020
Pierce, Mari Beth

Term Expires 2022
Mookerjee, Rajen

Brandywine
SENATORS (3)

Term Expires 2021
Gallagher, Julie

Term Expires 2022
Blockett, Kimberly

Term Expires 2023
Fredricks, Susan M.
DuBois
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2021
Breakey, Laurie
Vollero, Mary

Fayette
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2020
Conti, Delia B.

Term Expires 2023
Precht, Jay

Greater Allegheny
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2020
Grimes, Galen A.

Term Expires 2021
Jaap, James A.

Hazleton
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2022
Marko, Frantisek

Term Expires 2023
Petrilla, Rosemarie

Lehigh Valley
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2020
Egolf, Roger A.

Term Expires 2022
Krajsa, Michael J.
Mont Alto
SENATORS (3)

Term Expires 2020
Linehan, Peter

Term Expires 2022
Moore, Jacob

Term Expires 2023
Borromeo, Renee L.

New Kensington
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2022
Larson, Allen

Term Expires 2023
Amador Medina, Melba

Schuylkill
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2020
Aurand, Harold W.

Term Expires 2023
Zilleruelo, Arturo

Shenango
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2020
McDade, Kevin

Term Expires 2021
Saltz, Ira S.
Wilkes-Barre
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2020
Chen, Wei-Fan

Term Expires 2022
Ofosu, Willie K.

Worthington Scranton
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2020
Aebli, Fred J.

Term Expires 2023
Bishop-Pierce, Renee

York
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2022
Folkers, Deirdre A.

Term Expires 2023
Nesbitt, Jennifer P.
Background

Each year, Penn State’s Information Technology Fee (IT Fee) supports nearly 100,000 users by granting access to technologies—both inside and outside of the classroom—that enhance the student experience and increase chances for success. From tools for teaching and learning to digital security and seamless wireless Internet across campuses, IT Fee-funded services have a daily impact on the academic, research, and co-curricular pursuits of students.

Department Allocation of IT Fee Funds

During fiscal year 2017-2018, Penn State collected $43.7M in IT Fees to provide IT services to students. The fees collected were allocated departmentally per below.

University Library Services (18%, $7.9M) supports the University Libraries’ collection of electronic journals, e-books, databases and digital collections, as well as hardware, software, ScholarSphere, and Knowledge Commons activities at the Libraries.

Office of Information Security Services (3%, $1.3M) supports network and community security at every Penn State campus location.

Enterprise IT Central Services (43%, $18.9M) supports such centrally provisioned services as Penn State access accounts, service desk support, Lynda.psu.edu, and more. These services are provided through Information Technology Services.

Specific Campus and College Distribution (36%, $15.6M) includes location-specific provisioning and support for student computer labs and other student-oriented computing equipment, facilities, and programs.
It should be noted that Dickinson Law, Hershey, and Penn State Law collect applicable IT Fees from their own students and thus do not participate in the IT Fee sharing arrangement that covers other campuses. Rather, these entities transfer funds that they collect to EIT to pay for their pro rata allocations of central services.

**Enterprise Information Technology Use of IT Fee Funds**

Enterprise Information Technology (EIT) received $25.8M in IT Fee funds in fiscal year 2017-2018 between the categories of IT Central Services ($18.9M) and Specific Campus Locations ($6.8M). In the same fiscal year, EIT spent close to $41M in hard costs related to services that directly support students in their educational endeavors at Penn State. Below is enumerated EIT’s 2017-2018 direct student support spend by category.

**Computing and Collaborative Services** (23%, $9.4M) - IT Fee helped provide critical computing resources at Penn State in support of infrastructure, technologies, messaging, and communications. Funds from the IT Fee were used to support such services as [http://software.psu.edu/](http://software.psu.edu/), enterprise directory services, federated identity access, the EIT alerts system, service desk support services, enterprise communication tools, lab consultants, access account services, and much more.

**Enterprise Applications and Software** (4%, 1.8M) - The IT Fee contributed to a variety of enterprise applications in support of student success. IT Fee funds helped to support applications such as Office 365, anti-virus software, and global access to lynda.psu.edu.

**Networking and Infrastructure Services** (46%, $18.7M) - IT Fee contributed to increased security and network connectivity throughout the Penn State system. The IT Fee was used to support services such as internet connectivity, campus interconnectivity, network border protection, videoconferencing, and wireless coverage and capacity, among others.

**Teaching and Learning Technology Services** (27%, $11M) - IT Fee provided funding for educational initiatives, solutions, and core instructional services across all of Penn State’s campuses. Funds from the IT Fee were used to support such services as Assistive Technology, the Canvas learning management system, cooperative lab management, e-Learning support specialists, faculty technology support, EIT computer labs, Media Commons, One Button Studio,
printing, teaching and learning assistants, Tech Tutors, technology classrooms, 3D printing, and a host of other services.

Audit

An audit of IT Fee funds distribution, use, and governance, focusing on fiscal year 2017-2018, is ongoing as of March 2019. It is intended that the results of this audit will inform future IT Fee distribution and governance, particularly at campus locations.

Resources

Questions regarding this document and supporting documentation can be directed to L-EIT-FINANCEOFFICE@lists.psu.edu

Supporting Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall IT Fee Distribution</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Library Services</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$7,886,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Information Security Services</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$1,314,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise IT Central Services</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$18,925,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Campus and College Distribution</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>$15,560,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IT Fee</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$43,686,733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIT Direct Student Support</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computing and Collaborative Services</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>$9,447,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Applications and Software</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$1,819,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking &amp; Infrastructure Services</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$18,684,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning Technology Services</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$11,019,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total EIT Direct Student Support</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$40,970,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Specific Campus and College Distribution Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>$688,592</td>
<td>Mont Alto</td>
<td>$150,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>$674,207</td>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>$112,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>$195,051</td>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>$127,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>$869,404</td>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>$73,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>$492,760</td>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>$104,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>$277,895</td>
<td>Worthington-Scranton</td>
<td>$200,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuBois</td>
<td>$112,169</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>$187,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>$132,076</td>
<td>World Campus</td>
<td>$2,084,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Valley</td>
<td>$38,906</td>
<td>University Park Colleges</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>$897,001</td>
<td>EIT - Computing and</td>
<td>$2,748,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>$144,035</td>
<td>EIT - Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>$1,608,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley</td>
<td>$200,791</td>
<td>EIT - General</td>
<td>$2,484,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Allegheny</td>
<td>$104,323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Campus and College Distribution**  
$15,560,100

---

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES, INFORMATION SYSTEMS & TECHNOLOGY**

- Fred Aebli, Vice Chair
- Mary Beth Clark
- Barbara Dewey
- Roger Egolf, Chair
- Synthea Hairston
- David Han
- Michael Kubit
- John Messner
- Jacqueline Reid-Walsh
- Summer Rosendahl
- Francesca Ruggiero
- Shuang Shen
- Harold Smith
- Jennifer Sparrow
- Cristina Truica
- Stephanie Walker
Priority A5 of the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (SCoRSCA) for the 2018-2019 academic year is to explore climate and workplace issues in graduate programs. To address this priority, the SCoRSCA committee has reviewed and is reporting on the results from the Graduate School Exit Survey, as well as noting other ongoing and planned efforts to assess the climate for graduate students.

The Graduate School Exit Survey

Every semester, the Graduate School Exit Survey gives all Penn State graduate students who have activated their intent to graduate the opportunity to provide feedback on their experiences at the university. The survey is disseminated to these students by the Graduate School two weeks prior to the annual August, December, and May commencement ceremonies. Questions on the survey cover many aspects of the student experience, and the results provide a rich data source that can be used as part of a holistic assessment of graduate student experiences, program quality, mentoring by graduate faculty, professional development, academic climate, obstacles to success, and post-graduation plans. The Exit Survey is an important component of a continuous process of program evaluation and improvement on the part of the Graduate School. Responses are aggregated and reviewed within the Graduate School and shared with colleges and graduate programs to facilitate and contribute to each program’s self-review and improvement plans. A full report on findings from the Graduate School Exit Survey is being prepared and will be posted on the Graduate School website once complete.

The findings summarized here and more extensively described in the upcoming full report are based on student responses to key survey questions from 5,741 of the 15,744 students who filed their intent to graduate between the summer of 2013 and spring of 2017 (average response rate across all semesters was 37.7 percent, ± 5 percent). Data were compiled from students enrolled in residential graduate degree programs at the five Penn State campuses offering graduate degrees (University Park, Erie, Harrisburg, Hershey, and Great Valley), as well as online graduate degree programs delivered via the Penn State World Campus. Responses were grouped according to degree type – doctoral (PhD), research masters (MA/MS), professional masters offered through residential education, and professional masters delivered via the World Campus. Responses from students in residential professional doctoral degree programs were combined with those from research doctorate (PhD) respondents, due to the small numbers of students in these programs. In addition, responses from World Campus students in graduate degree programs other than those granting professional master’s degrees were not included in order to maintain confidentiality, given the small number of such programs and size of their respective graduating cohorts.
The Exit Survey responses during the four-year period of the analysis present a very positive picture of graduate education at Penn State overall. In evaluating their experiences in their graduate programs, 95 percent of respondents rated their academic experience positively ("good," "very good," or "excellent"), with similarly strong positive responses for their overall experience (94 percent "good," "very good," or "excellent") and student life at the university (87 percent "good," "very good," or "excellent"). Bolstering this conclusion, graduate student respondents rather strongly supported the statements that they were treated with respect by the faculty (87 percent "strongly agreed" or "agreed"), experienced a positive intellectual climate (88 percent "strongly agreed" or "agreed"), found their fellow students to be collegial (86 percent "strongly agreed" or "agreed"), and were embedded in a positive social climate (80 percent "strongly agreed" or "agreed"). No major variations in these strong scores were in evidence when the data were examined across time, with respect to race, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, or academic discipline. Likewise, very similar patterns of strong support were in evidence across all graduate degree types (research and professional degrees, doctoral and master’s level). Students supported by graduate assistantships (GAs) were as equally positive as non-funded graduate students in their responses to questions, including those about overall satisfaction, faculty mentorship and PhD dissertation advising. Finally, when compared to residential students, World Campus graduate students reported even stronger positive experiences on virtually all key questions in the Exit Survey.

The strong overall positive evaluations notwithstanding, the Exit Survey helped identify areas for improvement. Student ratings were somewhat lower in a few areas. With respect to graduate students’ academic experience, these areas include support for career and professional development, and the need for regular assessment of students’ academic progress. In terms of career and professional development, 18 percent of doctoral respondents rated advice from their dissertation adviser on non-academic career options as either “not very helpful” or “not helpful at all,” for an average rating of “somewhat helpful” (3.11 on a 4-point scale). In addition, student ratings of their graduate programs’ assistance in finding employment were centered around “good” as opposed to “very good” or “excellent” (mean rating of 3.03 on a 5-point scale across all degree types), and ratings of their graduate program’s career development opportunities were slightly higher than “good” (mean rating of 3.30 on a 5-point scale across all degree types) indicating that there is room for improvement. The Graduate School is aware that career and professional development resources need to be bolstered and efforts are underway to build more programming in this area. A second area of concern is that only 46 percent of respondents reported receiving formal assessments of their academic progress, outside of course grades and milestone exams while in their graduate program. This is an area of need particularly for those seeking research degrees. Efforts are currently underway to help address this problem, beginning with a recent revision of Graduate Council policy to require annual reviews for students pursuing a research doctorate.

Although most of the responses to questions about student life were positive, as noted above, these questions tended to receive more negative responses compared to those centering on the academic experience. For instance, 20 percent of students were “ambivalent,” “disagreed,” or “strongly disagreed” with the statement that the social climate in their program was positive. Moreover, while aggregate mean scores for women and under-represented minorities (URMs) are very positive and similar to those of men and non-URMs in the general population of
respondents, the rating distributions for these groups tended to be slightly shifted toward lower ratings, with somewhat fewer “excellent” or “strongly agree” and slightly more “good” or “agree” ratings, on several major questions. These results indicate that even though a large majority of the students are satisfied, we should not be complacent and that efforts should be made to continue to improve the climate for all graduate students.

Degree completion rates at Penn State are far above national averages, with approximately 70 percent degree completion within 10 yrs. for doctoral students and 80 percent for research and professional master’s students within 4 yrs. By comparison, completion rates for doctoral students nationally are 50-60 percent within 10 yrs. (1). Although comprehensive degree completion data for Master’s degrees are limited, a study of five institutions by the Council of Graduate Schools reflects 4 yr. degree completion rates of approximately 66% for Master’s students in STEM fields and 86% for MBA students, a professional master’s degree (2). Given the high degree completion rates at Penn State, the Exit Survey is distributed to a significant portion of the graduate student population and provides an important window on their experiences at the university. The data clearly reveal that the majority of students completing their respective degrees are quite satisfied with the academic elements, climate, and resources of their programs. Although the Graduate School Exit Survey does capture the opinions of a large number of graduate students, we do note that it is limited in that it reports solely on those students who anticipated completing their degree programs at the time they responded to the survey and does not capture the 20-30 percent of students who may have already left their graduate program without completing their degree. It also does not capture the opinions of current students who are not yet nearing degree completion. The experiences of these students are important to consider as well, and efforts are underway to give these populations the opportunity to provide feedback as described below.

Additional Efforts to Assess the Climate for Graduate Students

To address the gaps in our understanding of the graduate student experience resulting from the focus of the Exit Survey on students who have successfully completed their degrees, several other surveys are planned or are underway that will capture opinions of all graduate students, including those at risk for not completing a degree. These efforts include the university-wide Sexual Misconduct Climate survey distributed in Fall 2018 and a university-wide climate and diversity survey to be distributed in Spring 2020. The Graduate Student and Faculty Issues Committee of the Graduate Council is also exploring the development of a survey to collect information specifically from graduate students who fail to complete their degrees. Results of the various surveys will be taken into consideration along with the Exit Survey data and shared with colleges and programs to guide current programming efforts and in strategic planning for future endeavors on the part of the Graduate School, with a goal of continuous improvement towards making the graduate student experience exemplary in all areas.

(2) Master’s Completion Project. 2013. Completion and Attrition in STEM Master’s Programs: Pilot Study Findings. Council of Graduate Schools, Washington, DC
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SENATE COUNCIL

2017-2018 University Faculty Ombudsperson Report

(Informational)

Background

The Position of University Faculty Ombudsperson was established by the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules on March 31, 1998. The duties of the University Faculty Ombudsperson are defined in the University Faculty Senate’s Standing Rules, Article III, Section 10.

“The University Faculty Ombudsman shall coordinate the training of all college and campus ombudsmen; shall provide for the appropriate dissemination of information among the various college and campus ombudsmen; and shall be the university-level contact for the various college and campus ombudsmen. The University Ombudsman shall report periodically to the Senate Council and shall maintain liaison with the Office of the University Provost, the Office of Human Resources and the Senate Office. The University Ombudsman shall have no appeal function.”

The Selection and Responsibilities of the Academic Units Ombudspersons (referred herein as ombudspersons) are defined by the Policy AC76:

A. An Ombudsperson shall be appointed in each of the colleges, campuses and academic units. For those not associated with an academic unit, or in cases where the appropriate ombudsperson may be in doubt, the following policy shall be applied:
   1. Where appropriate, the ombudsperson will be from the same academic unit to which the employee is most closely associated. For example, research associates in the Applied Research Laboratory will have access to the ombudsperson for the College of Engineering.
   2. In cases where there is disagreement or doubt as to the appropriate ombudsperson, the Executive Vice President and Provost shall make the determination.
   3. In cases where the ombudsperson is in doubt as to his or her jurisdiction, he or she shall ask the Executive Vice President and Provost for a determination.

B. The Dean, Chancellor, or other appropriate campus official and the faculty shall jointly develop selection procedures for the ombudsperson. Normally, the role of ombudsperson will be performed by a single person, with a designated alternate. In unusual circumstances, a group of not more than three persons may be selected. No one who is a member of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities shall serve as ombudsperson.

C. Functions for the ombudsperson are:
   1. Clarification of misunderstandings;
   2. Advising faculty and administrators as to appropriate courses of action;
   3. Assisting in the informal resolution of differences;
   4. Assuring that appropriate department, college and/or campus procedures are exhausted before referring the case to higher levels;
5. Informing the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost and appropriate college or campus officials if a matter cannot be resolved at the lower level and the case is to be referred to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

6. **The ombudsperson shall not:**
   - Hold hearings;
   - Exceed the role of conciliator and advisor;
   - Substitute his or her judgment for that of appropriate administrative and/or faculty bodies;
   - Serve as counsel for either party to a complaint before the Hearing Board.

**Introduction**

Ombudspersons provide valuable services to the faculty and they are trusted resources for the faculty. Ombudspersons are committed to listening to the faculty; answering questions; explaining policies and procedures; providing information and advice; exploring possible solutions; suggesting appropriate referrals; assisting in pursuing a resolution; and informally mediating a dispute where appropriate.

To further enhance communications among the ombudsperson, in addition to the Ombudsperson Orientation meeting that was held in August, 2018, Vice Provost Kathy Bieschke, Senate Executive Director Dawn Blasko, and the University Faculty Ombudsperson Mohamad A. Ansari held a regional meeting with the ombudspersons from colleges at University Park in October 2018, and another meeting was held, in March 2019, with the Ombudspersons from the Commonwealth Campuses. The Senate Office received positive feedback on these regional meetings.

This informational report is drafted by the University Faculty Ombudsperson and is submitted to the Senate Council on behalf of all academic Units’ Ombudspersons from across the university. The purpose of this report is to summarize the activities and the services that were provided to the faculty by the ombudspersons during 2017-18 academic year. In order to assess the ombudspersons’ activities, on May 1, 2018, the Senate Office distributed “A 10 Question Survey” to all ombudspersons and alternate ombudspersons from 23 Commonwealth Campuses, 12 University Park colleges (including University Libraries), Great Valley, Penn State Law, Dickinson Law, and the College of Medicine.

**Survey Questions and Responses**

The Senate Office received 61 reports from the ombudspersons and alternate ombudsperson, a 93.85% response rate to the survey. This response rate is slightly higher than the 2017 response rate (84.8%).

1. **How long have you served as your unit’s Ombudsperson or alternate?**
   Of the ombudspersons who answered this question, 20 have served one year, 18 have served two to three years, 13 have served four to eight years, 1 has served ten years, and 1 had served 15 years.
2. How many cases have you been asked to help resolve in the past year?
During the 2017-2018 academic year, ombudspersons reported 90 cases. This is an increase of 2.2% over the 88 cases that were reported during 2016-2017 academic year.

3. For each case, what were the key issue(s)? (e.g., lack of communication, promotion and tenure, harassment, incivility, performance review, etc.)
The following issues that were reported by the ombudspersons are ranked by their frequency (24 to 1):
- Lack of communication/Miscommunication/Poor Communication;
- Incivility/harassment;
- Promotion & Tenure (P&T);
- Climate/Leadership;
- Procedural fairness unrelated to P&T;
- Performance reviews;
- Disrespect;
- Interpersonal conflict;
- Dismissal;
- Bullying/Threats/Spreading false rumors;
- Discrimination;
- Information/policy clarification.

4. What was the position of the person against whom the complaint was lodged? (e.g., staff, faculty, administrator, if other, explain)
During 2017-18 academic year, ombudspersons received complaints against Senior Leadership of the University, Administrator, Chancellor, Associate Dean or DAA, faculty colleague, Dean, Department or Division Head, School Director, staff, and Human Resources.

5. What steps were taken to resolve the issue?
During 2017-18 academic year, ombudspersons assisted faculty to resolve their problems by facilitating communication, clarifying policies, providing information, and discussing options. The following responses to this question are quoted from the survey:
- “Discussed with complainant options and made suggestions for resolution. No additional consult necessary; tied to clarify the issue and discuss the options; recommended 3 paths for resolution; individual met with administrators and faculty several times and eventually left the university.”
- “One-on-one conflict coaching or consultation; mediation; representation in meeting(s) with senior administration and sometimes HR; and referral to other offices at PSU.”
- “Researched HR policies, contacted university privacy office and put faculty member in touch with appropriate person to investigate whether any violation had occurred.”
- “A meeting with the Chancellor, DAA, faculty member, HR representative, and ombudsman was held. As a result of the meeting, situation was resolved and faculty member was reappointed to a FT-1 position.”
- “Private conversation between ombuds and DAA; listened to faculty member; took notes; sent memo to faculty member documenting the conversation (this was all that was
and attended meeting between faculty member, chancellor, and UC senior associate dean for faculty and research to document and help process information conveyed (this was all that was requested).”

- “Met with the faculty member several times and provided counsel on how to move forward. Also suggested he contact the University Ombudsperson for a different perspective.”
- “Generally, the actions involved many one-on-one conversations with the individuals, as well as follow-up consultations regarding recommended actions, including potential filings with affirmative action office.”
- “In two related cases, I conducted a "fact-finding" at the request of the Dean, and I turned in a written report. This report led to a series of steps to address the issues at the college and departmental levels. Related to these cases, I was asked to have conversations with faculty who had been accused of unprofessional behavior. One of the aggrieved individuals has filed with the AA office as well, and I was consulted on this filing.”
- “Consulted with the faculty, who was allegedly involved in bullying behavior, supervisors/department head, and in four cases, the Dean and HR leadership in the college.”
- “I just explained the conflict resolution process and the Ombudsperson's role in that process.”
- “I discussed the matter with the individual in person, phone and/or e-mail. In two of the eight cases the Alternate Ombudsperson was part of the communication. Some cases involved participating in meetings with the Associate Dean. One case also included participation from HR. Most of the steps involved additional communication to understand the issue and discuss any relevant policies.”

6. How many of the cases were resolved at the Ombudsperson level?
During 2017-18 academic year, ombudspersons who had been contacted by the faculty were able to resolve 39 cases out of 90 cases (43.33%). This rate is lower than the rate that was reported in 2016-2017 academic year (54.5%). For example, one ombudsperson was able to resolve 7 cases of the 10 cases that he/she had received, another resolved 4 cases out of 5, and another resolved 2 cases out of 8.

7. How many cases were referred to the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities or other offices? (e.g. Affirmative Action, Human Resources, etc.)
During 2017-2018 academic year, 14 cases were referred to the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (FR&R). One case was reported to the Office of Affirmative Action, and four cases were reported to the Office of Human Resources. The following responses to this question are quoted from the survey:
- “I referred one person to this committee (FR&R) as an option, but after further discussion, the person decided not to pursue; One person self referred to this committee - and is currently considering if this is an option to pursue. I consulted with HR on two of the 5 cases, one with a person present.”
- “1 to FR&R.”
- “In case 2, the faculty member independently approached HR.”
- “One, but the person decided not to pursue it.”
8. Were you aware of situations in which a colleague could have consulted an ombuds but went straight to another resource (e.g., Affirmative Action, Human Resources, etc.)? If so, please explain.

The following responses to this question are quoted from the survey:

- “Faculty sometimes go to HR naively thinking that HR is a neutral office when in fact they primarily represent the interests of the University and senior administrators.”
- “I was not aware of any such situation.”
- “Yes. Among newer/junior faculty, there seems to be a lack of awareness of the potential roles and even the presence of a unit faculty ombudsperson. Among those aware that there is an ombudsperson, their identity was generally unknown, and there was an overall perception that consulting the ombudsperson is the first step in a formal complaint process rather than a potential alternate route to resolution. I will be addressing this in the coming months. I will send out an introductory e-mail early in the fall semester. I also hope to provide a little more than name and contact information on our college's HR page.”

9. In your role as a college/campus Ombudsperson, did any issues concerning the Ombudsperson process arise which should be addressed by the University Faculty Senate? If so, explain.

The following responses to this question are quoted from the survey:

- “Yes. In Case 1 the faculty member believed the department head was misusing SRTE scores.”
- “When an issue arises with faculty not adhering to AD20 on a small campus in a small unit, there is no way to make an anonymous complaint. If the DAA refuses to address the issue, what alternatives exist for faculty to remain anonymous but still ensure the integrity of a program?”
- “I have grown increasingly concerned about faculty being mandated to show up at a private meeting with HR or a division head or a more senior administrator without being told the general topic of the meeting. This is sometimes understandable if the faculty member is the target of a serious investigation but, even then, it may violate due process. I have seen this happen more as a routine power move over the last few years. My sense is that it grows out of the post-Sandusky cultural update but it is not fully justified by us needing to be hyper-vigilant of all types of wrongdoing.”
- “The rights and responsibilities of faculty with partial appointments in departments are unspecified by current HR documents, which leave these individuals potentially vulnerable to marginalization by the departmental decision-making process. There need to be clear guidelines for rights and responsibilities of faculty appointments that are split between two or more academic units.”
- “Clarify timelines for tenure packages with regard to teaching and service: why is there a 5-year limit to these materials? What are the rights of minority appointments in a department? There should be a requirement that roles, rights, and responsibilities should be clarified at the time of appointment “at will” service in administrative roles should be clarified in all cases at the time of appointment, and reporting lines need to be clearly delineated at the time of appointment.”
• “The main issue: Clarification on faculty rights for an ombudsperson to be present at a meeting. For example, if a faculty member’s immediate supervisor does not consent to the presence of an ombudsperson, what rights does the faculty member have at that point?”
• “Very uneven rules on compensation for overloads, program coordinators, etc. across the campuses. Very very very different levels of compensation. Really unfair situation!”

10. Are there any suggestions you would like to make that could be useful to another ombudsperson, especially a new one? Are there additional meetings (beyond the fall orientation) that you would like to have with other unit ombuds during the academic year? The following responses to this question are quoted from the survey:
• “Make sure you go to the orientation as the beginning of your term and about every other year to stay current with policies and tools available.”
• “Please schedule the orientation far in advance. It makes it easier for us to block out the time at a difficult time of year. Please send the final report to all ombuds. Please have the University ombuds share a statement at least once per year and consider doing so with a posted video.”
• “Prepare for a lot of listening, understand diverse points of view, and offer alternatives that lead to conflict resolution with a minimum of bureaucratic kerfuffle and personal animosity.”
• “An online meeting with other unit Ombuds to discuss issues will be helpful.”
• “There is a great need to educate faculty and administrators in what characterizes harassment, sexual harassment, incivility, chilly climate, and bullying behaviors, differences between an isolated occurrence and a repeated pattern of behaviors, and how to document one's experiences. Penn State is lagging far behind peer institutions in efforts to educate its employees, including and perhaps especially faculty, in these issues. This exacerbates the wide generational difference in how younger and older employees interpret their experiences and perceive what is acceptable behavior.”
• “Having some information about the types of issues handled by others would be of value.”
• “Suggestions: 1) Increased communication between ombudspersons across the University. A meeting once per semester, in-person, can be useful. 2) Support training and certification from external organizations (e.g. International Ombudsman Association).”
• “I would have liked to consult with other ombudspersons at times just to get help processing and testing my own perspectives. Maybe sharing the names/emails of other ombudspersons would facilitate this if this would be an acceptable way to consult.”
• “The role of an "alternate" is questionable. While alternate, I was not involved in a single case.”
• “The orientation does a good job of reinforcing how important simply listening and understanding is when talking with someone about their concerns. I try not to rush in with suggestions or ways to fix things until the person has had plenty of time to talk. I think a mid-year check in meeting would be a good idea to find out if there are questions or issues that have developed. I also think knowing who counterparts are at other campuses would be beneficial.”
Respectfully,

Mohamad A. Ansari,
University Faculty Ombudsperson
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Executive Summary

Heavy episodic drinking among college students was first identified as a national public health problem in 2000 by the U.S. Surgeon General and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. In the past two decades, considerable attention has been focused on understanding the issue and identifying research-based interventions to reduce the academic, health, legal and personal consequences students experience as well as the negative impact on college communities. National data indicate that while heavy episodic drinking among college students has declined over the last 6 years (41.0% in 2008 compared to 37.4% in 2014), risky behaviors and associated harms still exist. (1)

This report provides a summary of student drinking at Penn State. The first part of the report provides data to demonstrate the scope and impact of dangerous drinking. The data focus primarily on Penn State University Park; however, when available, data from the Commonwealth Campuses are included. Staff at University Park have been tracking metrics related to student alcohol use since the late 1990s. Overall, the data in this report show a decrease in the number of alcohol-related violations and incidents over the last three years at University Park and the Commonwealth Campuses. Data from the Pulse Student Drinking Survey indicate an increase in the negative consequences experienced by students, including academic, personal and health consequences. Data from Mount Nittany Medical Center’s Emergency Department show a decrease in alcohol-related visits in the last year.

The second part of the report focuses on interventions. Penn State follows guidance from national experts and has a comprehensive approach addressing the individual as well as the campus and community (environmental) level. This report features some of the new and ongoing interventions. Strategies include programming for first-year students, mandated interventions for students with violations, counseling and recovery services, and initiatives focused on fraternity and sorority chapters. A comprehensive description of Penn State’s strategies is included in Penn State’s Biennial Review for the U.S. Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act.

Despite many years of effort, Penn State, like other institutions, continues to struggle with reducing dangerous drinking and its negative outcomes. Many factors contribute to the complexity of the issue including the availability of free and low-cost alcohol, the marketing of alcohol to teenagers and young adults, and the portrayal of the undergraduate experience in movies and on social media. These factors, coupled with an annual influx of thousands of new students, reinforce the need for a persistent and wide-ranging campus and community approach.
Introduction

In 2000, The U.S. Surgeon General and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services identified heavy episodic drinking, also known as binge drinking, among college students as a major public health problem. Two years later the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) released a series of publications designed to help universities address the growing issue. NIAAA took a novel approach and provided data to demonstrate the academic, health, legal and personal consequences students experience because of their own alcohol use and the excessive drinking of other students. The documents provided “recommendations to college and university presidents on the potential effectiveness of current strategies to reverse the culture of drinking on campus”

Two years prior to the U.S. Surgeon General’s report, The Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board (PLCB) provided funding to Penn State to develop campus and community partnerships. At the time, campus and community partnerships were encouraged because research demonstrated that “community-level interventions reduced problems such as youth access to alcohol, underage drinking, heavy drinking among adults, and drinking while driving.” In response to the PLCB’s commitment, Penn State University Park and the State College Borough formed “The Partnership—Campus and Community United Against Dangerous Drinking.” The mission of the group was to engage and actively involve various sectors of the Centre Region to change the Penn State and community culture with an emphasis on reducing the high-risk consumption of alcohol. Similar partnerships were formed at every Commonwealth Campus.

In addition to identifying and supporting research-based initiatives, The Partnership began tracking a set of alcohol-related metrics (including undergraduate student drinking rates, negative consequences of drinking, alcohol-related emergency department visits and sanctions and citations) to measure the impact of excessive drinking on the community. The data were published in an Annual Alcohol Assessment report for the first time in 2003. The Partnership continues to publish the report providing a 5-year overview of the indicators. Some of the data presented here are from the most recent Annual Alcohol Assessment report.

The first half of this report provides a summary of the data to demonstrate the scope and impact of dangerous drinking. The reporting period for most of the data is June 1 through May 31. This time frame is consistent with The Partnership’s Annual Alcohol Assessment report. The data focus primarily on Penn State University Park; however, when available, data from the Commonwealth Campuses are included.

For over twenty years, Penn State has implemented a wide range of strategies including policies, educational programs, and intervention services to address high-risk drinking among students. In accordance with the most recent guidance from the NIAAA (5), Penn State has a mixture of research-based prevention and intervention strategies that focus on the individual and the campus and community (environmental) level. The second half of this report provides a summary of some of the newer interventions as well as key initiatives that have been in place for close to a decade. A comprehensive description of Penn State’s strategies is included in the institution’s Biennial Review for the U.S. Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. A copy of the biennial review can be obtained from Health Promotion and Wellness.
Scope of the Issue

Student Drinking Behaviors

Information about students’ self-reported consumption of alcohol is collected on a regular basis through the Penn State Pulse Student Drinking Survey conducted by Student Affairs Research and Assessment. The data allow for comparisons of student alcohol consumption patterns at University Park which have been collected since 1995. An important indicator of students’ drinking patterns is the level of high-risk behavior. High-risk drinking is defined as having four or more drinks in a two-hour period for women and five or more drinks in a two-hour period for men at least once over a two-week period. Occasional high-risk drinkers are those who reported drinking at this level one or two times during a two-week period. Frequent high-risk drinkers are those who reported drinking at this level three or more times during a two-week period.

In 2017, 46.9% of students reported engaging in high-risk drinking behavior, with 20.0% being classified as frequent high-risk drinkers (see Chart 1). This represents a decrease in high-risk behavior compared to 2015 when 51.3% of students reported engaging in high-risk drinking behavior, with 23.9% classified as frequent high-risk drinkers.

High-Risk Drinking Rates for First-Year Students

Information about students’ self-reported consumption of alcohol is collected through the Penn State SAFE (Student Alcohol Feedback and Education) program. Penn State SAFE is required for all incoming first-year students prior to arrival on campus. Additional information about Penn State SAFE is provided in the interventions section of this report. The online module includes an alcohol use survey that students complete at the beginning of the module and again 30 days after the start of classes.
Below is a summary of the percentage of high-risk drinkers before and after matriculation broken down by University Park, residential campuses, and non-residential campuses (Chart 2). The data are from the fall 2017 implementation of Penn State SAFE. The data are consistent with research showing that alcohol consumption increases when students transition from high school to college \(^6\)\(^7\). At University Park, 27% of first-year students reported engaging in high-risk drinking behavior prior to arriving on campus. In the 30 days after arriving on campus, 36% reported high-risk drinking behavior. For residential campuses, 10% reported high-risk drinking pre-matriculation and 12% reported high-risk drinking 30 days after arriving on campus.

**Chart 2. Percentage of First-Year Students who are High-Risk Drinkers, 2017**

**Impact**

**Self-Reported Consequences**

As part of the Penn State Pulse Student Drinking Survey, students are asked about a series of consequences of alcohol use—both indirect (resulting from other students’ drinking) and direct (resulting from their own drinking). The top five consequences students experienced as a result of their own drinking are presented in Chart 3. In 2017, the percentage of students experiencing these consequences increased or stayed the same compared to the previous year.
Students who are occasional and frequent high-risk drinkers historically report the highest levels of negative consequences. Table 1 shows the percentage of students experiencing consequences by risk category.

### Table 1. Percentage of University Park Students Experiencing Consequences by Risk Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-high-risk drinkers</th>
<th>Occasional high-risk drinkers</th>
<th>Frequent high-risk drinkers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had a hangover</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed a class</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got behind in school work</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did something you later regreted</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got into trouble with the campus or local police</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got hurt or injured</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sexual Assault and Alcohol**

Based on results from Penn State’s 2015 Sexual Misconduct Climate Survey, 21.1% of undergraduate women at University Park reported having been sexually assaulted while incapacitated. The Sexual Misconduct Climate Survey was conducted in October 2018. Survey results are not yet available.
Alcohol-Related Emergency Department Visits

The Mount Nittany Medical Center’s (MNMC) Emergency Department (ED) provides information about Penn State University Park students who seek care for alcohol-related reasons. The information includes evidence of alcohol consumption (including Blood Alcohol Concentration), age and sex. In 2017-18, the number of alcohol-related visits to MNMC was 691, a decrease in the number of visits reported for 2016-17 (Chart 4).

![Chart 4. Number of Penn State Student Alcohol-Related Visits to Mount Nittany Medical Center](image)

In 2017-18, the average BAC level of Penn State students who visited MNMC for alcohol-related reasons was 0.253. In 2016-17, the average BAC was 0.254 (Chart 5).
Table 2 shows the number of alcohol-related visits to MNMC Emergency Department by month for the last 5 years for University Park students.

Table 2. University Park Students with an Alcohol-Related Visit to MNMC Emergency Department by Month, 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State College and University Park Police

State College and University Park police provide annual data for alcohol violations on the University Park campus and in the Borough of State College. Data are reported in three different categories: liquor law violations, public drunkenness, and driving under the influence (DUI) arrests. A liquor law violation includes purchase, consumption, possession, or transportation of beverages containing alcohol by a person under 21 years of age. Public drunkenness is defined as a person who appears in any public place manifestly under the influence of alcohol to the degree that she/he may endanger herself/himself or other persons or property, or annoy persons in her/his vicinity. A DUI is defined as a violation that consists of driving under the influence of alcohol, a controlled substance or a combination of both, to a degree that makes the person incapable of safe driving. A driver is also considered legally intoxicated when his or her blood alcohol content (BAC) is .08 or greater and age is 21 or older or if it is .02 or greater for a person age 20 or younger. As a caveat to these data, changes in the number of issued alcohol citations over the years may not be indicative of changes in behavior but rather a result of changes in the number of available police officers or fluctuations in the enforcement effort.

In 2017-18, the police issued 792 citations for liquor law violations to students, an increase from the 709 citations in 2016-17. Penn State students received approximately 84% of the citations in 2017-18 (Chart 6).

The total number of alcohol-related violations (combining public drunkenness, liquor law citations and DUI arrests) increased in 2017-18 (1,772 violations) compared to 1,487 in 2016-17 as seen in the chart below. In both 2016-17 and 2017-18, Penn State students received 67% of the total violations.
Office of Student Conduct

Staff in the Penn State Office of Student Conduct (OSC) receive referrals concerning alcohol and drug violations from off-campus police, University Police, and Residence Life as well as from faculty, staff, students, administrators and community members. In 2001, Penn State University amended its Off-Campus Misconduct Policy to take into account criminal violations occurring off-campus, including alcohol-related violations. By late 2001, the State College Police Department began referring all criminal citations and arrests to OSC for review. When any allegation of misconduct is referred to OSC, it is reviewed to determine whether to proceed with a discipline conference or a more formal hearing. The majority of cases are settled in discipline conferences with a small number of cases being reviewed by a hearing board or administrative hearing.

Beginning in the fall 2010 semester, OSC began charging students for off-campus, minor alcohol and/or drug violations (e.g., first-time, underage possession or use of alcohol or possession of a small quantity of marijuana) that previously were handled through an email warning. The majority of these referrals are alcohol related. In 2017-18, OSC, at University Park, processed 1,236 alcohol-related violations (the majority of which were underage possession or excessive consumption of alcohol) and 312 drug-related violations (the majority of which were use or possession of marijuana) (Chart 8). The total number of alcohol and drug charges increased from 1,406 in 2016-17 to 1,548 in 2017-18.
In Chart 9, the numbers of alcohol violations are standardized to represent the number of violations per 1,000 students. This provides a control for the changing enrollment at Penn State. In 2017-18, 26.52 violations were processed per 1,000 students, an increase compared to 2016-17 when there were 24.42 violations per 1,000 students.

In 2017-18, conduct staff at the Commonwealth Campuses processed 288 alcohol-related violations (the majority of which were underage possession or excessive consumption of alcohol) and 75 drug-related violations (the majority of which were use or possession of marijuana) (Chart 10). The total number of alcohol and drug charges increased from 256 in 2016-17 to 288 in 2017-28.
Residence Life

Penn State Residence Life maintains an alcohol policy that prohibits undergraduate students from possessing, using, distributing, manufacturing, selling or being under the influence of alcohol. Also, being in a residence hall room where alcohol is present and/or being served is a violation of Residence Life policy. After the 2006-07 academic year, it was confirmed that there was a continuing increase in the number of alcohol-related incidents seen by Residence Life staff. After recognizing this trend, staff members in Residence Life, along with the coordinator for New Student Programs, introduced new initiatives to inform and educate all students about alcohol, with a particular focus on first-year student environments such as residence halls and student orientation events. In addition, at the start of the 2010-11 academic year, a substance-free policy was introduced for all first-year residential buildings on campus. Beginning at the start of the 2011-12 academic year, all undergraduate housing areas became substance-free.

A total of 447 incidents were reported in 2017-18 at University Park. This is an increase from 430 in 2016-17. The majority of reported incidents were for underage possession/use of alcohol (Chart 11).
A total number of 139 incidents were reported in 2017-18 at the Commonwealth Campuses. This represents a decrease from 228 in 2016-17 (Chart 12).
Alcohol Intervention Programs and Services

The University has a wide range of alcohol intervention programs and services in place. Following guidance from NIAAA (4), Penn State has in place a mixture of research-based strategies addressing individual and environmental levels. The following summary includes a description of a number of initiatives that have been in place since 2010. The summary also includes information about several new initiatives as well as initiatives focused specifically on incoming students. The summary below is not a comprehensive list of alcohol initiatives at Penn State.

New Student Orientation

The University focuses on alcohol issues during first-year student orientation. Starting in May 2013 University Park rolled out a one and a half day orientation for first-year students and parents. During the orientation students attend an interactive session about health and safety. Students learn about alcohol poisoning and the connection between alcohol and sexual assault. Additionally, students receive information about Pennsylvania alcohol laws and Penn State’s alcohol policies. Parents participate in a 1-hour session about health and safety. Several health issues, including alcohol and sexual assault, are discussed during the session. Parents also receive a guide that includes information about Pennsylvania alcohol laws and University alcohol policies. The content for the session and the guide has been made available to the Commonwealth Campuses.

Office of Student Conduct

Pre-Enrollment Identification

When a person applies to the University and acknowledges that they have a history of alcohol-related problems, once it is determined that the student may enroll, the Office of Student Conduct shares information about a variety of resources with the student. At University Park, students who may be seeking a sober community are connected with staff in the Collegiate Recovery Community. Students are provided with information about the two living options on campus, ROAR House (Residence of Addiction Recovery) and LIFE House (Living in a Free Environment). The students are also provided with information about on and off campus resources such as counseling and education programs. Students enrolling in World Campus or at a Commonwealth Campus are given information about Student Affairs resources, including counseling resources.

Parental Notification

Since fall 2010, parents have been notified in every case involving an alcohol violation by an underage student, whereas previously, parental notification was utilized only in the more serious or repeat cases. This notification is coupled with an offer to provide guidance if the parent seeks additional insight that may be helpful to them in discussing the situation with their student.
Responsible Action Protocol

In 2010, the University instituted a responsible action protocol encouraging students to get help in the event of alcohol-related emergencies. Under this program, a student who acts responsibly by notifying the appropriate authorities (e.g., calling 911, alerting a resident assistant, contacting police) AND meets one or more of the following criteria typically will not face University conduct action for use or possession of alcohol or drugs. However, the student will be required to attend an approved alcohol or drug education program, such as BASICS or the Marijuana Intervention Program (MIP); the fee will be waived. When the student’s behavior involves other Code of Conduct violations, (e.g., vandalism, assault, furnishing to minors) the additional behavior may be subject to disciplinary action. If a student exhibits a pattern of problematic behavior with alcohol or drugs, that student may be subject to formal disciplinary action.

The criteria which invoke the protocol are:

- Students seeking medical assistance for themselves when experiencing an alcohol or drug overdose or related problem
- A student seeking medical assistance for a peer suffering from an alcohol or drug overdose or related problems and remains with the peer until appropriate authorities arrive
- A student suffering from an alcohol or drug overdose or related problems, for whom another student seeks assistance and remains with the peer until appropriate authorities arrive, will also not be subject to disciplinary action for alcohol violations.

Fraternity and Sorority Life

In spring 2017, Penn State announced new safety initiatives for Greek-letter organizations. The initiatives include restrictions on the number of social events per semester, the elimination of “daylong” social events, and a requirement that the service of alcohol at social events must follow Pennsylvania law and be distributed by Responsible Alcohol Management Program (RAMP) trained servers. The initiatives include compliance checks to ensure that new social restrictions are being followed. As part of the new measures, the University began charging a participant fee which is used to provide staffing for Fraternity and Sorority Life Compliance.

In fall 2017, a Greek Chapter Scorecard was launched. The Greek Chapter Scorecard shows a snapshot of key measures for each chapter in the governing councils: Interfraternity Council (IFC), Multicultural Greek Council (MGC), National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) and Panhellenic Council (PHC). The data is gathered from reporting by each chapter and council. The scorecard includes information about conduct violations and suspension status of any chapter.

The new initiatives included deferring recruitment and enhancing eligibility requirements. Full-time students who have earned 14 credit hours and meet a minimum 2.5 GPA are eligible to participate. The new member process (recruitment) is now limited to a maximum of six weeks. Chapters are required to develop and implement a new member process and education plan.
Penn State SAFE and AWARE

Student Affairs implements an online alcohol education module, Penn State SAFE (Student Alcohol Feedback and Education) that is required for all incoming first-year students. The program was developed in collaboration with Penn State Public Broadcasting. Penn State SAFE was implemented for the first time prior to the start of the 2011-12 academic year. The one-hour program provides content that is relevant to the Penn State first-year student experience and contains three main sections: 1) alcohol information, 2) the Penn State University Code of Conduct and Pennsylvania alcohol-related laws, and 3) a personalized normative feedback component (a research-based strategy). First-year students are also required to complete Penn State AWARE (Sexual Assault Awareness) which is designed to increase knowledge and understanding about relationship violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sexual harassment. SAFE and AWARE include information about the connection between alcohol and sexual violence.

In 2017-18, 96% of all eligible, incoming first-year students at University Park completed some or most of the Penn State SAFE program; 92% of first-year students completed the educational portion (Part 1) in its entirety (Table 3). At residential campuses, 80% of students completed Part 1 and at non-residential campuses, 75% completed the educational content.
Table 3. Participation and Completion Rates for Penn State SAFE, 2013-2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of eligible students</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>% Participation</th>
<th>Part 1 Completion</th>
<th>Part 1 Completion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14 University Park</td>
<td>8352</td>
<td>7918</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>7479</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Campuses</td>
<td>5583</td>
<td>4709</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>4204</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Campuses</td>
<td>2876</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15 University Park</td>
<td>8570</td>
<td>8104</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>7479</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Campuses</td>
<td>5725</td>
<td>4935</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>4321</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Campuses</td>
<td>2763</td>
<td>2131</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16 University Park</td>
<td>7787</td>
<td>7328</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>6836</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Campuses</td>
<td>5419</td>
<td>4728</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>4293</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Campuses</td>
<td>2787</td>
<td>2179</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17 University Park</td>
<td>8873</td>
<td>8359</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>8029</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Campuses</td>
<td>5896</td>
<td>4721</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>4309</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Campuses</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18 University Park</td>
<td>8157</td>
<td>7801</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>7470</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Campuses</td>
<td>6747</td>
<td>6068</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>5417</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Campuses</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. John Hustad, Associate Professor of Medicine and Public Health Sciences from Penn State College of Medicine, conducted a randomized controlled trial of Penn State SAFE in fall 2010. The study was conducted with 1,200 students from University Park. Participants who received SAFE reported drinking less alcohol on a typical drinking occasion than students who did not receive SAFE (i.e., the waitlist control group) and this difference was statistically significant. In addition, there was a trend (i.e., results approached the conventional alpha level of ‘0.05’) for participants in SAFE to report fewer alcohol-related consequences at follow-up than participants in the waitlist control group.

**Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students (BASICS)**

Effective fall 2010, University Park students who have a first-time alcohol violation on or off campus or an alcohol-related visit to the emergency department at Mount Nittany Medical Center are required to complete the BASICS (Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students) program. Students may also be referred to BASICS by a county or district...
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magistrate or may self-refer if they are concerned about their own drinking. BASICS is an evidence-based intervention that is designed to reduce drinking and enhance awareness about alcohol-related issues. A student who is referred to BASICS initially completes two one-hour sessions with a community health educator in Health Promotion and Wellness (HPW). During the first session, students meet individually with the health educator and complete an online questionnaire. Students are screened for alcohol abuse, depression and anxiety, and, if needed, are referred to Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS). In the second session, students discuss the questionnaire with the health educator and receive a personalized normative feedback report.

Students who complete the first two sessions of BASICS and have scores indicating a high level of alcohol abuse on the screening instrument, have multiple risk factors for alcohol abuse, or have a second alcohol-related violation are mandated by the Office of Student Conduct to complete two additional sessions, BASICS 3 and 4, with a counselor in CAPS. Information and data about BASICS 3 and 4 is provided in the CAPS section below.

In Chart 13, data are presented regarding the number of students who completed an alcohol intervention program in HPW. The number of students seen in BASICS (sessions 1 and 2) was 1,337 in 2017-18 compared to 1,212 in 2016-17. In June 2014, Mount Nittany Medical Center updated their privacy practices and began asking students if they wanted University Health Services to have access to their health information for necessary follow-up care. As a result, many students have chosen to not share records about alcohol-related ED visits with University Health Services. This change may explain the decrease in BASICS sessions starting in 2014-15.

In 2010-2011, Health Promotion and Wellness worked with Dr. John Hustad from Penn State College of Medicine to evaluate the effectiveness of BASICS. Dr. Hustad analyzed data from the fall 2010 and fall 2011 implementations of BASICS. Key variables for BASICS were compared at baseline and the 30 day follow-up to evaluate whether students changed their behavior after they received BASICS (i.e., from baseline to the 30 day follow-up). Students
reported drinking less alcohol after they received BASICS versus before they received BASICS. In addition, students reported experiencing fewer alcohol-related consequences after they received BASICS versus before they received BASICS.

As noted above, a student may be sanctioned to either two or four sessions for BASICS. Dr. Hustad found that higher-risk students were more likely to receive four BASICS sessions. On average, students who received just two sessions and the higher-risk students who received four sessions decreased their drinking and associated harms at follow-up. However, data suggest that students who received four sessions (i.e., higher-risk students) decreased their alcohol use and related harms at a steeper rate (i.e., a larger mean difference between baseline and the 1 month follow-up) than students who received two BASICS sessions.

Staff in Health Promotion and Wellness repeated Dr. Hustad’s analyses using data from fall 2012-2014 and again for fall 2017. Overall, students reported a significant reduction in alcohol consumption 30 days after completing the BASICS program. Participants also reported fewer instances of high-risk drinking, fewer alcohol-related consequences, and significant reduction in the volume and frequency of drinking, overall. Typical and peak BAC levels were also significantly reduced at follow-up.

Penn State’s Code of Conduct applies at all campuses. Any student who has a first-time alcohol violation on or off campus for underage drinking, public drunkenness or driving under the influence is required to complete an alcohol education program. In 2017-18, fourteen Commonwealth Campuses used BASICS or a similar program.

**Counseling and Psychological Services**

Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) provides group and individual counseling, crisis intervention, and psychological and psychiatric evaluations for undergraduate and graduate students, as well as prevention and consultation services for the University community. Staff in CAPS provide counseling services for students who present with drug and alcohol-related concerns. Table 4 shows the number of alcohol-related diagnosis made by staff in CAPS as well as the number of students with alcohol and drugs as a presenting concern from 2013 through 2018. Staff at CAPS enter a diagnosis for first and last appointments. As the numbers below indicate, formal diagnoses for alcohol are down; however, 555 students presented with alcohol as a clinical concern. Table 5 shows the number of other drug and alcohol appointments and substance abuse group.

| Table 4. Number of Diagnoses and Clients with Drug and Alcohol Related Concerns |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Clients with Alcohol as a Presenting Concern as Determined by Clinician | 551 | 628 | 560 | 575 | 555 |
| Clients with Drugs as a Presenting Concern as Determined by Clinician | 201 | 267 | 231 | 282 | 306 |
Table 5. Other Alcohol & Drug Appointments and Group Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Other Drug &amp; Alcohol</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Group Sessions</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAPS administers BASICS sessions 3 and 4 and the Alcohol Intervention Program (AIP) for mandated students. AIP is provided by a professional counselor who specializes in drug and alcohol treatment. Students are referred to AIP if they have already completed BASICS (sessions 1 - 4) and are exhibiting an addiction or a pattern of abuse of alcohol. Typically, the Office of Student Conduct refers students to AIP who have a history of repeated sanctions and are at risk of being separated from the University. The intervention is tailored to the student’s needs and focuses on heightened self-awareness and behavior change. Students meet with the counselor for one to four sessions. For AIP, counselors met with 16 clients in 2017-18; the number of sessions attended by these 16 clients totaled 50 (Table 6). In 2017-18, a total of 260 students who completed BASICS 1 and 2 (provided by Health Promotion and Wellness) were further mandated to CAPS for BASICS 3 and 4.

Table 6. Students Completing BASICS 3 and 4 and Alcohol Intervention Services (AIP) at Counseling and Psychological Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIP</th>
<th>BASICS 3 &amp; 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collegiate Recovery Community

Founded in 2011, The Penn State Collegiate Recovery Community (CRC) is housed within Student Affairs and has a dedicated space for both students and staff in the Pasquerilla Spiritual Center. The Penn State CRC offers dedicated on-campus recovery housing for up to sixteen undergraduate and/or graduate students in ROAR House (Residence of Addiction Recovery). Penn State Student Affairs employs a Program Coordinator, an Assistant Program Coordinator, and a Program Assistant. The Penn State core student community consists of 27 members and serves many more students in various forms of crisis. The CRC’s main recovery programming consists of five one-hour recovery seminars each week in which students discuss issues related to being in recovery at Penn State. Additional recovery programming includes weekend retreats, travel to recovery conferences, and a wide range of social activities. In
addition, the Penn State CRC offers academic advocacy, student conduct advocacy, admissions advocacy and alumni support.

The Penn State CRC has two affiliated groups. Lions For Recovery is student-run and arranges speakers for Centre County’s Youthful Offender Program and the Interfraternity Council’s Drug and Alcohol education classes. Lions In Recovery is an Alumni Interest Group.

For official membership in the CRC, students must remain abstinent for at least 90 days, attend 12-step meetings (or equivalent) weekly, meet with a sponsor (or equivalent) weekly, attend at least one Penn State CRC Seminar weekly, and perform at least one volunteer responsibility. Students who are actively working toward these requirements are welcome to attend seminar and social activities.

Students who become members of the CRC graduate at higher rates and achieve higher GPAs than the mean GPAs of students at University Park, are retained at high rates (87.3%), and maintain long-term recovery (with a mean annual relapse rate of just 7.3%). The CRC is currently offered at Penn State University Park only.

Other Indicators

State College Alcohol Sales

The Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board (PLCB) is the Commonwealth’s agency that manages the alcohol beverage industry in Pennsylvania. The PLCB is responsible for alcohol licenses and retail sales as well as offering alcohol education. The 2016-17 alcohol sales information reported here are the most recent available data \(^6\). Data are based on the fiscal year from July 1 to June 30. Centre County has 14 alcohol manufacturing licenses (e.g., limited distillery, limited winery, manufacturer malt beverage). There are also 7 malt importing distributor and malt distributor licenses in the county. Centre County has 113 retail licenses, which include 59 restaurant liquor licenses, 21 hotel liquor licenses, 6 club liquor licenses, 18 catering club liquor licenses, 2 club retail dispenser licenses, 4 public venue licenses, 1 airport restaurant liquor license, 1 performing arts facility license, and 1 continuing care retirement community liquor license.

The total sales volume for the four State College Wine & Spirit shops are presented in the chart below. The total sales across locations decreased from $28,349,658 in 2015-16 to $27,845,028 in 2016-17. During the 2016-17 sales year, the Hills Plaza store closed and the Southridge Plaza store opened.
Home Football Games

Alcohol and drug violations and alcohol-related emergency department visits increase on the weekends during Penn State home football games. Table 7 includes an overview of data for the last five years from Residence Life, Office of Student Conduct (OSC) and Mount Nittany Medical Center.

Table 7. Home Football Game Alcohol and Drug incidents and Emergency Department Visits, 2013-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017 Season</th>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>OSC</th>
<th>Residence Life</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Alcohol-related ED visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>9/1—9/3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>9/8—9/10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State</td>
<td>7:30 PM</td>
<td>9/15—9/17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>9/29—10/1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>7:30 PM</td>
<td>10/20—10/22</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>11/10—11/12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>11/17—11/19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Season</td>
<td>Start Time</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>OSC</td>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Alcohol-related ED visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>9/2—9/4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>9/16—9/18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>9/30—10/2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>10/7—10/9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>10/21—10/23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>7:30 PM</td>
<td>11/4—11/6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>11/25—11/27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>285</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 Season</th>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>OSC</th>
<th>Residence Life</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Alcohol-related ED visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>9/11—9/13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>9/18—9/20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>9/25—9/27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>10/2—10/4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>10/9—10/11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>10/30—11/1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>11/2—01/22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>315</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Season</th>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>OSC</th>
<th>Residence Life</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Alcohol-related ED visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>9/5—9/7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>9/19—9/21</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>9/26—9/28</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>10/24—10/26</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>10/31—11/2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>11/14—11/16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>11/28—11/30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Season</td>
<td>Start Time</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>OSC</td>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Alcohol-related ED visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>9/6—9/8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Florida</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>9/13—9/15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>9/20—9/22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>10/11—10/13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>11/1—11/3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>11/15—11/17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>11/22—11/24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
<td><strong>449</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

High-risk drinking among college students was declared a national public health issue almost 20 years ago. National data indicate that while heavy episodic drinking among college students has declined over the last 6 years, risky behaviors and associated harms continue (8).

Penn State has been tracking metrics related to student alcohol use since the late 1990s. Overall, the data in this report show a decrease in the number of alcohol-related violations and incidents over the last three years at University Park and the Commonwealth Campuses. Data from the Pulse Student Drinking Survey indicate an increase in the negative consequences experienced by students, including academic, personal and health consequences. Data from Mount Nittany Medical Center’s Emergency Department show a decrease in alcohol-related visits in the last year.

Over the last two decades the institution has implemented individual and environmental interventions to address high-risk drinking and its impact on the community. Penn State follows guidance from national experts and has a comprehensive approach that incorporates the recommended research-based strategies. In spite of many years of effort, Penn State, like other institutions, continues to struggle with reducing dangerous drinking and its negative outcomes.
Footnotes


Dr. Renata Engel, Associate Vice Provost for Online Education, and Yvonne Gaudelius, Associate Vice President and Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, will present information about One Penn State 2025.
ONE PENN STATE 2025

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Future of Online Learning and the Role of the World Campus Task Force was charged by Provost Jones in Fall 2016 to review trends and issues that would impact the University’s ability to advance and expand quality education across Penn State while leveraging the success of the World Campus. Based on a rigorous process of gathering feedback from constituents across the University, an overarching framework emerged that shaped the work of this task force around a vision that reaffirmed Penn State’s commitment to being one university by looking ahead to the year 2025 when we can fully realize the power of digital resources to further address the current constraints that too often hinder our ability to be agile in creating educational experiences and that prevent our students from having access to the breadth and depth of the resources available throughout Penn State.

The One Penn State 2025 vision that emerged and which was endorsed by Provost Jones and the Transforming Education Steering Committee expanded beyond the confines of online education to encompass all education modalities with an understanding that digital resources and capabilities will play a key role in achieving the vision.

Through discussions with approximately 600 stakeholders from across the University the taskforce developed five guiding principles that can be used to steer the University’s decisions in a coordinated manner through action-oriented steps that will strengthen the educational opportunities in collaborative and innovative, forward-looking approaches. The principles address different facets of the ways we engage learners from transactional processes and support to academic processes and curricula. They introduce approaches to ensure relevance in what we offer, how it is offered, and in how we engage learners beyond degrees. And they address the need for efficiency to sustain high-quality student support and the University’s position as a world-leader in higher education. The principles are:

Guiding Principle 1: Provide a Seamless Student Experience. In 2025, Penn State will provide students with a seamless, mobile student experience in all student interactions with the institution, whether this be the admissions or enrollment processes, the process of taking courses, co-curricular learning, or full access to the curricula and support services offered across the University.

VISION: One Penn State 2025 builds on our strong traditions of working as one university to provide world-class education and drives us to be a more integrated, flexible, and responsive institution. By 2025, seamless online access to curricula and processes will be embedded in every part of Penn State across the Commonwealth, enabling us to become a 24/7/365, diverse and inclusive institution. One Penn State 2025 represents a fluid, personalized, and collaborative environment that enables students, faculty, and staff to achieve their goals regardless of their location in the world.
Guiding Principle 2: Achieve Curricular Coherence. In 2025, Penn State will embrace a commitment to design degree, minor, and certificate programs that provide students with access and clearly articulated pathways through the curriculum, built through thoughtful approaches to course coherence. Strong disciplinary and interdisciplinary communities and multiple and flexible models of course taking will form the basis of this transformation.

Guiding Principle 3: Design Relevant and Responsive Programs. In 2025, Penn State will offer degrees and programs with learning outcomes defined by disciplinary communities and contemporary needs while also offering flexibility in achieving these outcomes via multiple pathways.

Guiding Principle 4: Engage Learners Throughout Their Lifetimes. In 2025, we will engage learners throughout their lifetimes with content that is timely, topical, and relevant to their personal and professional wellbeing.

Guiding Principle 5: Achieve the Highest Level of Efficiency of University Resources. In 2025, we will leverage digital resources and align faculty, academic, and administrative resources to strengthen learning, research, and student support opportunities, thereby achieving greater institutional efficiency to address equity of, access to, and affordability for a high-quality Penn State education.

Along with these guiding principles, this bold vision for the future requires the creation of models and structures that incentivize cooperation and collaboration that spur the University community to leverage our collective talents and expertise to create the best learning environment for our students and for our institution. Specifically, the task force recognized the need for

- budget models that strongly align with and support the One Penn State 2025 vision; and
- academic and administrative structures that foster greater student, staff and faculty identification with disciplinary communities rather than exclusively with one department, college, or campus location over another.

To truly live the vision and the possibilities of One Penn State 2025, this reconsidered approach will require commitment and dedication by all members of the Penn State community at all levels to be fully realized.
INTRODUCTION

Driven by the idea of One Penn State 2025, this report outlines a number of guiding principles that the University should embrace and implement if we wish to achieve the goals of continuing to be a world leader in higher education and of effectively leveraging our digital learning assets. The result of nearly a year of discussion and interaction amongst the members of the task force and University community, this report outlines an ambitious re-thinking of some of our most fundamental approaches to how we think about and structure learning and how we operate to support student success.

The digital environment today is influencing our current educational experiences more than ever before. Online learning is no longer new and is recognized for both the ability to reach new and non-traditional audiences with high-quality, engaging academic content and for bringing new ways of thinking about active and engaged learning to face-to-face learners. The continued pace of technological change provides the promise for an even greater ability to teach and learn in flexible and fluid ways that meet the needs of learners and enable student success in the future. Furthermore, technology may present us with more affordable options to engage students, even while we recognize that online learning is certainly not without cost, and it currently provides us with the opportunity to reach more students from across the world, thereby expanding the reach of Penn State. It is within this context that the five Guiding Principles presented here provide direction for decision-making as we move toward fully realizing the concept of one university by leveraging online technologies from admissions through graduation and on to life-long engagement.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Guiding Principle One: Provide a Seamless Student Experience

In 2025, Penn State will provide students with a seamless, mobile student experience in all student interactions with the institution, whether this be the admissions or enrollment processes, the process of taking courses, co-curricular learning, or full access to the curricula and support services offered across the University.

Just as our learners are no longer bound by place or time, we must eliminate institutional barriers that reflect such boundaries, and therefore prevent students from fully engaging with the University, and likewise, prevent the University from fully supporting students in the most effective ways. Many of our student processes are built upon pre-technology business processes, which slow and convolute our ability to make thoughtful and expedient decisions as we interact with students. These processes also mean that students are only able to engage with the business of being a student during the traditional hours and that they must complete functional transactions through mail or fax. For example, at this time, the only way that students can withdraw from the University is by printing out a form and then mailing or faxing it to the relevant office. There are countless similar examples, and we must make real and immediate progress in moving these processes into an online, 24/7/365 business environment that can be easily accessed through mobile devices. We believe that the business of being a student should be easy to navigate in order to allow our students to focus their energies on their educational
experiences. Additionally, just as our transactional processes suffer from outdated and manual business practices that restrict data and require extra work for both staff and students, student support services such as advising or career counseling that are often essential to a student’s academic and future success find themselves in a similar situation. It is essential to update these processes and systems to provide our students with the services and advice they need to be able to achieve their academic goals and reduce time and cost to degree.

Still other parts of the current student experience are dependent on assigning a geographical location to a student and then allowing and restricting access to the learning resources of the University depending on this location. Such restrictions also apply to co-curricular experiences as students are limited, by location, in their ability to join student organizations. While we speak of online communities and even while we develop innovative student organizations for our fully online students at a distance, we fail to realize the potential that digital environments can offer when we use geographical location to limit membership to student organizations.

In addition, the distinctions that we make between resident instruction courses, programs, and students and online ones are already blurred to staff and students. By 2025, such distinctions will be obsolete as digital learning environments will have become more flexible and fluid and learners and faculty will expect all students to have access to the curriculum, course content, and student success services no matter where the student lives and learns. Learning and student success will be at the center of the conversation, and our organizational, transactional, and financial models all must support this paradigm.

Through careful management of the transition to a more cohesive and consistent environment, the University will be able to explore models that continue to incentivize innovation and collaboration across academic and administrative units to ensure learners have seamless, 24/7/365 access to the education we offer. The needs of distance learners to access processes and curricula through an entirely online campus and the needs of resident and hybrid learners to have physical facilities and digital resources must be considered separately for the unique aspects of those environments, but they must also be considered together for the ways in which they can be leveraged to support each other and to enhance the education of both groups in ways that we have not yet explored or even imagined.

Guiding Principle Two: Achieve Curricular Coherence

In 2025, Penn State will embrace a commitment to design degree, minor, and certificate programs that provide students with access and clearly articulated pathways through the curriculum, built through thoughtful approaches to course coherence. Strong disciplinary and interdisciplinary communities and multiple and flexible models of course taking will form the basis of this transformation.

For the last decade, the University community has worked to have a high degree of curricular integrity when it comes to courses, such that we often refer to the fact that “a Penn State course is a Penn State course, no matter where or how the student was enrolled.” This is supported through Faculty Senate policy 42-10, which went into effect in Fall 2016 and which states that 80% of a course must share core content and learning objectives.
What began years ago as a focus on course coherence can be extended to curricular programs through the One Penn State 2025 vision. The existence of programs with the same or similar names can sow confusion among prospective and current students in the areas of recruitment, admission, and campus mobility, and they can present advising challenges. This guiding principle leverages our past initiatives and experience of tackling these challenges together. Specific examples of institutional efforts that have supported curricular coherence and the mobility of students include the development of a shared curriculum via the 2006 Uniform Course Abbreviation initiative that phased out duplicative discipline abbreviations and courses; the 2011 Faculty Senate legislation that enabled students at any Penn State campus to complete the requirements for academic minors and certificates; the development of procedures that extended programs from one campus to another campus, contributing to the triple benefit: enabling more academic offerings to students, helping to reduce the number of “campus specific” programs, and developing a sense of shared faculty ownership of academic disciplines; and the development of common program (learning) outcomes which further supports program assessment and accreditation processes.

In order for the University to be positioned to effectively deliver rigorous curricula that are not bound by location and the resources available at a given location, and to fully embrace the strength of all of the faculty, we must create a curriculum development and delivery model that builds coherence and articulated student pathways through disciplinary and appropriate multi-disciplinary communities. Such an approach should be in a better position to be responsive to issues such as access and affordability, student success, diversity, innovation, flexibility, and the use and development of shared resources. Additionally, we should use innovative approaches to curriculum development to consider multiple pathways to the programs as well as multiple pathways from the program to the next degree or certificate—all while keeping in mind the fluidity in the modalities through which people will learn in 2025.

Guiding Principle Three: Design Relevant and Responsive Programs

In 2025, Penn State will offer degrees and programs with learning outcomes defined by disciplinary communities and contemporary needs while also offering flexibility in achieving these outcomes via multiple pathways.

As Penn State evolves to meet 21st century expectations for offering degree programs, attention must be paid to providing core content that will be defined by the disciplinary faculty, as well as elements that must respond to professional and societal needs in a time-critical fashion. Not only will Penn State need to incorporate a more flexible way of providing the professional content, we will also need to allow for accelerated pace and phased courses in order to provide relevant delivery modes as well as content knowledge.

The guiding principle for University decision-making is to support the development of curricula that are grounded in pedagogical principles but that allow for alternate schedules or forms of engagement (e.g., a three-credit course that can be offered as 3 one-credit courses in sequence, or 2 three-credit courses that could be offered as a single course of variable credit that can be taken multiple times, but paced by the learner). Other pathways to course or degree completion could include achieving a learning outcome through a co-curricular experience instead of a single
course. Winter-break courses could be designed to target places where acceleration is viable and desirable for the learner. Alternative curriculum structures and student support offerings will enable accelerated or self-paced learning, concentrated learning, or learning enhancements so that a student can plan both the time to degree and the degree enhancements that define it. Such pathways or alternative learning experiences will need to be designed and developed with both residence and distance students in mind in order to maintain the seamlessness that is outlined in Guiding Principle 1. Such approaches also may require the development of alternative forms of assessments.

In addition to the curricular structures, the development of content that supports acquisition of professional skills can be made available across multiple majors and locations. Technology plays an ever-increasing role in all realms of society, including necessary job and employment skills; even the most traditional of careers are being impacted by technological advances more quickly than ever. New disciplines and careers emerge very quickly, and they develop critical workforce shortages almost as quickly as they emerge. This pace of change also presents an opportunity for Penn State to meet another societal need while potentially generating additional revenue to support its mission. The so-called “skills gap” has been widely discussed. In some cases, this gap is the result of the pace of technological change, the resulting continually evolving skills required by the modern workforce, and the lack of formal ways for these new skills to be acquired. There is no reason that Penn State, with its rich experience and expertise in online learning, should not fill these gaps when it makes strategic sense. In doing so, Penn State needs to carefully consider the appropriate scale of the education needed—in some cases this may be a traditional associate, baccalaureate, or graduate degree. However, in some settings, shorter and more easily digestible units that reflect the increasing rate of change in the employment market may be more appropriate depending on the specific circumstance. This could include certificates, workshops, and potentially individual courses or parts of courses. As with traditional degree-granting curricula, meeting this need will require close relationships with industry and government to quickly identify emerging needs and opportunities.

Guiding Principle Four: Engage Learners Throughout Their Lifetimes

In 2025, we will engage learners throughout their lifetimes with content that is timely, topical, and relevant to their personal and professional wellbeing.

One Penn State 2025 will connect students to the institution across the educational spectrum: from credit to non-credit, from courses to certificates, from degrees to single lectures, in online and blended delivery formats. Life-long engagement will be learner-centered and will span offerings from colleges, campuses, and continuing and executive education. Penn State will meet learners where they live and how they learn.

We expect that learners will want to engage with learning in a multiplicity of ways that meet individual educational needs. For example, a student might wish to enter the University as a traditional-age, full-time, degree-seeking student who is housed on or near a campus. However, such a student should have the opportunity to access all of the digital learning opportunities that the University affords and not be limited by the artificial restrictions of geography. Another student may be an alumnus who graduated 15 years earlier and who needs new content in a sub-
specialty of a discipline that could be covered in a partial course. This learner may wish to attend three lectures of the course to bring her knowledge up-to-date. Yet another learner may live on the other side of the world but enroll in Penn State as a full-time degree-seeking student who accesses the entire educational experience as a distance learner. Another learner may wish to complete, on a part-time basis, a credential that was begun years before. The list of such variations is endless but we must embrace this range of learner needs.

In order to engage learners through their lifetime and across all of the contexts mentioned above, it is necessary to have a University-level commitment that provides shared resources to support the efforts of campuses and colleges to develop and deliver timely content that benefits from shared quality standards, technology support, marketing, ADA compliance, and copyright adherence. By leveraging existing models, such as those in Penn State Extension and executive training programs, and constructing a system of access for learners that supports the variety of needs that our students have, Penn State will create paths to engage learners throughout their lives. This model would offer a single University portal with easy and seamless access to distributed content sources for learners and an equally seamless process for faculty, colleges, and campuses to make content available.

**Guiding Principle Five: Achieve the Highest Level of Efficiency of University Resources.**

In 2025, we will leverage digital resources and align faculty, academic, and administrative resources to strengthen learning, research, and student support opportunities, thereby achieving greater institutional efficiency to address equity of, access to, and affordability to a high-quality Penn State education.

The economic quandary of higher education today is clear. Student loan debt now exceeds $1.3 trillion in the U.S. Student loan default rates are continuing to rise and are now greater than 11%. The primary sources of higher education funding (governments and individuals) have reached their limits; state and federal governments have entitlements to fund, and individuals are becoming increasingly burdened by the aforementioned debt. Closer to home, Pennsylvania has the second highest average student loan debt per individual at close to $35,000, and Penn State’s average undergraduate debt level exceeds that. These factors contribute to the increasing pressure Penn State faces to improve access to an affordable education while continuing to improve its own operation to realize greater efficiency.

When considering this pressure for increased effectiveness (efficiency of operation combined with student success) in our educational mission, we can look to our recent history of exploring and creating innovative approaches to using digital content. The Digital Learning Cooperative (formerly the e-Learning Cooperative) exemplifies this kind of approach with its effective use of digital resources to share content while maximizing faculty capacity and supporting curricular coherence. Recent efforts to improve access to affordable education has led Penn State to explore and expand its use of Open Educational Resources (OER) as a means of providing high quality textbooks to students in an affordable manner. These examples present us with a demonstration of what is possible, but they represent only a slice of what is essential for us to achieve in the next decade.
Appendix - The Task Force and Stakeholder Groups

The task force was charged in Fall 2016 and conducted its work by gathering input from more than 20 different stakeholder groups which included more than 600 faculty, staff, and students. During the first couple of months, the stakeholder groups were instrumental in shaping the vision. The latter stages of stakeholder input were constructed for facilitated discussions that focused on big topics such as curriculum models, student experience, institutional/organizational structure, or government policies. These sessions revealed an openness to the university moving in directions that embrace meeting students where they live and learn throughout their lives and developing the ideas that ultimately turned into the broad guiding principles.

The membership of the task force and the stakeholder groups that participated in discussion sessions are listed below.

Task Force Membership

Titles at the time of the taskforce work.

- Michael Verderame, Sr. Associate Dean Graduate School
- David Christiansen, Assoc. Vice President and Sr. Associate Dean, Commonwealth Campuses
- Joseph Salem, Associate Dean for Learning, University Libraries
- Karen Pollack, Assistant Vice Provost for Online and Blended Programs
- Renata Engel, Associate Vice Provost of Online Programs
- Yvonne Gaudelius, Associate Vice President and Senior Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education
- Brian Cameron, Associate Dean for Professional Programs, Smeal College of Business
- Clark Brigger, Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions
- Penny Carlson, Executive Director, Academic Services/Assessment, Commonwealth Campuses
- Bill Fritz, Enrollment Services Manager, World Campus
- Melissa Kunes, Senior Director for Student Affairs Operations
- Jody Heckman, Budget Director, Office of the President
- Jeff Smith, Associate Vice President, OOE Operations
- Andrew Reisinger, Director for Budget and Reporting, University Budget Office
- Andrea Dowhower, Assistant Vice President, Student Affairs
- Martin Trethewey, Director of Global Penn State
- Sonia DeLucca Fernandez, Assistant Vice Provost for Educational Equity
- Albert Lozano-Nieto, Director of Academic Affairs, Penn State Wilkes-Barre
- Teaching and Learning with Technology
- Jennifer Sparrow, Senior Director for Teaching and Learning with Technology
- Raymonde Brown, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs, College of Nursing
- Dawn Blasko, Associate Professor, Penn State Behrend
- Deena R. Levy, Assistant Research Professor and Instructional Consultant
Stakeholder Groups

Commonwealth Campus Chief Academic Officers
Graduate Council
Faculty Groups (2 sessions) with faculty members drawn from multiple colleges and campuses, and which represented residential and online instruction
Penn State Berks – 3 sessions: Faculty, Staff, Student
Academic Council for Graduate Education
Administrative Council for Undergraduate Education
Transforming Education Steering Committee
E-Education Council with representation from learning designers across the University
Digital Learning Academic Council with representation from academic leaders with overarching responsibility for online education in the colleges and campuses
Online Coordinating Council with strong representation from leaders of online education support in colleges and the campuses
Directors of Student Affairs
Commission for Adult Learners
UPUA – University Park Undergraduate Association
GPSA - Graduate and Professional Student Association
World Campus Student Advisory Board
CCSG - Commonwealth Campus Student Government
Financial Aid, Registrar, Admissions, and Bursar units
Council of College Multicultural Leadership
Financial Officers
Marketing Council
World Campus staff (2 sessions) with staff involved in learning design, faculty development, marketing, technology, and student support
Teaching and Learning with Technology Symposium session
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What is One Penn State 2025?

• It is a vision for an ambitious rethinking of some of our most fundamental approaches to how we structure learning and how we operate to support student success.

• It is described with a set of guiding principles that
  • leverages our strength as one university,
  • reinforces our commitment to learners and their access to quality education, and
  • builds upon the affordances that come with the digital age.

• It supports the university’s well-being in terms of growth and engagement, continued value and relevance, and operational efficiency.
How it Emerged

As an element of the Transforming Education pillar of the University’s Strategic Plan

“Penn State will be a leader in the transformation of education, including enhancing access to it, as it fulfills its land-grant mission in a 21st-century context and continues to drive discovery-focused research across disciplines.”

Conducted visioning exercises and provided forums (600 + individuals participated); Settled on five areas that impact the educational experience: business processes, curricula, timely content and modalities, lifelong engagement, and support systems

Fall 2016
Provost charged the taskforce to review trends, leverage success of World Campus and recommend a vision and framework for the future of online learning at Penn State

2017
Engaging in deeper discussions of the Guiding Principles and developing approaches to pursue projects and the appropriate structure to support and coordinate activities in each area

2018

PennState
The Vision: One Penn State

One Penn State 2025 builds on our strong traditions of working as one university to provide world-class education and drives us to be a more integrated, flexible, and responsive institution. By 2025, seamless online access to curricula and processes will be embedded in every part of Penn State across the Commonwealth, enabling us to become a 24/7/365, diverse and inclusive institution. One Penn State 2025 represents a fluid, personalized, and collaborative environment that enables students, faculty, and staff to achieve their goals regardless of their location in the world.

The Guiding Principles for One Penn State 2025

- Guiding Principle 1: Provide a Seamless Student Experience. In 2025, Penn State will provide students with a seamless, mobile student experience in all student interactions with the institution, whether this be the admissions or enrollment processes, the process of taking courses, co-curricular learning, or full access to the curricula and support services offered across the University.

- Guiding Principle 2: Achieve Curricular Coherence. In 2025, Penn State will embrace a commitment to design degree, minor, and certificate programs that provide students with access and clearly articulated pathways through the curriculum, built through thoughtful approaches to course coherence. Strong disciplinary and interdisciplinary communities and multiple and flexible models of course taking will form the basis of this transformation.

- Guiding Principle 3: Design Relevant and Responsive Programs. In 2025, Penn State will offer degrees and programs with learning outcomes defined by disciplinary communities and contemporary needs while also offering flexibility in achieving these outcomes via multiple pathways.

- Guiding Principle 4: Engage Learners Throughout Their Lifetimes. In 2025, Penn State will engage learners throughout their lifetimes with content that is timely, topical, and relevant to their personal and professional wellbeing.

- Guiding Principle 5: Achieve the Highest Level of Efficiency of University Resources. In 2025, Penn State will leverage digital resources and align faculty, academic, and administrative resources to strengthen learning, research, and student support opportunities, thereby achieving greater institutional efficiency to address equity of access to, and affordability for, a high-quality Penn State education.
## ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

### Guiding Principle 1: Provide a Seamless Student Experience

In 2025, Penn State will provide students with a seamless, mobile student experience in all student interactions with the institution, whether this be the admissions or enrollment processes, the process of taking courses, co-curricular learning, or full access to the curricula and support services offered across the University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Longstanding:</th>
<th>Underway:</th>
<th>Possibilities for the Future:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-learning cooperative (now Digital Cooperative) provides a platform and process for students to take courses offered at another campus.</td>
<td>Exploring the creation of a digital integrative portal that can serve as a single sign-on and one-stop access to transactional functions.</td>
<td>Review policies and procedures for out-of-class activities to create flexibility across campuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident students can enroll in open seats (10-days prior to semester) in many World Campus courses as part of their regular enrollment.</td>
<td>Coordinating Student Aid to provide students information about the total aid they receive across multiple sources (central, college, campus, program, etc.)</td>
<td>Develop long-range enrollment planning that accounts for greater student mobility throughout degree completion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

### Guiding Principle 2: Achieve Curricular Coherence

In 2025, Penn State will embrace a commitment to design degree, minor, and certificate programs that provide students with access and clearly articulated pathways through the curriculum, built through thoughtful approaches to course coherence. Strong disciplinary and interdisciplinary communities and multiple and flexible models of course taking will form the basis of this transformation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Longstanding:</th>
<th>Underway:</th>
<th>Possibilities for the future:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared curriculum via the 2006 Uniform Course Abbreviation initiative phased out duplicative discipline abbreviations and courses.</td>
<td>Common program (learning) outcomes supported program assessment and accreditation processes.</td>
<td>Design curriculum with the intent to enable greater flexibility for subsequent degrees or for greater mobility for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Faculty Senate legislation enabled students at any Penn State campus to complete the requirements for academic minors and certificates.</td>
<td>BS Health Policy and Administration faculty across multiple campuses are designing the curriculum, coordinating academic resources (e.g., internships), working with one certification, faculty support for teaching, etc. together with one vision for the program.</td>
<td>Enable students to complete a degree at a campus without that degree if the student is completing non-major courses at that campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

**Guiding Principle 3: Design Relevant and Responsive Programs.** In 2025, Penn State will offer degrees and programs with learning outcomes defined by disciplinary communities and contemporary needs while also offering flexibility in achieving these outcomes via multiple pathways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Longstanding:</th>
<th>Underway:</th>
<th>Possibilities for the Future:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An array of minors span concentrated areas of study as well as opportunities for students to augment degree programs with a focus that is outside their direct discipline.</td>
<td>Micro-credentialing in timely workforce topics (technical skills, business acumen) to supplement degree programs.</td>
<td>Create and accommodate alternate forms of engagement (3-credit courses offered as three 1-credit courses).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated summer schedule, such as 'Maymester' to facilitate academic progress and concentrated studies.</td>
<td>Credit courses designed and delivered in a 7.5 week format to facilitate learners taking back-to-back courses in a single semester.</td>
<td>Create alternative curriculum structures or offerings for self-paced learning, or concentrated delivery (e.g., over winter break).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Guiding Principle 4: Engage Learners Throughout Their Lifetimes.** In 2025, Penn State will engage learners throughout their lifetimes with content that is timely, topical, and relevant to their personal and professional wellbeing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Longstanding:</th>
<th>Underway:</th>
<th>Possibilities for the Future:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OLLI (Osher Lifelong Learning Institute) provides hundreds of courses/year to senior learners.</td>
<td>A portal (ATLAS) recently launched by Penn State Extension provides an array of content from webinars, to papers, and online short courses reaching the agricultural sciences community with relevant and timely content.</td>
<td>Create fee structures that incentivize collaboration and are sustainable, and consider subscription services, pay-as-you-go options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Alumni Association provides educational programs (tours), Huddle with the Faculty, etc.</td>
<td>Repackaging credit content for non-credit use, e.g., law, education.</td>
<td>Provide access to single courses, single lectures to alumni as refresher or to support their current needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive programs provide a blend of non-credit content for corporate training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

Guiding Principle 5: Achieve the Highest Level of Efficiency of University Resources. In 2025, Penn State will leverage digital resources and align faculty, academic, and administrative resources to strengthen learning, research, and student support opportunities, thereby achieving greater institutional efficiency to address equity of, access to, and affordability for a high-quality Penn State education.

| Longstanding: A common learning management system (LMS) was selected and adopted for curricular offerings. Coordination of approaches, access to resources, and shared practices have been in place for decades by the University Libraries. | Underway: Adopted an enterprise-wide advising platform and recently added support for data analytics capability to support student success. Recently launched an integrated career system for 37 Penn State career units leading to a more unified, seamless student, alumni, employer and staff experience. | Possibilities for the Future: Exploring a common or coordinated content management systems to support shared curriculum and dual-purpose of course content. Create lifelong digital access to Penn State (identity services). |

---

One Penn State 2025 Vision and Guiding Principles Presentation Groups

- Academic Leadership Council
- Administrative Council for Undergraduate Education
- Commonwealth Campus Caucus
- Digital Learning Academic Council
- Online Coordinating Council
- Undergraduate Education Council
- Alumni Association Leadership
- Transforming Education Steering Committee of Strategic Planning Implementation
- Infrastructure and Support Steering Committee of Strategic Planning Implementation
- Transforming Education Working Group Chairs
- University Finance and Business Leadership
- Graduate Council
- Commonwealth Campus Student Government
- University Planning Committee of the Faculty Senate
- Office of Planning and Assessment
- Academic Affairs and Student Life Committee of the Board of Trustees
- Academic Leadership Forum
- Teaching and Learning with Technology Symposium
REPORT OF 2019-2020 SENATE ELECTIONS

Senate Council
- To be determined, Penn State Abington
- To be determined, College of Agricultural Sciences
- To be determined, Penn State Altoona
- To be determined, College of Arts and Architecture
- Mohamad A. Ansari, Penn State Berks
- To be determined, Smeal College of Business
- Brian King, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences
- Josh Kirby, College of Education
- To be determined, College of Engineering
- To be determined, Penn State Erie
- Paul Thompson, Penn State Harrisburg
- To be determined, College of Health and Human Development
- Caroline D Eckhardt, College of the Liberal Arts
- To be determined, College of Medicine
- To be determined, Eberly College of Science
- To be determined, Units with fewer than four senators: Communications, Great Valley, Information Sciences and Technology, International Affairs, Dickinson Law, Penn State Law, Libraries, Military Science, and Nursing
- To be determined, University College

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules Elected for two-year terms
- Jonathan Abel, College of the Liberal Arts
- Victor Brunsden, Penn State Altoona
- Jeff Laman, College of Engineering
- Ann Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences
- Kent Vrana, College of Medicine

Senate Committee on Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Elected for three-year terms

Faculty from University Park:
- Amit Sharma, College of Health and Human Development, member
- Richard Robinet, Eberly College of Science, alternate

Faculty from Locations other than University Park:
- Gina Brelsford, Penn State Harrisburg, member
- Delia Conti, Penn State Fayette, alternate
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Deans/Chancellors:
- David Christiansen, Penn State York, member
- V. Dale Jones, Penn State Wilkes-Barre, alternate -2022
- R. Keith Hillkirk, Penn State Berks, alternate -2021

University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee - Elected for two-year terms
- Mary Beth Oliver, Bellisario College of Communications, member
- Linda Patterson Miller, Penn State Abington, member
- Barbara Cantalupo, Penn State Lehigh Valley, member
- Peter Crabb, Penn State Hazleton, alternate
- Matthew McAllister, Bellisario College of Communications, alternate

Standing Joint Committee on Tenure - Elected for three-year terms
- Lisa Posey, Smeal College of Business, member
- Ira Ropson, College of Medicine, alternate

Faculty Advisory Committee to the President - Elected for three-year term
- Bonj Szczygiel, College of Arts and Architecture, member
- Kathryn Jablokow, Penn State Great Valley, alternate

Senate Secretary for 2019-2020
- Judy Ozment, Penn State Abington

Senate Chair-Elect for 2019-2020
- Elizabeth Seymour, Penn State Altoona
MINUTES OF SENATE COUNCIL
Tuesday, April 9, 2019– 1:30 p.m.
102 Kern Graduate Building


Absent: N. Jones, V. Brunsden, M. Hanes, Z. Karpyn, J. Warren

Chair Bérubé called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 9, 2019, in 102 Kern Graduate Building.

The minutes of the February 19, 2019 meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

Chair Bérubé reported that the Faculty Advisory Committee discussed the following topics at the meeting on April 9, 2019. The use of external letters for the immediate tenure process (VP Bieschke noted that letters of recommendation could be used for that purpose), the graduate School’s requirement for Graduate Assistant Stipend levels, the reporting line for the leadership of the College of Medicine, whether the current time limit in which course credits must be used conflict with the ideals expressed in One Penn State 2025, status of “Smoke Free Penn State”, and encouraging and rewarding Senate Service.

Chair Berebe reported a new special committee is being formed to examine ways to streamline Curricular processes. This Committee will include UP and campus faculty representation as well as the Chair of Curricular Affairs and the Curricular Coordinator.

Mark Dambly and Matt Schuyler, Chair and Vice Chair of the University Board of Trustees, respectively, will be attending the April 23, 2019 Senate meeting. Chair Dambly will be delivering some remarks.

Vice Presidents’ and Vice Provosts’ Comments

Provost Jones and Vice President Hanes were not able to attend.
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Bieschke gave an update on searches. The announcement on the search for a Dean for the College of Arts and Architecture is forthcoming. The Vice President for Global Programs position and the search for the Dean of Education should wrap up by the end of the month. Dr. Bieschke also mentioned that the rules for outside consulting will be changing and some activities will need to be approved in advance. The Senate and administration have agreed that policies AC-13, and AC -22 are in need of revisions and they will be reviewed for changes.

Rob Pangborn, Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education gave an update on applications and admissions. Three weeks from the deadline, UP has 6,000 paid accepts and 5,000 offers still out. At the campuses, there was 4,000 paid accepts and 12,000 offers still out. Most are out of state students.

Marcus Whitehurst, Vice Provost for Educational Equity, reported that there was a very robust conversation during the Diversity and Inclusion session at the Board of Trustees. Some faculty expressed that the recent shooting of a black man by a State College officer brought up concerns about safety, policing and mental health.

Renata Engel, Vice Provost for Online Education, reported that there were 3,370 students who graduated from a program delivered by World Campus. Discussed the importance of the quality of the content of online courses, and this often includes the support of instructional designers for online and resident courses. She is concerned over the high costs of text books and is examining ways to make course content more affordable such as using and developing open access books and journals.

ACTION ITEMS

The University Faculty Senate has a consultative and advisory role on the academic impact of proposals that involve the establishment, reorganization, or discontinuation of academic organizational units A review of these guidelines was conducted and Senate Council voted in favor of the revisions which clarified the process and timeline of review. They will now be sent to the Provost for approval and posted on the senate website.

Senate Council approved revisions of the governing documents for three units based on the recommendation of the Unit Constitution Committee chaired by Secretary Annie Taylor. They were Penn State Fayette, College of Liberal Arts, and Libraries.

REPORT OF GRADUATE COUNCIL for March 13, 2019. John Nousek reported that Graduate council discussed the changes to the council that would require the election of a Faculty Chair. Graduate Council will have their next meeting of this academic year on Wednesday, April 10, 2019.

SENATE AGENDA ITEMS FOR APRIL 23, 2019
**LEGISLATIVE REPORTS**

Committee on Committees and Rules, “Revisions to Senate Bylaws; Article III – Election to Senate, Section 8”. The report was placed on the agenda by an Eckhardt/Ansari motion.

Committee on Committee and Rules, “Revisions to Standing Rules; Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (b and c)”. The report was placed on the agenda by an Ozment/Eckhardt motion.

Committee on Committee and Rules, “Revisions to Standing Rules; Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (k)”. The report was placed on the agenda by a Nousek/Eckhardt motion.

Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid and Committee on Education, “Changes to Senate Policy 42-50, 42-80, 42-81, 42-82, 42-84, 42-86, 42-88, and 42-90, 42-92, 42-94, 42-96, 42-97, 42-99 Acquisition of Credit.” The report was placed on the agenda by a Hughes/Eckhardt motion.

Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, “Revisions to Senate Policies 67-10 Division I – Athletic Competition (University Park) and 67-30 Division III and PSUAC – Athletic Competition (non-University Park)” The report was placed on the agenda by a Posey/Ozment motion.

**ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS**

Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment, “Report on Results Will Vary* and Campus Climate Issues”. The report was placed on the agenda by a Nousek/Eckhardt motion.

Committee on Faculty Affairs, Revision to AC-14 “Academic Administrative Evaluation” The report was placed on the agenda by an Ozment/Eckhardt motion.

Committee on Faculty Affairs, Revision to AC-21 “Definition of Academic Ranks.” The report was placed on the agenda by an Ozment/Eckhardt motion.


Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity and Graduate Council, “Barriers to Sustainability and Growth of Intercollege Graduate Degree Programs”. The report was placed on the agenda by an Eckhardt/Ozment motion.

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, “Proposed Revisions to Penn State Policy HR68, Postdoctoral Appointments”. The report was placed on the agenda by a Nousek/Eckhardt motion.

Special Committee on Tenure and Equity, “Report from Senate Committee on Tenure and Equity”. The report was placed on the agenda by an Eckhardt/Ozment motion.
INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid, “Annual Report on the High School Students Enrolled Nondegree in Credit Courses.” This report was placed on the agenda by a Szczygiel/Eckhardt motion. The report will be presented on the Senate website.

Curricular Affairs, “One-Semester Experimental Course Offering Procedures.” This report was approved for presentation in the September 2019 Senate meeting on an Eckhardt/Plummer motion. The report will be presented on the Senate website.

Educational Equity and Campus Environment, “Report on Educational Equity in the Academic Curriculum.” This report was approved for presentation in the September 2019 Senate meeting on an Ozment/Nousek motion.

Educational Equity and Campus Environment, “Report on Equity for Learning Support for Commonwealth Campuses v. University Park.” This report was approved for presentation in the September 2019 Senate meeting on an Ozment/Ansari motion. The report will be presented on the Senate website.

Elections Commission, “Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2019-2020”. This report was approved for presentation on the Senate website on an Eckhardt/Nousek motion.

Intercollegiate Athletics, “Avenues for Student-Athletes to Report Concerns or Abuse by Coaches.” This report was approved for presentation in the September 2019 Senate meeting on an Ozment/Nousek motion.

Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology, “IT Fee Usage”. This report was approved for presentation on the Senate website on an Ozment/Nousek motion.

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, “Graduate School Exit Survey Report” This report was approved for presentation on the Senate website on a Shannon/Nousek motion.

Senate Council, “2017-2018 University Faculty Ombudsperson Report. This report was placed on the agenda by a Szczygiel/Eckhardt motion. [10 minutes where allocated for presentation and discussion]

Student Life, “Penn State Student Drinking Data, Interventions and Impact. This report was approved for presentation on the Senate website on an Ozment/Nousek motion.

University Planning, “One Penn State 2025”, This report was approved for presentation on the Senate website on a Nousek/Eckhardt motion.

Report of Senate Elections was approved for presentation on the Senate website on a Nousek/Eckhardt motion.

The Agenda for the April 23, 2019 Senate meeting was approved unanimously.
Chair Bérubé thanked Council members for their attendance and participation. The meeting was adjourned at 4:15.

_Dawn G. Blasko, Executive Director_
Date: April 16, 2019
To: All Senators and Committee Members
From: Dawn Blasko, Executive Director

Following is the time and location of all Senate meetings April 22 and 23, 2019. Please notify the University Faculty Senate Office and committee chair if you are unable to attend.

MONDAY, APRIL 22, 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, APRIL 23, 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 – 252 Erickson Food Science 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 Graduate Building

11:15 a.m.

Commonwealth Caucus Meeting - Nittany Lion Inn- Boardroom

1:30 p.m.

University Faculty Senate – 112 Kern Graduate Building
Date: April 16, 2019
To: Commonwealth Caucus Senators (includes all elected campus senators)
From: Rosemarie Petrilla and Elizabeth Seymour, Caucus Co-chairs

MONDAY, APRIL 22, 2019 – 8:15 PM
102 KERN BUILDING

Guest Speaker:
Dr. Madlyn Hanes
Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses and Executive Chancellor of Penn State

Topic:
Commonwealth Campuses Updates

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, APRIL 23, 2019 – 11:15 AM
BOARDROOM, NITTANY LION INN
A buffet luncheon will be provided at 12:15 p.m.

Agenda

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