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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, April 23, 2019, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate building with Michael Bérubé, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Michael Bérubé, University Faculty Senate Chair: We start with Agenda Item A, Minutes of the Preceding Meeting. The March 12, 2019 Senate Record providing a full transcript of the proceedings of that meeting was sent to the University Archives and is posted on the Faculty Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions to these minutes? All in favor?

All Senators: Aye

Chair Bérubé: Ayes have carried. Motion carried. The minutes of the meeting have been approved. I want to note that these minutes include the already classic exchange between Keith Shapiro and myself as to who was stepping on whose lines.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Bérubé: Item B, Communications to the Senate. The Senate Curriculum Report of April 9, 2019 is also posted on the University Faculty Senate website. Appendix A

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Bérubé: Item C, Report of Senate Council. Minutes from the April 9, 2019, Senate Council meeting can be found at the end of your agenda. Included in those minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President at the April 9 meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Bérubé: Item D, Announcements by the Chair. I do have a few. I will try to be expeditious.

First, I would like to offer a postscript to Senator David Han's account of our relations with the Board of Trustees. Perfect timing. David did a wonderful job of crediting former Senate Chair, John Nichols, for his tireless work on the Senate Committee on University Governance, Parts 1 and 2. A lot of people think the sequel is even better than the original. I would just like to add my thanks to Laura Pauley for her work in forging closer relations between the Senate and the Board, and to her and Roger Egolf for their service on Board committees.

Second, I have end of the year updates for you on our special committees, the ones undertaking specific and critical tasks that do not fall under the purview of our 15 Standing Committees. The Senate Special Committee on Addressing Allegations of Faculty Misconduct has been charged and has held its first meeting. That charge, along with the names of the committee members, is available on the Senate website.

The report of the Special Joint Committee on Reexamining the Consensual Relationships Provision of AD85 is being circulated among various University's constituencies to make sure we're all on the same page, but that committee's work will be finished soon. And, in the near future, Incoming Chair, Nicholas
Rowland, will issue the charge to a new special committee whose task it will be to streamline Senate procedures for curriculum revision in response to faculty members who find our current procedures cumbersome and a disincentive to faculty interested in curricular innovation. The reason Nicholas will be issuing the charge is that it just wouldn't make sense for me to charge the committee now at the end of the year, only for Nicholas to have to recharge it immediately—the next week.

Third, I want to update you on what has happened to the Annual Faculty Salary Report— for those of you who have been wondering. It's usually provided to the Faculty Benefits Committee by the Office of Planning and Assessment. We will indeed have a Faculty Salary Report, but we don't have one now, thanks to what we might call a Workday related delay. It will be forthcoming in the fall.

And I would like to introduce to the Senate Kenya Mann Faulkner, our new Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer. Kenya? There is a beckoning. Oh, okay. It's not on the script either. All right. I'll introduce her at the end of the remarks then if she's not here now.

I am now pleased then to invite Martha Levine, the Chair of the Senate Committee on Student Life, to introduce the John White Fellowship recipients. Martha.

**Martha Levine, College of Medicine**: Thank you, Chair Berube. Each year, the Senate Committee on Student Life recognizes outstanding undergraduate students who are graduating Summa cum Laude and who plan to enroll in graduate study. The John White Graduate Fellowship is one of the oldest continuing fellowships at Penn State. The award was established in 1902 by James Gilbert White to honor his father, Reverend John W. White of Milroy, Pennsylvania.

Joining me on this year's review committee were Sinfree Makoni, Professor of Applied Linguistics and African Studies, College of the Liberal Arts, and Jennifer Nesbitt, Associate Professor of English, Penn State York. This year, eight students were chosen to receive a John White Graduate Fellowship. Each student will receive a $575 award. I am pleased to introduce five of the fellowship recipients. As I say your name, please join me at the podium. Senators, please hold your applause until all recipients are introduced.

**Shenyun Chen** will graduate with B.A. degrees in Psychology, Sociology, and Criminology. She has been accepted to several master’s programs and is most interested in the Human Development Counseling Program at Vanderbilt University and the Psychology in Education Program at Columbia University. After completing her master’s degree, Shenyun plans to pursue a doctoral degree in clinical psychology. She is a licensed tea artist in China, which is a traditional form of art in some Asian cultures. Thus, she is interested in uncovering the associations among psychotherapy, mindfulness, and tea art. Shenyun has performed research at University Park, was an Undergraduate Teaching Assistant in Introductory Sociology, and Law and Society. She also interned as a Teaching Assistant of Web International English in China. Among other honors, Shenyun was the recipient of the Evan Pugh Scholar Junior and Senior awards.

**Maria Hudock** will graduate as a Schreyer Honors Scholar with a B.S. degree in Biomedical Engineering. This summer, she will matriculate into the Medical Scientist Training Program (MSTP) for a dual degree of MD-PhD at Columbia University Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons. This program is designed to train physician-scientists, people dedicated to translating new medical technologies “from the bench to the bedside.” Maria wants to be a tissue engineer and a hematologist-oncologist so that she can use engineering principles to pursue treatments for previously uncurable conditions, especially creating
replacement tissue for those who suffer from lung cancer, COPD, and other pulmonary disorders. She eventually wants to direct an engineering laboratory, see oncology patients, and teach. Maria was a member of several research teams at University Park and Hershey Medical Center, was a teaching intern for Bio-continuum Mechanics, and performed medical shadowing. Among other honors, Maria was the recipient of the College of Engineering Research Initiative (REU) Scholarship, the Evan Pugh Scholar Award, and the Erickson Discovery Grant.

Adam McCarron will graduate as a Schreyer Honors Scholar with B.S. degrees in Physics and Astronomy & Astrophysics, and Minors in Spanish and Mathematics. Adam will attend the University of Texas at Austin to pursue a Ph.D. in Astrophysics. He wants to shed light on how galaxies formed and evolved in the most distant observable reaches of our universe, and to understand the properties of galaxies undergoing intense star-formation whose light experiences severe obscuration from thick clouds of dust. After finishing his Ph.D., Adam plans to become a professor of astrophysics. He was a member of several research teams at University Park and was a Learning Assistant for both Astronomical Methods and the Solar System, and Astronomy of the Distant Universe. Among other honors, Adam was a recipient of the Elsbach Honors Scholarship in Physics, the J&E Teas Science Scholarship, and the Evan Pugh Scholar Senior Award.

Janelle Rothacker will graduate as a Schreyer Honors Scholar with a B.S. degree in Kinesiology with the Movement Science Option. She will pursue a Master of Arts degree in Intercollegiate Athletic Administration within the College of Business at the University of Nebraska. This program is the only one of its kind in the country. During the second year of the program, cohort students are placed in full-time internship positions within Husker Athletics. Upon completion of her master’s program, Janelle’s goal is to pursue a career in athletic administration at a large university. She has been a Research Assistant at University Park Kinesiology, a Program Assistant for Penn State University Competitive Sports, and a C3 Sports Operation and Facility Management Intern. Among other honors, Janelle was a recipient of the Weber Family Memorial Scholarship, the Evan Pugh Scholar Award, and the Oswald Award in Academics.

Stephen Thornton will graduate as a Schreyer Honors Scholar with B.S. degrees in Mathematics, Physics, and Astronomy & Astrophysics. Having taken advantage of the Integrated Undergraduate/Graduate Program, he will also graduate with a Master of Arts degree in Mathematics. He will attend Cornell University’s doctoral program in Physics, focusing on condensed matter theory, with options including application of the AdS/CFT correspondence to condensed matter, and analysis of certain special emergent states of matter. Stephen was a member of several research teams at University Park and was a Learning Assistant for Astronomy of the Distant Universe. In addition, he was involved in two REUs; one at Cornell University, and one at the University of Pennsylvania. Among other honors, he was the recipient of the McCubbin Fellowship for excellence in Physics, the John & Elizabeth Holmes Teas Scholarship, and most recently the Cornell Graduate Fellowship.

Three John White recipients were unable to join us today, but I also want to recognize them.

Jo Ann Durdan will graduate with a B.A. degree in Corporate Communications and a Minor in Business. She is a dedicated returning adult student and she will pursue a Master of Professional Studies degree in Strategic Communications via Penn State World Campus. Jo Ann’s goal is to teach at the college level with hopes of inspiring youth by providing a real-world experience and the inspiration to follow your dreams no matter what obstacles you may encounter. She was an Education Program Assistant at Penn
State Worthington Scranton, and an Office Manager and Events Coordinator at the Masonic Temple in Scranton, PA. Jo Ann was a member of the Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society and the Blue & White Society.

Heidi Fanton will graduate with a B.S. degree in Communication Sciences and Disorders and she has been chosen to be the Student Marshall for her graduating class. She will be pursuing a M.S. degree in Speech Language Pathology at Penn State with the goal of becoming a Speech-Language Pathologist in order to help children with complex communication needs. Heidi has been a Research Assistant for the College of Health and Human Development working with devices for children with communication disorders and has been a Teaching Assistant for the Introduction to Disorders of Articulation and Phonology. She was also a Resident Assistant for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Summer Academy. Among other honors, Heidi was the recipient of the Evan Pugh Scholar Award and the Health and Human Development Summer Research Grant.

Elise Venter will graduate with a B.S. degree in Marketing and a Minor in Biology and she has been chosen to be the Student Marshall for her graduating class. Elise plans to go to medical school with the goal of becoming a physician in the Philadelphia area, and eventually move into hospital administration. She has been accepted into two schools thus far and is still deciding which path to choose. Elise started volunteering at her local hospital at the age of fifteen and fell in love with the clinical environment. Throughout her undergraduate career, she continued to explore healthcare, and after completing a pre-med internship with Abington Jefferson Hospital, she knew that she was meant to be a physician. Elise has been a Marketing Teaching Assistant at University Park, a Marketing Intern at Waffatopia in Conshohocken, PA, and an intern with The Atlantis Project in Athens, Greece. Among other honors, she was the recipient of the University Provost Award, and the Penn State Abington Fellows Scholarship and Scholarly Works Grant.

Please join me in congratulating these outstanding students.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Bérubé: Thank you, Martha, and congratulations all of you. It's very impressive, to say the least. I am now pleased to introduce to the Senate, Kenya Mann Faulkner. Our new Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer. Ms. Faulkner earned her Law Degree from the University at Buffalo and was most recently the Managing Director for Business Intelligence and Investigations at Kroll, the Global Risk Management Firm. She has more than 25 years of experience in higher education, government, and criminal justice. She joined us on December 3. Please extend her a warm welcome.

[APPLAUSE]

Kenya Mann Faulkner, Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer: I just wanted to say it's a pleasure to be here. I look forward to working with all of you in the coming months letting you know what my goals and missions are for my office. And I appreciate the warm welcome. Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Bérubé: Now I have to go over here. Presentation of certificates. This is going to feedback, won't it? I would like to offer special recognition to four elected Faculty Senators who are leaving the Senate with distinguished records of service over at least eight years. As they come forward, I will present them with a certificate signed by President Barron and myself, acknowledging their dedicated service to the
Senate. Please come forward when I read your name, and I ask everyone else that you hold your applause until all four have been introduced.

Colleen Connolly-Ahern is a Senator from the Bellisario College of Communications. She has served eight years, from 2011 to 2019. She has served as chair and vice chair of the Senate Committee on Global Programs and is a member of Curricular Affairs. Is Colleen here? “O” for one.

Peter Eberle is a Senator from Fayette. He has served nine years, from 2010 to this year. Peter has served on Research, Intra-University Relations, and University Planning.

Timothy Lawlor is a Senator from Brandywine. He's been a senator 12 years, from 2007 to the present. He has served as committee chair of the Intra-University Relations Committee, and this year as vice chair on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid. He has also served on the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

Matthew Woessner needs no introduction, and therefore will receive none. No, I'm sorry.

[LAUGHTER]

It says he's a Senator from Harrisburg. I'm not sure I knew that. He was elected in 2013, and of course served as a Senate Officer from 2016 until some point later today. He served as Committee Vice Chair of Faculty Benefits and served in the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits, the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, the Committee on Committees and Rules, and Senate Council. Thank you so much for your service.

[APPLAUSE]

[INAUDIBLE]

Now, my personal thanks, I'd like to acknowledge all the Senate Officers for their contributions over the past year. Chair-elect Nicholas Rowland, Immediate Past Chair Matthew Woessner, Secretary Annie Taylor. It has been such a delight working with all of you. I couldn't have asked for a better team of Officers. I know I have benefited from your wisdom, your advice, your wit, and your amazing knowledge of policy and procedure. And I know that I could not have done this job alone, and that I did not do this job alone. I relied on all of you at every step. And I thank you for letting me rely on you at every step. I congratulate all of you on the time you have spent as Senate Officers, and I thank you for your service to the Senate.

[APPLAUSE]

And to our indefatigable Parliamentarian, Beth Seymour. Last year I thanked you for being so wise in the ways of Robert's Rules of Science, and of course wise in the ways of Monty Python references. So, I don't want to do that again. Besides, you're still wise. I'd prefer to welcome you to the ranks of the Senate Officers next year because, spoiler alert, you will be doing so as the new Chair-elect. Congratulations.

[APPLAUSE]
I wanted to thank John Nousek—hi, John—our liaison to Graduate Council who served in that role in a decisive year in which Senate leaders worked with Graduate Council to establish the principle that that elected faculty body should elect its own chair. John, you were an indispensable part of that process, as was Annie, as chair of the Committee on Faculty Governance Bodies. And, I'm so happy to report that as of next month, the members of Graduate Council will indeed elect their own chair. Thank you also to Dean Younken for overseeing and enabling that change.

[APPLAUSE]

Now I'd like to recognize this year's leadership of the Senate Standing Committees and special committees. So, if all the chairs and vice chairs could stand for just a moment. It is a truism that the work of the Senate is done in its committees. It's a truism because it's true. Our chairs and vice chairs make this body work, and I'm so grateful that each of you have agreed to serve from last year when I asked you. And as our year comes to a close, I thank you again heartily.

[APPLAUSE]

And next, I would like to ask those who are leaving the Senate, if they would please rise. You're all sticking with us? I thought that—hi, folks. Thank you for your service to the Senate and your role in shared governance. For those who are retiring from the University on June 30, best wishes for a long and healthy retirement. And for all of you who served in the Senate, as you close out your Senate careers, thank you. We do appreciate your time and your service. Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

I want to acknowledge Lee Fessler and Jon Leslie of Media Technology Services for their work on MediaSite, and for providing tech support for Senate meetings. We all know how important that is. I also want to recognize Dave Test and the other staff from Teaching and Learning with Technology who have provided support with the clickers. Folks, without you, we can't vote. So, thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

I'd like to offer a special thanks to Executive Director, Dawn Blasko, for our most successful year. Running the Senate from the home office here in Kern is a more than full-time job. And Dawn's long experience and invaluable institutional memory make her an awesome Executive Director. To be honest, there have been times this year when issues have come up that I have found baffling, and about which I really couldn't tell my left hand from my right. Those would be the moments in which Dawn would call me on my cell, and she would remind me that my left hand is the one to which she attached a tag reading ‘L’.

More seriously, I'd like to offer one small but telling example of her help. Some of you might recall my remarks in December on the desecration and subsequent theft of the menorah at the Zeta Beta Tau fraternity house. Our meeting that day happened to fall on the 80th anniversary of Kristallnacht, as I remarked at the time. And I called upon all of us at Penn State to repudiate and resist any instance of the resurgence of antisemitism. After that meeting, Carey Eckhardt came up to thank me for my statement, and I said, you're very welcome. But you know who suggested I say something about this in my opening remarks? Dawn. I really can't serve out my year as chair without acknowledging that. So, thank you for that, Dawn, and for all your advice and guidance this year.
Last but surely not least, I want to acknowledge the amazingly dedicated Senate staff. This body could not work without you. These meetings could not work without you. You are the wheels inside the wheels. They say that once you take a position like Senate Chair, the first thing you learn is that you lose control of your calendar. Well, I wasn't worried about that, because with this staff I knew my schedule and everything else was in very good hands. Paula, Anna, Kadi, Allison, Patti, and Kathe, thank you so much for the work you've done for the Senate this past year and the work you do every year.

Okay, now for my closing remarks. I was originally going to warn you all of the insidious wiles of foreign influence, since history and experience proved that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of Republican government. But it turns out that George Washington already said that. Then I thought that maybe I should issue some prophetic remarks about the military industrial complex. But finally, I decided I should stick to things I know about, like academic freedom and shared governance.

As I wind down my final few hours as your Chair, I want to thank you all again for the opportunity to serve in this role. One thing I've learned over the course of these past few years is that it's really not productive to think of shared governance simply as a matter of faculty and central administration. It's not even adequate to think of things that way, even when the relations between faculty and central administration are pretty good as they are here.

In two years of chairing the Faculty Affairs Committee, and then another two years as a Senate Officer, I've learned that shared governance isn't just about the Senate and Old Main. It's also about the Senate and Human Resources, the Senate and Research and Compliance, the Senate and Information Technology, the Senate and the Ethics Office, the Senate and the Athletics Department, the Senate and the Office of Risk Management, the Senate and the Office of General Counsel, and of course, the Senate and the Board of Trustees.

We've worked hard to establish ourselves as reliable partners in University governance, sometimes by pointing out that we have faculty experts in things like risk management, information technology, and even wellness programs. I don't think any of you would believe me if I tried to describe the work of shared governance as fun. But I think it is actually something better. It is illuminating. It is edifying. And it helps make Penn State a better place to work for all of us.

And as you know, academic workplaces really are anomalous. People looking at universities from other walks of life are sometimes flummoxed by the peculiarities of academic life, particularly by the phenomenon of shared governance, which doesn't exist in a whole lot of other workplaces. And even when people do understand the importance of academic freedom in research and teaching, they sometimes have a hard time seeing why shared governance should be understood as an aspect of academic freedom.

So, I think it's incumbent on civic-minded, public-spirited faculty members like you to make the case. We are full partners in this enterprise. You don't always have to take our advice. But you should always solicit it as a matter of course. And that's one way for all of us to recognize and to realize, to make real, what a university is. So again, once more with feeling, thank you for all your service to the University, and thank you for the honor of serving as your chair.
[APPLAUSE]

Thank you so much.

We are pleased now to have Mark Dambly and Matthew Schuyler with us today. Mark Dambly is, as you know, the Chairman of the Penn State Board of Trustees. He was appointed to the Board by Governor Ed Rendell effective October, 2010. He earned his BS in Real Estate and Insurance from Penn State, and he is president of Penrose Properties, LLC, a Philadelphia-based real estate group. He also serves on the Boards of Directors of the Crozer-Keystone Health System and the Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center.

Matthew Schuyler is Vice Chairman of the Board of Trustees. He was elected to the Board of Trustees effective July 2015 as an at-large trustee.

The Chief Human Resources Officer of Hilton Worldwide earned his BS in Accounting from Penn State at 1987 and an MBA in Organizational Behavior and Human Resources Management from the University of Michigan in 1995, though we don't hold that against him. His Penn State volunteer service includes membership on the Board of Visitors, the Smeal College of Business, the College of Information Sciences and Technology, and on the School of Hospitality Management Advisory Board. He has been a member of the National Academy of Human Resources, and the Penn State Alumni Association honored him with an Alumni Fellow Award in 2013.

Chairman Dambly will now deliver remarks and stand for a few questions. Chairman Dambly.

[APPLAUSE]

Mark Dambly, Chair, Board of Trustees: I appreciate your introduction and comments. And it's a pleasure to be with you again. This is my third year to be here, and I'd like to thank Michael for your service as the Faculty Senate Chair and for your participation with the Board of Trustees. It's been very, very constructive, and I enjoy and look forward to continuing to work with you and the balance of your leadership team.

I would like to recognize Matt Schuyler. Matt's with me, and Michael introduced Matt. And Matt and I are a real team approach to leadership. Since I was elected as the vice chair with Ira Lubert, he and I worked as a team, and Matt and I for the last two years have worked as a team. And we're really interchangeable. And Matt is really a co-chair of the Board with me. And I appreciate all of Matt's support and efforts.

I'd also like to take a moment to recognize Dr. David Han. I think I saw David earlier. David's here. And David, you're a Faculty Senate Representative on the Board. David's done a wonderful job from our perspective of both acknowledging and representing the interests as his fiduciary interest as a Board of Trustee member, and also representing the Faculty Senate. Matt and I have put him in two leadership positions. The prior year he was the chair of the Governance Committee. And, this most recent term, he's been chair of the Academic Affairs Committee. And Dave has been great to work with, a real great colleague, and has represented your interests very, very appropriately and fairly. And again, I wanted to recognize Michael again for your leadership.
I thought I'd share with you just a few of the current Board of Trustees priorities, in no particular order, and certainly not in their entirety. But to the extent that you have an interest in what our priorities are—and hopefully you do-- this will give you a little bit of insight into it.

First and foremost, I think Matt and I's commitment to President Barron and his leadership team, I think that's important for any Board leadership. But we've had the pleasure of being with the Board when we hired Eric, recently gave him a contract extension, and Eric's been wonderful to work with. We have a very open dialogue, and I think it's important for us to be able to support his initiatives as President's Counsel, Provost Jones, and their initiatives. And we work together to align our interests, and Eric does a great job in terms of leadership of those priorities. And I hope that he feels that the Board supports him in those endeavors, both privately and publicly and financially as we work through the budgeting process.

I want to mention our commitment to the Research Enterprise. Dr. Barron's made that one of his big commitments, and I think there are really two initiatives of ours are priorities that transcend the Faculty Senate. And I think the Research Enterprise and hiring and retaining the best faculty we possibly can. We think that those two priorities are important to the construct of the University, and also to putting together the infrastructure in place for our students to be successful. And it starts with the faculty. I know you have great advocates in Dr. Barron and Dr. Jones when we have those conversations and when we talk about those things like budgets and salaries and those kinds of things. First and foremost is their commitment to hiring and retaining the best of the best. And we think that's really the hallmark of this University, along with our research mission. And so, we had that in the forefront.

We continue to focus on access and affordability. It's a huge issue nationally. It's a huge issue for us as a Land Grant Mission. And affordability is a big issue. One of our challenges is the minimal appropriations request. And I don't mean to say $250 million dollars is minimal. But as a per student, per capita, it is at the lowest end of the Big Ten universities. And it's very difficult for us to maintain tuition at the levels that they are. And we've worked very, very hard with Dr. Barron and his leadership team to do that. And we are very, very focused on access and affordability. And it's in the forefront of us and our thoughts.

Another one of our focuses is staying focused on the Boards of the Commonwealth Campuses. That's actually where I finished up my career. I started at Shippensburg University, and I came to Penn State University and was at University Park, and I didn't have the wherewithal to continue to stay at University Park. So, I went back to Brandywine and finished up my career at Brandywine and started off as an Advisory Board member there.

And we just feel very, very strongly about the importance of the furtherance of our land grant mission and the Commonwealth Campuses participation in that. And it's a priority for us and the quality of education it could provide to those who either choose not to or can't afford to be at University Park, and to the economic engine of each of those municipalities where those Commonwealth Campuses reside. So, you've got huge advocates in Matthew and me, and the entire Board, and certainly Provost Jones and Madlyn Hanes and Dr. Barron.

Diversity and inclusion have become a central focus of our Board. This last Board cycle meeting, Dr. Han convened a very large roundtable discussion, along with Brandon Short on our Board, around diversity inclusion. It was very, very well attended, very well received. Matt and I have made a commitment to have that dialogue continue with each of our Board meetings moving forward. So, that's a discussion topic that we'll continue to focus on.
One Penn State 2025. I'm getting really excited about it, and we kind of got a little ahead of ourselves in the Board. And I know Nick is being patient with us and had a chance to talk to some folks before this meeting. And we have asked Nick, and he's agreed to spend some time with us each Friday morning of our Board cycle keeping us updated and apprised of One Penn State 2025.

We think the furtherance of the Strategic Plan in this way is going to be very, very effective. And as Matt has pushed us to begin to think as a Board, and in conversations with Dr. Barron, just thinking about the new way of delivering education. And higher education is changing, as all of you can tell, and as all of you know, better than I. And, we think One Penn State 2025 is going to lead us into that future of higher education.

Some more mundane things. Succession planning of Dr. Barron and his staff. Dr. Barron's worked very effectively with Matt and I on a succession plan, as any business would have for all the top-level executives in the C-suite of the University. So, Dr. Barron has identified folks, along with his President's Council, in each of those areas who could be potential successors under any circumstances by which anyone may leave, retire, take another job. But we think it's important for the continuity of the enterprise to have a good strong succession plan. So Matt, being the Chief HR Executive for Hilton, is well versed in that and has helped us with that as well.

Penn State Health is a big focus for us. As you might imagine, it's about a third of the revenue of the enterprise. We are working very effectively, as you probably all are aware. At the last Board meeting, we voted and made a decision to change the Bylaws by which we are now going to have a separate CEO of the clinical enterprise of Penn State Health, and then a dean of the College of Medicine. And, Provost Jones will be leading that search. And he will give us some updates on that at the next Board meeting. But we're separating those obligations.

And, in furtherance of that, we're also separating the obligations of the borrowing of Penn State Health. We felt that the risk associated with Penn State Health was continuing to grow, and their strategic plan and their ability to grow was really outpacing the University's comfort level of being the backstop for that borrowing. So, we've taken that first step. We've gone to Moody's and all the rating agencies that would receive favorable feedback on that initiative.

And so, we're embarking down that path. And we think it's going to lead to the growth of the clinical enterprise, and further hopefully revenue opportunities for the College of Medicine in terms of support of that initiative, as you probably all would support in all your individual units. There's a lot of needs there, and we think that this will provide an opportunity for the College of Medicine to avail itself to some more revenue stream.

I will also mention that our partnership with Highmark has been very, very successful at Penn State Health. They invested over $300 million into the enterprise and took a 20 percent interest in it. And it's been really good. It's been a really good partnership to begin with. And again, as health care is changing every day-- and we had lunch today and talked about the ever-changing environment of higher education, and how quickly things are changing.

But health care is really changing quite quickly. I mean, between Board meeting and Board meeting, I get used about what we're buying and what we're selling. But we still stay true to our Strategic Plan. And we're very comfortable with it. And we think that Highmark's going to be a really, really good partner with that, as we align a health insurance provider with a clinical enterprise and a medical college. We
think that's a model for success in the future. And so that's been a good partnership to date. The Board members that are on the Board with us are very constructive, very thoughtful, and are thought leaders in the industry.

The last thing I'll mention is an initiative that we're working on that some of you may have heard of, which is really kind of a continuance of what the administration had already been doing, but kind of formalized a little bit more for visibility, really for the Board of Trustees, and we think providing support for the administration moving forward. We engaged with a company called Huron to come in and do a top high-level review of the operational efficiencies of the University. And, I say that every year, the administration has been working hard on those operational efficiencies. They've been making progress. We yearned for some more visibility on that front from the Board's perspective. And we prioritized 11 initiatives for you to prioritize over those 11. And there are work groups and a project management plan in place for that. And Provost Jones, Dr. Barron, David Gray, and others are working very, very effectively on that. And I think you should be comforted by the approach that they're taking and the commitment of the Board, in that it's not about just saving money. It's about harvesting opportunities to reinvest into the enterprise.

And so, with the commitment to our Land Grant Mission, with our commitment to high quality education, the best in class faculty and students, and a physical plant. So again, we're just trying to encourage and provide support necessary to the President and his administration and some visibility to the Board. There's 36 of us, and we're all hungry to I think meet our fiduciary obligations, but also to be engaged in a thoughtful and productive way with the Board. And this has been given us an avenue to do that. I'm hopeful that the President Barron and Dr. Jones feel that way, as well with David Gray.

And we think it's going to yield some great results and some opportunities. Because we know that there's lots of investment that we want to make into the University and its enterprise to keep it best in class. So those are some highlights that we're working on. I don't know if Matt wants to add anything. I don't know if anybody has any tough questions, I'll deflect them to Matt. But I'd be happy to stand for any questions. Matt, if you'd like to add anything at all, Matt. That's good.

So again, thank you for all you do. And I know that Matt and I's focus when we came into leadership was really to prioritize our visibility and the exposure for the Faculty Senate, for the faculty members, for the students, to have access to the Board members. So, we meet every Board cycle. We meet with leadership of Faculty Senate. Matt, myself, and President Barron, Dr. Jones and Damon Sims and a couple others. And, this is really an open forum about what topics are important to you. Not that we can solve them all, or any of them for that matter, but at least you have a sounding-board for them. And if there are opportunities, sometimes that we are able to provide a priority for them. And then sometimes maybe they'll get done a little more quickly or efficiently, or more to your satisfaction.

So, thank you for all you do. My son came through the University. I came through the University. It's world-class, great faculty, great education, great research mission, great land grant mission. And so, we're thankful for the opportunity to serve on your behalf. So, I saw a hand raised.

Chair Bérubé: Yes, we have for the chair of the tough questions committee, Ira Saltz.

[LAUGHTER]
Ira Saltz, Shenango: You mentioned that you're very excited about One Penn State 2025. Could you elaborate a little bit on what maybe the Board's vision is of that, and what excites you about it?

Mark Dambly: Well, I think the excitement for me-- and again, I actually asked before this meeting to be a little bit more deeper dive on it-- what excites me is the opportunity to continue on with our Strategic Plan and provide access to our students throughout their entire life, and to really look to the vision of higher education, and for us to be thoughtful about that and thought leaders in it. And Nick has been somewhat tempered in the information flow appropriately as it develops. So, I wouldn't profess to have all the answers or all the background on it.

But I'm excited with the fact that we are at the forefront of it, and that it's going to provide a continuity of educational opportunities for our students from the time they get out of high school through-- I actually just heard a great story where there was an older gentleman. He probably isn't quite as old as I am. But really, just unfortunately, just lost his job. He was a couple credits short of getting his degree, and his daughter provided him the information necessary to re-engage at the University through this opportunity. And now he's going to graduate in the summer with a degree. And those kinds of things that excite me about it. So Matt, do you want to-- you talked a little about it before. Is that okay? Thanks.

Matthew Kaag, College of Medicine: Matt Kaag. Can you guys hear me?

Mark Dambly: Yep.

Matthew Kaag: Okay, sorry. Matt Kaag. I'm a Senator from the College of Medicine. Thank you very much for taking the time to come and talk to us. I know what I'm about to ask, I think you've probably heard before. But I'd be interested in hearing your response in front of this body. When we talk about separating the leadership role of the CEO and the leadership of the College of Medicine, the thing that concerns me as an academic surgeon-- I was an undergrad here. I did my medical school here. I'm now back here on faculty as an associate professor. I'm proud of the fact that I get to teach for the University. And I'm proud of the research that I do, and that my colleagues do.

Our biggest concern, I think, if I can speak for my colleagues, is that the separation of the leadership is going to make the priorities somewhat disjointed. That the clinical mission of the hospital and the academic mission of the College of Medicine may somehow get separated, and the priorities may get mixed. Can you speak a little bit as to how you and the Board might address those?

Mark Dambly: Well, I will tell you that when we first started having a conversation, that was the first thing that David Han came to us and talked about. So, it's not the first time we've talked about it. David brought it up to leadership. He brought it up to anybody who would listen to him. Just joking. But I think he highlighted that as an issue for us.

I think what we have agreed to do is a couple of things. One is the dean of the College of Medicine will be on the Board of Penn State Health. And that's important. I think that's a really fundamentally sound, thoughtful Board, with a lot of mutual respect and dialogue and a lot of consensus building. I think that the reporting will still be up through-- although that position of Dr. Hillemeier reported directly to President Barron, now the Dean of College of Medicine will report to Dr. Jones, Provost Jones, as well the financial obligations of it.
We have set out to begin— and I think that's one of the reasons— I don't want to speak out of school, and sometimes I do— but I think Nick's paused a moment. And I don't know where you are in the search, but one of the reasons why Nick has paused is, Steve Massini, the new CEO, has gone out and met with all the leadership of the College of Medicine, all the department chairs, and is hearing from them what their concerns and what their issues are. I think Dr. Jones is in contact with our Board Chair, Kathy Casey, acknowledging, recognizing, talking about where those touch points are, and where those areas of friction are going to be.

And I think at the end of the day, our commitment— I mean, that's really what the clinical enterprise is all about. It's about the commitment to the College of Medicine. I mean, that's why we want it to be profitable. That's why we want it to be able to have its strategic plan, which will allow it to be as successful as it can be. I think on the flip side, if we weren't able— one of the things that we were encountering is our inability to execute on our Strategic Plan because of the combined nature of the leadership and the way we were structured.

So, things are happening so quickly, and the other enterprises that we wanted to have some affiliations or partnerships with, we're concerned about the structure and our nimbleness, if you will. So we actually think it's— and I know it's easier for me, because I'm not a surgeon, or I'm not part of the College of Medicine— but we felt that there was a better likelihood for success with the clinical enterprise separating it, allowing it to execute on a strategic plan, grow. And our plan and our agreement is for, as their revenues increase, the commitment of dollars to the College of Medicine increases incrementally.

And, so, kind of a long-winded answer is, we recognize those touch points, that friction. Dr. Jones is taking that into account. He's communicating with Steve Massini, who is going to be the new CEO. And I think the Board at Penn State Health, of which I sit on, is aware of that. And we're really focused on— and the majority of the Board are appointed by Penn State University— our focus is on the College of Medicine.

So, I think change is— look, everybody's heard it— change is sometimes difficult. And I think you have legitimate concerns that we are legitimately and appropriately in our mind trying to address and acknowledge. And listen, I think at the end of the day, some things are probably different. You know? And sometimes change is good. And hopefully everybody will be open to the opportunities that we'll have through that. So, I don't know if that answers your question at all. Yeah.

Chair Bérubé: Chair Dambly, if I may, the faculty of the College of Medicine also brought this to my attention, and I brought it to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President in our last meeting. And we are assured that the reporting structure by the new dean will report to Provost Jones will have nothing to do— so the CEO will not intervene in that reporting structure. The academic side of the College of Medicine remains the academic side and will be run on academic criteria.

Mark Dambly: And Nick, did you want to add anything to that at all?

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: I'm having conversations with a lot of people as we try to basically develop a job description for [INAUDIBLE] to make sure that [INAUDIBLE]. And [INAUDIBLE] reflected in how we construct [INAUDIBLE].

Mark Dambly: David, did you want to add anything? Okay, thanks. One more?
Chair Bérubé: In a microphone challenged position. Equidistant from all three.

John Liechty, Smeal and Eberly: I'm split for choice.

Mark Dambly: Mic him up.

John Liechty, Smeal and Eberly: Okay, I don't have that much to say. That's okay, I'll try my best. John Liechty, I have a joint appointment at Smeal and Eberly. Just curious, you were mentioning about the partnership with Highmark. And I'm curious to understand what you're hoping that the collaboration or partnership would bring to Penn State. What are we looking to try to accomplish with a partnership with them? And maybe just give a little more elaboration on where you hope we see that going.

Mark Dambly: Well, I think it was a strategic partnership, and it was a financial partnership that came with it. I mean, they invested over $300 million dollars. And incidentally, I think a chunk of it was to the College of Medicine, if I'm not mistaken. And strategically, we're seeing more and more nationally relationships in different formats with health care providers and with academic institutions. So, the reason for it is access to insurance programs for our catchment area, and increased competition.

And, so, we wanted to be more competitive and to be able to have a relationship with a health care provider who is willing to invest in not just intellectually, but financially with us, and with insurance programs. It makes sense. That's one of our largest costs, is health care costs of the University. And so, we're trying to figure out ways to more efficiently maintaining appropriate coverages, drive those costs down. And we thought that was a strategy that'll help us with that. I don't know-- Eric, you have any--

Eric Barron, President, Penn State University: [INAUDIBLE]

Mark Dambly: Okay, good, thanks.

President Barron: [INAUDIBLE]

Mark Dambly: Thanks.

Chair Bérubé: He's on deck. Thank you again.

Mark Dambly: Okay, thank you. Yep. Appreciate it.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Bérubé: And speaking of following up on those comments, it is now my pleasure to recognize President Barron for his comments. And as always, President Barron will stand for questions. President Barron.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Eric Barron, President, Penn State University: Thank you. And thank you, Mark and Matt, for being here. I've left mine relatively short, knowing that we could have a lot of discussion. But I do want to make a couple of comments about the health enterprise. In my mind, every single decision we're making is to make sure that we protect-- in a very competitive environment in health care-- that we protect the
College of Medicine and our health enterprise. And many, many people view this at risk because of the level of competition, including having those competitors combine an insurance product and management product with a clinical enterprise, and even telling people that they have no choice, if they're going to use to use a particular product, of where it is they get their health care. So, this becomes extremely important.

Only two things have really been changed at this point. One is to move toward separate obligated debt. This allows the health enterprise to be more nimble about what they're doing instead of going through so many multiple levels of approval. Plus, now we're looking at the degree to which growth of the health enterprise has an impact on ENG building so that we can replace buildings on campuses all across the state that are academic buildings. So, we're protecting our ability to be able to fund those academic buildings. And the only other change is to separate the CEO of the clinical enterprise and the dean. And, in my view, this should be the opposite of the worry that we're hearing. Because now we have a full-up advocate. So that in the midst of building hospitals and buying property and having physician practice plans being incorporated into Penn State Health, and having all of that be so consuming, I think our fear was that with the complexity of that job and with the fact that we're working to add partners, that the College of Medicine becomes secondary. And we can't afford to do that. The whole reason why we have the enterprise is the College of Medicine.

Those two are the changes. Penn State remains in complete control of this entire enterprise. And if that CEO and dean are not working well together, then it's our job to fix that. And there are many cases out there where they don't work well. And when individuals are replaced, then they do seem to work much better. So, we will work at that. So just wanted to have those [INAUDIBLE].

I just had a couple of different points. One is the admissions scandal, because it strikes me that many of you might be interested in this topic. It is a source of some pride on our part that we've established an Academic and Athletic Integrity Office that helps create a firewall between athletics and admissions. This is something that is working very well. And so, if you actually had a coach who was saying, this is the person I want to have, they don't get to go to admissions and make that step. So, we already have this one sense of protection there in that particular process.

And the second part about this is that we deliberately compare rosters of who's coming in for a team, and then whether or not those individuals are on the roster. So, we have a couple of mechanisms in place that separate us out from other institutions in this space. So that's a good thing.

There's also-- you might be of interest to know that there is quite a bit of surveys that are being done, and quite a bit of media attention to this particular topic. And the outcome of it is a view which is almost entirely negative on the side of private institutions in this country as being more elitist. And so, you're starting to see more and more of this, that you're there to educate the top one percent. And yeah, you toss in a few students in there that aren't in the top one percent. So, whether that's fair or not, it is interesting that that's what the public perception is.

And polling on both ends of the scandal demonstrate that the public research universities like Penn State are doing just fine in terms of their image, and the privates have taken a significant hit in this process. Well, that's sort of added information, but I just wanted you to know that we feel very comfortable with our process. That's not to say a bad actor can't do bad things. That's not to say that someone is cheating on their SAT, and we're not going to know it until perhaps they're in the classroom. But hopefully you can rest easy in terms of our process catching this.
You know that the philanthropy has been going pretty well. And two weeks ago, we crossed the billion-dollar mark at two years and eight months into the campaign of a five-year campaign. This is really a great pace. And so, we're really very proud of it. I've decided I really like ‘B-words’, like billion. It just somehow rolls off the tongue really, really well. So, this is something to be proud of. But what's more exciting about it, not just the fact that that philanthropy is going well, but what's happening with it.

So, we may have crossed 1,000 new scholarships at this institution in that period of time. That's quite exciting in so many other ways. The other thing that's interesting is that you can see our alumni and friends voting with their feet, in terms of this is-- a philanthropic gift is in many ways voting with your feet on what they think the institution is doing. And so, the Impact the World theme, which includes economic development and the health enterprises as just two of the examples of energy, water, and food security in there-- basically, two-and-one-half years in, halfway, are at 93 percent of its goal.

So, this is telling you that our alumni and friends are looking at these broad themes that institutions can only accomplish if they can integrate across multiple disciplines, which we see over and over again in our institutes and the projects that we're taking on. This is a sign that our alumni and our friends are looking at this very, very positively, to be at that level halfway through the campaign.

So, we'll see what the end amount is, but you should also know there are only 11 institutions in this country that have had a successful billion-dollar campaign three times. That includes publics and privates. And we are right now sitting with an endowment that ranks us seventh among the publics. And three of the schools that are above us are systems, not individual schools. So, this is a very good company and suggests that our alumni and friends are really stepping up to help make sure that this is a great institution.

So, following on perhaps that philanthropic story about scholarships is the fact that I told the Senate Education Committee that Penn State's graduating class this last year had a decreased debt. That's a remarkable statement. The average debt of a student graduating from a campus dropped $1,500 dollars. And the average debt for a University Park student dropped close to $500 dollars. That is a fascinating statement.

And I just wish I could tell you exactly why. Is it because there is added wealth out there in the world, and people are feeling a little bit more comfortable, and so they're giving? Is this the 1,000 scholarships, and the focus on so many different activities? Is it the programmatic things that we're doing in Complete Penn State and Summer PaSSS, and the fact that we now have an endowed financial literacy center? Is it just national awareness on debt loads in this country? I do not know the answer, but I will tell you just how wonderful it is to see that curve bend down, from a curve that has been going steadily up through time. So, in a way--

[APPLAUSE]

Three bits of good news.

[APPLAUSE]

And I am sensitive on time, but Mr. Chairman, as usual, I'm happy to answer a question on any topic, if I'm able.
Chair Bérubé: This man with the lovely tie in the front. Mohamad.

Mohamad Ansari, Berks: With that introduction, good afternoon, President Barron. Very nice seeing you.

President Barron: Nice seeing you too.

Mohamad Ansari: It's been a long time.

President Barron: Yes.

Mohamad Ansari: I want to thank you for that first time that you have Development in line with the Strategic Plan. That's a five-year plan. And I want to congratulate you for the billion-dollar mark that has passed. My question is, did you set a target number that we would like to raise for the next three years?

President Barron: So, we did. And now, the interesting thing about this is, typically every university wants to raise more and more money. So, if you raise $2.2 billion dollars, you want to raise more. And many, many institutions are then extending their campaigns longer and longer and trying to pull out all the stops. So, it's a little bit-- and people said, “Eric, are you sure you want to do this?” Because you're going to do five years instead of seven-and-one-half, and you're going to set a goal at $1.6 billion dollars. And we're just a little bit past halfway there.

People are going to think that you're not raising the amount of money that you should be raising. But in fact, we set a goal substantially higher than the goal initially set for For the Future, and then you tried, then you beat that goal. So, we are taking that up as a notch. And interestingly, one of the things that we set-- so not that big number at the end of it, although that is a big number-- is to change the bar on what we're raising. So, we are about to complete, for the first time ever, three years above $300 million dollars. And there has never before been two years above $300 million dollars, except for last year. And, so, we feel like we're actually changing the whole structure.

So, what I'm telling people is, you know, we should be aiming for $1 million a day as a fundraising target. We have a new floor of over $300 million. And the other part about it is, normally you do a campaign, and you just watch this tooth go up like this. The campaign stops, your staff leaves, because you just removed the budget because you're not in a campaign. The staff leaves. All these people that know so much about our alumni and have so many connections. You wait two or three years, and you start over again and build it up.

And people will tell you that a typical development officer takes two years to get to know the alumni base. So, in this theme is, we don't want to stop. We don't want a budget change to occur at the end of five years. We want constantly to be building the pipeline. So, a big effort of development is constantly looking at that next group of people that are coming in, not just focusing on the people that have been giving. So, we're just hoping that instead of that big number, I tell people, that we're looking at a sustained fundraising for strategic planning efforts that is persistent.

Mohamad Ansari: Thank you so much. Thank you.
President Barron: It's still so much easier to say, we'll raise $2.5 billion dollars, because that's one of those B-word things. But I think this is a better way to do it. Focus on what we need to operate the University well. Yeah.

Vinita Acharya, College of Medicine: Simple question. Penn State has been very welcoming to high school students in the past. In Hershey, we get students from-- medical school gets about ten, and they used to go to Penn State Harrisburg. This year they stopped the program, and the reason given is they don't have enough teachers certified-- whatever-- child abuse training. Is the training that difficult? Because we do it as physicians, and it's really not that difficult.

President Barron: So, I will tell you, if you've never done the training before, and it's introduced as a new requirement, you may complain about it a little bit. On the other hand, there's no choice. And, so, it does have an impact in some cases. It has an impact in some cases for volunteers who say, “Wait, I'm a volunteer, and I've got to do these hours-worth of training.” Sometimes people are looking at it as how cost effective it is. We can look at that specific case for Harrisburg, but--

Vinita Acharya: Because the other Penn States have continued their [INAUDIBLE] program at York, what is happening is these are good students, and we really get them to stay at Penn State. So, the private schools nearby, the students are going there. So maybe in the future, we should have the high school students coming to us, rather than them going to private schools.

President Barron: We can raise this with Madlyn about a specific-- I always worry-- please don't quote me-- where a student would pick a lesser institution to go to over Penn State. But yeah, I will ask about that one specifically. Because it could be just a campus decision based on the resources that they wanted to have. But thank you for that.

Chair Bérubé: Rose.

Rose Jolly, College of the Liberal Arts: I just wanted to ask Eric if the move for the change in structure of the medical school can in any way incorporate a more sustainable and better practice of insuring or insurance for Penn State faculty and staff. Because we're facing increasing-- as with everybody-- we're facing increasing prices with less services and higher copayments and so on and so forth. And is there any way in this reinstitution that we can figure out a way in which we as a co-operative do not need to be competitive against ourselves in that area?

President Barron: So, this is an active topic of discussion. It probably wouldn't be a good idea for me to sit there and say what the steps are. But this is something that we're looking at in a very thoughtful way. We're in a high cost environment. And we have the potential to either have stronger and better partnerships, or to strengthen things just the way you said in order to save money. So, this topic is not lost on us.

Rose Jolly: Thank you.

President Barron: You're welcome.

Chair Bérubé: And thank you, President Barron.

President Barron: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Chair Bérubé: It is now my pleasure to recognize Provost Jones for his comments and questions.

Provost Jones.

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: Thank you, Michael. Michael kind of led off the meeting by reminding us all that the April Senate meeting is a time of transition, as is the summer. And I would just say that some summers are bigger transitions than others. So, I just want to take a few moments at the beginning of my remarks to acknowledge the contributions of a number of people whose impact on the University has really been profound.

I'll begin with Neil Sharkey, who is sitting right up there. I can see him. Neil, will you stand up, please? Neil has served as Vice President for Research for the past six years. I kidded around with Neil at the last Senate meeting. I'm not going to kid around today. This is serious. Neil is retiring. He's done an extraordinary job of growing our Research Enterprise over the past six years. And his contributions have been very much valued. So, Neil, congratulations on your impending retirement, and best of luck, and thank you.

Okay, so now I have a trio that I'm actually going to ask to come down the front for a moment. So, Bobbi, David, and Susan, would you mind joining me up here, just for a moment please? This summer really marks an extraordinary transition in the academic leadership of the University. Retiring are Bobbi Korner, with 12 years of service as the Dean of the College of Arts and Architecture. David Monk, who is coming, who is retiring with 20 years of service as the Dean of the College of Education. And Susan Welch, who is retiring after 28 years of service as Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

Now, I don't know about all of you, but what I am looking at here is 60 years of decanal leadership walking out the door at the same time. That's a little bit scary to me. We've got searches in progress in two of the cases and a new dean in place for the College of the Liberal Arts, of course. But I don't think there's many provosts around the country who get to introduce three deans who together have committed 60 years of service in their leadership roles. And I think all three of these individuals have contributed just amazingly to Penn State in just about every way that you can imagine. And, so, I wanted to bring them before you so that you too would have a chance to acknowledge their contributions, thank them, and wish them well as they transition into the next phases of their careers. So, thank you three very much.

I would just-- I know we have a busy schedule, so I'm going to keep this brief. But I just want to run through I thought a few bullets of feel-good items, things that we can be proud of in terms of accomplishments this year. Eric or Mark I think mentioned the economic impact across the Commonwealth of Penn State. I think, as many of you are aware, we did a study recently to look, measure the economic impact. And it shows that we contribute-- Penn State, across the Commonwealth, contributes more than $11.6 billion dollars to Pennsylvania's economy, and supports directly and indirectly more than 105,000 jobs each year.
For every $1 dollar in state appropriations received by Penn State, the University returns $1.24 dollars in tax payments to the Commonwealth. This is a big number. We have it broken down by campus, as many of you know. You should all be proud of that. That is something-- a great feather in our cap. We are an investment by the legislature when they provide our appropriation.

I mentioned research a moment ago. We have had an extraordinary year. I think you're all aware that we had record expenditures for yet another year. $927 million dollars last fiscal year, up $64 million dollars from the prior year. This year we're tracking 15 percent ahead of that in income and 5 percent ahead in expenditures. So, we are getting perilously close to another one of those B's, as Dr. Barron likes to say.

I will also point out a milestone this year. We are probably one of the few institutions of our size that does not have an NSF funded Engineering Research Center. And I'm pleased to report-- don't want to jinx it-- but this year for the first time, we're actually a finalist in the ERC Competition with one of our proposals being very favorably received.

Admissions. So far, we've received more than 103,000 undergraduate applications for 2019. University Park applications are up 36 percent from last year. Commonwealth Campus applications up 64 percent. This is driven largely by our use of the Common App this year for the first time. Pennsylvania applications are up 4 percent, out-of-state up 72 percent, and international up 19 percent.

As of yesterday, paid accepts tracking are slightly ahead of last year, three percent up at University Park, one-and-one-half percent down at the Commonwealth Campuses. But I remind you that it is April. So, things are changing on a daily basis by a lot. Pennsylvania paid accepts are up three percent, out of state up eight percent. International, little troubling, down 26 percent. So that's something we need to be paying attention to. Good news- paid accepts from African American applicants up 15 percent, and from Hispanic-Latino up 19 percent. So, some very good progress there.

Penn State World Campus marked its 20th anniversary this year, launched in 1998 with 41 students enrolled in five academic programs, that now has more than 150 degree and certificate programs and more than 14,000 students from over 130 countries. It is highly ranked by all entities that do such things, like US News. And Renata Engel actually shared with us yesterday that we will be next week in commencement graduating 3,370 World Campus students. So that is a pretty significant accomplishment of which we can be proud.

Strategic Plan. The University Strategic Plan, I think as most of you know, was extended through 2025, with substantial implementation efforts underway. Since last year, we've invested more than $4 million dollars in over 20 pilot programs, advancing transformative work of our faculty, our staff, and students. This academic year, through the RFP Process, we received nearly 200 proposals in two semester-long submission cycles. In Cycle 3, we approved nine. And in Cycle 4, just last week- in a moment of weakness, I approved 12. Mainly because there were so many good ideas, it was just difficult to draw the line at ten.

And just to give you a flavor, if you haven't been paying attention of the diversity of investment, I just want to share- not all 12, but maybe six or seven of the titles of these funded projects with you. "Redesigning Modernities, Why Does the Modern World Look So Different in Various Places Around the Globe?"; "Establishing Penn State's Leadership in Secure and Ethical Use of Health Behavior and Social Science Data"; "Penn State Cohort Study: To Promote High Impact Research, Student Engagement, and Health"; "A Systems Approach for Meeting Local and Global Food-Energy-Water
Nexus Challenges”; "Restorative Justice Initiative (RJI): Prison Education Project”; "Holocaust, Genocide, and Human Rights Education Initiative”; and, "The Midcareer Diverse Faculty Advancement Program and Humanities Collaborative". This just gives you a little bit of a flavor of the scope of these proposals. And we're very excited to see what these investments produce.

Signature initiatives. You heard from the chair of the Board about One Penn State 2025. Much more discussion to be had on this, but progress underway. And, we are really in the business of operationalizing that effort now. So many of you will be-- you'll actually all be participating in One Penn State 2025, some of you more directly than others. The launch, of course, of the Consortium to Combat Substance Abuse back in the fall, and we're very excited to see that develop. The Humanities Institute, I think I mentioned that last time. And then the Access and Affordability space, in addition to the other things you heard about earlier, Penn State joined 129 other public universities for a five-year APLU initiative to study measures to lower the barriers to higher education.

One miscellaneous data point, and then I'll finish with I think the thing that for me in the past week has probably been the most exciting news of all. So, fact, Penn State student athletes posted a 90 percent graduation rate, compared to the 87 percent average for all Division I institutions. That's something we should be proud of.

And then last week, I got an email from the Dean of Penn State Law telling me that for the first time since 2004, a US team was in the final four of the Vis Moot Court International Commercial Arbitration Competition in Vienna. 350 law schools from 80 countries competed, including most of the top-20 law schools in the United States. That school that happened to be the first American school in the final four for 15 years happened to be Penn State Law. And then the next morning, she texted me to inform me that we had won. Thank you very much.

[APPLAUSE]

So that's a pretty extraordinary achievement for Penn State and certainly for this team and for Penn State Law. So, I think that would be a really good place to stop, I think.

**Chair Bérubé:** We should have bumper stickers. Are there questions for Provost Jones? Rose. To your right. No, to your left, my right.

**Rose Jolly:** Just a question. Nick, do we know, or do we have any understanding of why our international applications are so radically down? So, in other words, we can worry about it. But until we know what's causing it, what do we do?

**Provost Jones:** It's the wrong time in the process for us to do an analysis, because things are changing quickly, and it could be in the last week or so, we remain open at University Park. We remain open at the campuses longer. There may be a bounce. So, it's a little early. But I think there are climate issues and concerns internationally about the welcoming nature of the United States for students to study. It is a concern.

**Rose Jolly:** It's distinguishing between Penn State and the United States is what I have a question on.

**Provost Jones:** Oh, I think--
Rose Jolly: And how do we do that?

Provost Jones: Applications-- it's way too early for us to have any information about paid accepts from other institutions. But certainly applications are under downward pressure nationally. I think we're holding our own. We're actually doing reasonably well compared to peer institutions. But there is definitely downward pressure on applications, has been for the last couple of years.

Rose Jolly: Thank you.

Paul Thompson, Harrisburg: On that topic-- Paul Thompson with Harrisburg-- on that topic, I'd heard that there are also some limitations being placed on certain countries' admissions. Is that correct? Is there some limitation on how many students are admitted from certain areas?

Provost Jones: Not that I'm aware of. I have not heard that.

Paul Thompson: There are no quotas then?

Provost Jones: No.

Chair Bérubé: I'm glad that that cleared up. Anything else? Thank you again, Provost Jones.

Provost Jones: Thank you for a great year.

[APPLAUSE]

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Bérubé: We have no Forensic Business.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Bérubé: Unfinished Business. We have some Unfinished Business that will remain unfinished. I will explain. The Senate Committee on Committees and Rules has a Legislative Report that was introduced at our last meeting on March 12, with the expectation that it would be discussed and voted on today. However, CC&R has pulled that report from the agenda. We would like to explain briefly why.

So, the idea was this. Based on concerns the Senate committees sometimes requested too much information from the Office of Planning and Assessment, CC&R proposed the creation of a Data Advisor to help coordinate the Senate's work. Under this plan, the Data Advisor would one, help the Chair formulate charges involving the acquisition and analysis of data; two, space out the data requests so as not to overwhelm the Office of Planning and Assessment; and three, assist the committee leadership in analyzing the results for Senate reports.

We thought, given the specialized nature of the position, and the extensive time commitments it would require, we'd ask the administration to temporarily support this position with a course release. That request was turned down. So as a result, CC&R concluded it would be kind of pointless to issue a report calling for the establishment of a Data Advisor with no course release. So, we've withdrawn the legislation from the floor. We hope to revisit this issue in the future. We move to Legislative Reports.
Chair Bérubé: Legislative reports. Legislative Report from CC&R can be found in Appendix C, Revisions to Senate Bylaws; Article III, Election to Senate, Section 8, has a revision to the Bylaws. It will be introduced and discussed today and voted on at the September 17, 2019, meeting. CC&R chair Keith Shapiro will present the report and lead the discussion. Keith.

Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture: Yes, thank you.

Chair Bérubé: These are your lines now.

Keith Shapiro: Hello, everybody. Today we're voting on or at least we're looking at. We're not voting on. voting on This is an introduction to revisions to the Senate Bylaws, Article III, Election to Senate, Section 8, regarding our Attendance Rules. We'll start here. Adequate attendance at plenary meetings ensures that our campus and college faculty constituents have the representation promised by our Faculty Senate Constitution.

However, it's more than just the plenary meetings that are duties. Our bylaws say that we are supposed to attend Senate plenary meetings, but we're also supposed to attend our assigned standing committee meetings and communicate with our faculty governance organizations what we do, both here and in our standing committee meetings.

However, we do have a problem. And the problem is that low attendance to our standing committee meetings affects the ability of the committees to perform their work and places an unreasonable burden on the committee chairs and the regular attendees. And I think we may have heard from some of our chairs this year that we've had some problems that way, and that they've had to do-- the chairs have had to do a tremendous amount of extra work, because they just don't have the attendance in order to help them get through those reports in a timely and efficient way.

CC&R looked at, after hearing, some of those reports. We looked at the numbers and discovered that 26 percent of the elected senators had ten standing committee meetings only a third of the time. And that 25 percent of all elected Faculty Senators are routinely absent from the standing committee meetings during a year. So, it seemed like we did have a problem.

We recommend that we bring the attendance expectations into alignment between the plenary meeting and the standing committee meetings. Our Bylaws already require attending both the standing committee meetings and the plenary meetings. However, our current attendance rules provide no recourse if elected faculty members, senators, decide not to attend the standing committee meetings. And many don't attend.

So, this legislation is to amend the Senate Bylaws so that the expectation is that elected Faculty Senators attend both the plenary and standing committee meetings at least two-thirds of the time. Now, this may seem scary. However, we already are supposed to attend two-thirds of the time. So, what we do here, and what we're doing here, is we're changing the language a little bit. And the language is to emphasize attendance rather than absences. So rather than say how often you can be absent, we're saying how often you ought to attend, which seems to be a little bit more positive approach to it.

Also, we're using two-thirds instead of a number to give people a better kind of picture of how often they ought to be here relative to the number of meetings that there are. But the real change on this is that it
adds into our legislation that the Senators, elected Senators, must attend also the standing committee meetings at the same rate. So, the expectation now is that we'll attend both two-thirds of the plenary meeting and two-thirds of the standing committee meeting.

Who will be affected? Elected Faculty Senators who are absent from three or more plenary meetings or standing committee meetings in a row two years -- standing committees two years in a row. So, in order for this to kick in, you have to do it for two years. So, it's not exactly a real egregious thing. We have six meetings a year. It's not that often. We know they're always on Tuesday. We know they last all day. So, chances are the units, if the units are unaware of this, I think we need to ask some questions about whether they're paying attention to what the Senate is doing.

What is not affected? Well, the same things that aren't affected now. Absences due to sabbatical, medical, or other leaves of absence, or absences related to professional responsibilities. These are already in the legislation as it stands.

When will this go into effect? Well, it's not going to go into effect right away. We're looking at two years from the date of passage, which would not be until September, until our first meeting. And until then, we continue on our current rules. And what we're hoping is, is that this gives the units plenty of time and an especially extra encouragement to make appropriate accommodations so their elected faculty senators can regularly attend both meetings. And that's the basis of what we're asking to change. Are there any questions?

Chair Bérubé: Are there any questions from absent Senators?

[LAUGHTER]

Keith Shapiro: There we go. I thought that was going to be a hard one. So, thank you.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

And you can stay right there. The next report is also from CC&R, found as Appendix D, Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, Senate Committee Structure, Sections 6 (b and c). These next two are pretty much housekeeping. But, Keith.

Keith Shapiro: Okay. The Student Caucus asked CC&R -- made a recommendation to CC&R -- to move one of the two student senators from Curricular Affairs to ARSSA because they believed -- and the committee chairs agreed with them, and so did CC&R -- that they would have more influence on ARSSA and be able to make better recommendations there, since the work of Curricular Affairs is such that they really don't have much influence. And that's what this basis for this is very simple.

Chair Bérubé: Any questions? Are we ready to vote? It says we will use clickers for voting today. Senators should have received a clicker before entering. Raise your hand if you need one. Senators joining by MediaSite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject it, press B.

Anna Butler, Faculty Senate Staff Assistant: On Poll Everywhere, I have seven accept.
Paula Brown, Faculty Senate Administrative Coordinator: In house, we have 116 accept, seven reject.

Chair Bérubé: Okay, thank you. It passes.

Chair Bérubé: Our next report from CC&R is Appendix E, Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(k). Keith.

Keith Shapiro: This is basically a change in the membership rules on Outreach that addresses changes in title that have happened with some of the administrative members on there. However, I would like to move to amend this legislation before we go forward on it. And the motion is, is that we changed-- if we could look at it, please.

Scroll down to the membership section, where it says on the line membership, Item Three, Vice President for Outreach, add his or her designee, change the words his/her to ‘their’. It is just to bring it in the line with our current practices.

Unidentified Senator: [INAUDIBLE]

Chair Bérubé: Sorry?

Unidentified Senator: [INAUDIBLE]

Chair Bérubé: Okay, all in favor of this change, say aye.

All Senators: Aye.

Chair Bérubé: All opposed on pronominal grounds or something? Okay. All right. Are we ready to vote on the report as amended?

Keith Shapiro: Yes, let's vote on the report. Unless there's-- are there any comments about this report?

Chair Bérubé: All right. MediaSite, Poll Everywhere. Everyone here, to accept the motion, press A. To reject it, press B.

Anna Butler: Poll Everywhere, I have 12 accept.

Paula Brown: In house, we have 121 accept, three reject.

Chair Bérubé: The motion carries. Thank you, Keith, for your exceptional work in a very busy year for CC&R.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Bérubé: Our next Legislative Report can be found in Appendix F, Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid and Education Committees, Changes to Senate Policy. I'm not going to read all those numbers.
Chair Bérubé: Beth Seymour and Mary Beth Williams will make the presentation and answer questions.

Elizabeth Seymour, Altoona: Hi, how's everyone doing today? We're getting there. We're also joined up here by the Director of Prior Learning Assessment, Michele Rice. The changes you see here are-- you know, honestly, I think these policies-- because the landscape of prior learning assessment changes so quickly-- probably need to be updated about every five years. And that's basically what we're on cycle doing here.

We also, in that interim time, hired Michele in the position she's currently in. And that's been helping to bring in line better practices. So, for instance, having faculty committees review credits coming in, either through exam, through portfolio, through transfer credit, rather than admissions offices. So, the changes you see here are those kinds of changes. They're just very extensive.

Chair Bérubé: Report comes to the floor by committee, needs no second. Are there questions? Are we ready to vote? MediaSite, Poll Everywhere. To accept the motion, press A. To reject it, press B.

Anna Butler: Poll Everywhere, I have 13 accept.

Paula Brown: In house, we have 116 except, five reject.

Chair Bérubé: Motion carries. Thank you, Beth and Mary Beth.

Chair Bérubé: Our final Legislative Report is from Intercollegiate Athletics, can be found in Appendix G. Revisions to Senate Policy, 67-10, Division I- Athletic Competition (University Park) and 67-30 Division III and PSUAC - Athletic Competition (non-University Park). Committee Chair, Mark Stephens, will present the report and stand for questions. Mark?

Mark Stephens, College of Medicine: Thank you. First and foremost, I had Easter dinner with mom, and she's getting her hair back and doing great and said to say hi to you guys.

Chair Bérubé: Hi, mom!

[APPLAUSE]

Mark Stephens: So, it's wonderful, wonderful to see. Two things in terms of processes. We would like that student athletes come with waiver requests not infrequently. And what we are asking for -with the help of the Morgan Center and others- is just a more explicit codification of what that exception looks like. So, an underachieving GPA is what we're after. And there are all sorts of different exceptions that folks come with. So, it clarifies the process of working with the Morgan Center counselors and others up through the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee for approval of those waivers.

The second item is clarification of including credit that the Senate has deemed good-to-go to be eligible for a competition. So, it's clarification, as the credit world changes, just clarification of what we would consider to be eligible credit for competition.

Chair Bérubé: Are there questions? This, too, is brought to the floor by committee, needs no second. Are we ready to vote? MediaSite, Poll Everywhere. If you're here- to accept, press A. To reject, press B.
Anna Butler: Poll Everywhere, I have 16 accept.

Paula Brown: In house, we have 114 accepts, six reject.

Chair Bérubé: Motion carries. Thank you so much. Thank you, Mark.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Chair Bérubé: Item J, Advisory/Consultative Reports. We have only seven today. The first is from the Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment. It appears on your agenda as Appendix H, Report on Results Will Vary* and Campus Climate Issues. Committee Chair, Alicia Decker, will present the report and respond to questions. Alicia.

Alicia Decker, College of the Liberal Arts: Derek's joining me. Thank you for the support. Hi everyone. So, this report, what we are asking the President to consider is that Results Will Vary* should be performed once a year during convocation at University Park in order to alleviate the financial burden. We met with Drs. Clements and DeLuca Fernandez, who talked about the tremendous expense that went into hiring a team of students to repeatedly perform this production.

And, so, the suggestion was made that if it was performed once during convocation, that would be more cost effective. And it would reach a maximum number of students at one time. It would then be recorded and utilized or encouraged to be utilized during the beginning of school at the various Commonwealth Campuses. It could be followed by discussions by peer educators in consultation with those of us in Educational Equity who are trained on a lot of these diversity issues.

We also are recommending that a series of academic scenarios be added to the performance. As it currently stands, the program is primarily based on issues of sexual assault, of alcohol abuse and consumption, and these kinds of daily life things of college, but don't really focus on the micro aggressions, the racism, and stuff that happens within the classroom. So, we want that academic component added to the performance.

And we also want the University to make a commitment to permanently fund this program, this production. It's quite an amazing thing, and we see a lot of value in it being used on a yearly basis. So, we absolutely want the University to make this an important commitment. So, we're asking you to support our advisory recommendations to the President. Do you have anything to add?

Unidentified Senator: [INAUDIBLE]

Alicia Decker: Yay, support team.

Chair Bérubé: Discussion.

Bonj Szczygiel, Arts and Architecture: I caught one of those performances last time, and it was just wonderful. But I'm wondering-- it was my understanding that these are student generated. And would it still-- if this were to be approved, would it continue to be student generated every year?

Alicia Decker: Yes, it is student generated. The students are responsible for creating the vignettes that they're going to be performing. We have been in touch. We've received some emails from students who
have been involved who said they'd love to collaborate with us in the future in designing some academic scenarios to go along with it. But the beauty of it is that it's created by and for students, but we see this as an opportunity to insert a little bit more academic rigor and give students an expectation of the kinds of issues they might experience in the classroom here at Penn State.

**Chair Bérubé**: Ann.

**Ann Clements, Arts and Architecture**: Hi, thank you. Ann Clements, Arts and Architecture. Alicia, thank you so much for your hard work. I know that this was a challenging year for EECE, and you've done a lot of reports and worked very hard.

I appreciate the time and energy that's gone into this report, but the original conversation that we began was in early fall. I believe it was the beginning of October. And, we haven't had an opportunity to dialogue about changes that have occurred since the original engagement that we had. Since then, your recommendation for permanent funding has come true. And I think we're on the way to having that secure. So, I would like to make a motion that this report return to Educational Equity to update the important findings that they have created to ensure that it reflects the current status of the project.

**Chair Bérubé**: I read an editorial that we also have the advantage of having people see it again next year and provide input on that. So, do we now debate the motion? That needs a second. Okay. All in favor of the motion to return this to committee for next--

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

**Elizabeth Seymour, as Parliamentarian**: Let's see if there's any debate.

**Chair Bérubé**: Is there any debate on the motion? That's why we need a Parliamentarian.

**Rose Jolly**: Yeah, just a question about how long--

**Chair Bérubé**: Rose Jolly, Liberal Arts.

**Rose Jolly**: Sorry.

[LAUGHTER]

I just have a really practical question about how long it takes on the convocation place. This is not-- I'm not against it at all. I'm totally for it. I just want to make sure our people are actually going to watch it. I haven't been to convocation. I've only been to graduation. People start walking out. So, I'm just trying to sense how many people are actually going to see it in relation to the time of convocation. That's my only question.

**Chair Bérubé**: Which is a great question, but actually with the motion at the moment on the floor is the motion to return to committee. But that question has come up. Laura.

**Laura Pauley, Engineering**: Does this updated information affect the recommendations of this?
Chair Bérubé: It does. Any further discussion of the motion on the floor? All in favor with the motion to return committee.

All Senators: Aye.

Chair Bérubé: All opposed? And so, it is. Thank you again for this work though. And it'll be a work in progress, as is Results Will Vary. 

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Bérubé: The next Advisory/Consultative Report is from the Senate Committees on Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations, and appears as Appendix I. This is ‘Revision to AC14 Academic Administrative Evaluation.” Committee Chairs, John Nousek and Rose Petrilla, will present the report and respond to questions. John, Rose.

John Nousek, Science: Could we bring up the report? It's a relatively compact revision. The point is that for some time-- several faculties cycles-- there have been requests to Faculty Affairs to improve the opportunity for commentary by faculty on administrator performance. And this is covered usually through what used to be AD14 and is now AC14, which is a five-year review. And the concerns that have been stated for several cycles of Faculty Senates has been that five years was too long an interval. And, so, we came out with this policy, after considerable discussion between Faculty Affairs, the Senate Officers, and the administration, about what would be an appropriate revision to the process of administrator review. And, I hope you've had a chance to read this. This was distributed with the bold face. And the key point is, it calls basically for annual inputs. It does not call for doing the AC14 every year. It's still a five-year cadence on that. But it calls for the mechanism. And there is even an acronym, which will give it untold power. We all know that SRTEs have untold power. So, I suspect amongst administrators, this new FRAE will be a word that they are well aware of. And all flippancy aside, I think this is a valuable improvement of the processes within the University. I'm very happy that the administration has expressed a receptiveness to implementing this. Rose, do you want to say anything?

Rose Petrilla, Hazleton: Well, just for point of clarification, I did come up because I'm up for the next one. But IRC was not consulted. It wasn't part of this one on the original priority. So that's-- I'm going to let you--

John Nousek: No, no. I'm sorry.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

John Nousek: Yeah, yeah, that's correct. Right.

Chair Bérubé: All right. I'll just cross that part out. Any questions? Carey?

Caroline Eckhardt, College of the Liberal Arts: I'm completely in favor of the spirit of this, but a practical question has come up. If each of these reports or survey instruments or however it be conducted is going to come separately from that person's immediate supervisor, if a faculty in a unit, for example, a faculty member in a department, University Park, would they be receiving one about their department
head, another one about an assistant dean, and two other ones about two associate deans, and one in the dean?

And how far on up does one go in the list of administrative offices on which the faculty individual be invited to comment annually? I don't know. I imagine that if it turns out there are a dozen different ones of these, that they would rapidly get ignored, if this shows up every single spring. And, so, I don't know whether in the implementation somehow could be coordinated so that they're not separate ones coming always from each individual's next immediate supervisor.

**John Nousek:** Yes. I don't believe there was a substantive discussion about the implementation on exactly where this applies. There was a discussion that it would only apply to what would be considered senior administrators, not someone who may have somewhat administrative, some minor administrative functions. But I can't answer. I'm sorry, say that again?

**Kathy Bieschke, Vice President for Faculty Affairs:** [INAUDIBLE]

**John Nousek:** Okay. What Kathy is stating is the definition of who is covered by this is exactly who would be getting an AC14 review.

**Caroline Eckhardt:** [INAUDIBLE]

**John Nousek:** I'm sorry, you would want the--

**Chair Bérubé:** I'm sorry, pass the microphone back. Carey, here, Carey.

**Caroline Eckhardt:** Sorry. I'm looking at the earlier paragraph under the word definition, which lists a lot of different categories of individuals. And if that is the list of whom all of this would apply, it's a long- I may be misreading it, but it says such offices shall include the following. Office of Assistant Associate Vice Presidents, assistant to the associate deans, department division heads, directors of research units, directors of academic affairs- non-University Park locations. I'm not sure whether the beginning of that sentence, which includes others yet, would also apply.

**John Nousek:** Would it be possible to scroll backwards? Carey, this is above [INAUDIBLE].

**Unidentified Senator:** Can you make it larger?

**Caroline Eckhardt:** It's totally just a practical question, because I'm aware of the spring clutter of information requests that already do not get answered. Keep scrolling. Yeah, yeah, right there. That's what I was looking at. And that's what generates my practical question. If those are the categories of people to whom this might apply-- because in some cases, I think they don't have an independent separate group of faculty. For example, in a college, if there's an associate dean, that associate dean's faculty might be all the faculty in the college.

If you bring it down to the individual human being unit level, somebody such as me, if potentially we would be mandating something that sounds like a huge number of surveys. Could you at least coordinate them so I would receive only one of them and not 12 different ones with each generated by that person's immediate supervisor, which is what it says a little later? So, it's only a practical question. I don't want to
delay this. But I want to raise the question now so that if it passes, as I hope it will, that somebody looks at streamlining the implementation.

Unidentified Senator: [INAUDIBLE]

Kathy Bieschke: I will do my best to streamline this. And it depends on how many questions. There could be one question. What feedback do you have for your administrator? And then it could be each administrator listed. So, we haven't talked about that at all.

John Nousek: This is calling for the creation of a process. It is not meant to be an implementation of the process. There's another question.

Chair Bérubé: No, here.

Deirdre Folkers, York: At a campus, we don't have quite the abundance of administrators above us, so that's not quite the concern I don't think on our end. But I do have a question relating to the general anonymity of the person providing the feedback. Oftentimes on the campus, or when we receive anonymous surveys, the required identification is such that there really isn't much doubt left as to who the person is when you have, for example in some instances, disciplines of one. So, apologies if I've overlooked it, but exactly how are we handling that end of the feedback mechanism?

John Nousek: That is, again, not something that we have covered because it's not in the area of implementation at this point. We're sympathetic to that view. The goal is to have it analogous to SRTEs because that's a case in which the students have a degree of anonymity. And that is the intent of what we're trying to do. However, there are a great many situations in the University-- and that is why I thought it was so important to get the support of the senior administration, because there are questions that are going to have to be answered. And I don't think they are-- this is more to create the conditions under which faculty input to administrator evaluations are expected. And that is the principle that we're going after here. I think there are many of these questions that are very good questions. But this one paragraph is not attempted to address all of those questions. So, I apologize on that, but I still believe that it's worthwhile passing this.

Harold Hayford, Altoona: Hi. Hayford, Altoona. I remember being on IRC probably about 10, 12 years ago. And we did a report on the status of AD14. And I remember a source of personal confusion and some other of the committee members was that when the AD14 is actually done, the evaluation is made for the office rather than the people in the office. And unfortunately-- well, I guess not unfortunately, but typically we look at the evaluation being about the person. But really it is about the office. And, I guess the questions that unfold with the AD14 are actually designed to get at information about the people in the office at various levels going down. So, I just wanted to share that.

John Nousek: Yes. I point out that the previous definition of what used to be AD14 and is now AC14 is not changed by this. It is only the addition of other information.

Chair Bérubé: Up here and then Annie.

Rajarajan Subramanian, Harrisburg: I have this question. I was under the impression some of the administrators are going on job contract year to year. Is it commensurating with the type of evaluations from year to year contract or you know?
John Nousek: I do not know the contract status of administrators.

Chair Bérubé: I think Kathy can answer that question.

John Nousek: Kathy could answer that.

Rajarajan Subramanian: Okay.

Provost Jones: Kathy?

Kathy Bieschke: Thanks, Nick. Administrators serve-- are in at-will positions. So, they serve at the pleasure of whoever is supervising them. So, typically, they're not hired on a contract basis. And if their administrator decides they don't want them to work for them anymore, then they don't have their jobs anymore.

Provost Jones: Good answer by Kathy. She can stick around for another year.

[LAUGHTER]

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

Chair Bérubé: Annie, and then Keith, and we should move on. The hard one comes next.

Ann Taylor, Earth and Mineral Sciences: Taylor, EMS. And I'm going to throw this back to Kathy, just ask you to clarify. I am an Assistant Dean, so I get reviewed this way. And I find it very helpful. So, I am not speaking against that. But to the question about whether it's the whole office, yeah, because I have filled them out multiple times in 25 years. And it did used to seem it was about the office, but I just did four for four administrators in my office, and they seem to be now much more focused on the individual.

Chair Bérubé: Keith, and then one more.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

Chair Bérubé: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see that. Thank you.

Kathy Bieschke: So, in my best experience of not having done an AC14 yet. So, let's all put that in perspective. But serving on an AC14 Committee. When we charge a committee, we're reviewing a dean, we're reviewing the dean and their office. But the dean is in charge of charging an AC14 for the people who report to them. So, when you do your dean-- probably this is what you remember-- you're not really evaluating their associate deans at the same time, except that they are part of who the dean supervises. So, it's important to say, is it working? How is the leadership team?

But the dean does have to charge another committee to review those individuals and their offices, who then have staff underneath them who aren't really the focus, but are part of that person's purview, so to speak. That's why it's a little bit confusing in terms of who this is. But every administrator who is identified in this way should be being reviewed. So, I know in the College of Education-- thank you,
David-- David regularly reviews his department heads and associate deans and assistant deans, consistent with this policy. But they're not being reviewed when he's being reviewed, so to speak.

Chair Bérubé: Question up here. Over here to your right.

Alok Sinha, Engineering: Yeah, I just wanted to inform that in Faculty Affairs Committee, we looked at all what our peer universities were doing. And this annual feedback from faculty is very much in line with other Big Ten universities are doing.


Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: Thank you. Egolf, Lehigh Valley. In my time at Penn State, I've seen AD14 done on the chancellor-before that called the CEO. But we've never had one on a DAA at our campus. It has always been the office. And the chancellor has never charged an AD14 Review Committee to separately review a DAA. And that's okay with me, but I am a little confused on your comment there. Is it not being done properly? Should there be AD14’s on DAA’s? Because I don't know about other campuses, but I've never seen one at Lehigh Valley at least. And I thought that was pretty much standard practice.

Chair Bérubé: Okay, I want to remind everyone, this is not a report about AC14’s in general. This is about annual reviews that are not part of that process. Matthew?

Roger Egolf: This is falling the same.

Chair Bérubé: Yes, but the answer to your question is, yes, absolutely DAA’s should be reviewed. Matthew. Matthew Woessner calls the question. Does it have to be seconded?

Unidentified Senator: Second.

Chair Bérubé: Are we ready to vote? Report is brought to the floor by committee, needs no second. Et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Beth Seymour, as Parliamentarian: [INAUDIBLE] called the question, so you have to--

Chair Bérubé: Oh, I'm sorry, yes. All in favor of calling the question?

Senators: Aye.

Chair Bérubé: All opposed. I can't imagine why I'm skipping steps today.

Unidentified Senator: It's a long day.

Chair Bérubé: Long year. MediaSite, Poll Everywhere. To accept the motion, press A. To reject it, press B.

Anna Butler: Poll Everywhere, I have 17 accept and three reject.

Paula Brown: In house, we have 93 accepts, ten rejects.
Chair Bérubé: Motion carries. Thanks so much.

Chair Bérubé: The next Advisory/Consultative Report is also from the Committee on Faculty Affairs, and this time also Intra-University Relations. Appears as Appendix J.

John Nousek: Well actually, this is the one that really is with IRC. Last one--

Chair Bérubé: Right. No, this was--

[LAUGHTER]

I only read what they tell me to say. Except where I go off script. No, I actually was under the impression that the AC14 [INAUDIBLE]. I'm sorry.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

Chair Bérubé: It is. Yeah, we only have the room till 4:00. That's not true. So yes, here is this report. And this is a tricky one. So, if there are questions, John and Rose will take them.

John Nousek: Well actually, I have a short presentation--

Chair Bérubé: Presentation first.

John Nousek: To introduce this. You may recall--

Chair Bérubé: Matrix

John Nousek: You may have seen me before on this very same topic, AC21. This dates back to a several year-long odyssey, which was started by, I believe, Michael and Nicholas, as they chaired the Faculty Affairs Committee. And as a result, we have made several modifications to AC21. There were major ones at the beginning, but this year there were three bits of clean up. And the Faculty Senate has approved two revisions.

This is the third and final revision for this year, which I hope can be projected. Okay. I'll talk and fill the time then. Yes. So the basic concept that was of some confusion was how the naming scheme, which started out with 87, I think, separate ranks at this University, was to be transformed so it could more readily be amenable to the reviews that were envisioned and the promotion opportunities that were envisioned in AC21 as it is now constituted. Could we go to the second slide, please?

So, the basic concept that I'm trying to do is, I'm a big believer in you don't know where you are unless you understood a bit about how you got there. And I'm going to try to describe in a couple simple steps how we went from 87 ranks into what is currently in the legislation that has been passed by this Senate over the past several years. But it is clear to me, at least, in some of the feedback and discussions that we had on this topic this year, not all senators are aware of the implications of what they have already voted for. So, this revision aims to make that perfectly clear.

So, as I said, we start with 87 ranks. And the initial concept was that that 87 ranks should be digested into a much more simplified-- initially it was three rows and three columns, a matrix-- puns about Neo and
Morpheus and stuff notwithstanding. So, the original concept was the tenure track. And there were three tiers within the tenure track, as everyone is well aware of, assistant professors, associate professors, full professors.

Then, for people that do not have the tenure track, there was a recognition that there were a set of positions that arose either from primarily teaching responsibilities or primarily for research responsibilities. And in order to clear away and simplify that, the titles were changed to a much more simplifying role. So, things like a senior scientist is now a research professor, and so on. So, I think that simple matrix, I believe, is well understood.

Now, since I produced this yesterday, I got a useful piece of feedback. It turns out there are people on standing positions that would be covered by the right two columns. And they are rare at this University, but they exist. And so, I used the term fixed term. A better term is non-tenure track. But with that small modification-- this is where we were at the beginning of the roll out of AC21. Can we go to the next slide?

Some useful feedback was received from units in this process, that those nine ranks did not suit all the cases. And, so, some of the modifications-- one of the AC21 modifications, which we have already passed, was to allow a set of specific title nomenclatures for some units. Specifically units like Business, Law, Nursing, and the Libraries. So, there are titles that are librarians. There are titles that are called clinical, and so on. And some definitions about what they mean are particular to those units. But there is still the concept of three tiers.

And then finally, there was a particular reluctance, or a choice by some units-- I think Liberal Arts was a leader in this-- which felt there are some tiers in which people do not need to hold the terminal degree. For example, in science the terminal degree would be a PhD. In other disciplines, it's not called a doctorate necessarily, but it's clear it's a terminal degree. But there are people who are holding professorial positions that do not hold such a degree.

There's a fifth column for-- sorry about the pun about fifth columns, but anyway-- a fifth column for these people. But the entry point on that is not an assistant professor. It is an instructor. And three promotions from that reaches the level of associate professor. They can be not just teaching professors.

There are also other choices. But the key is that it is the senior rank. It receives three promotions-- well sorry, two promotions, just like all the other ranks. And the question that has come about that requires clarification is, how do you create committees? How do you promote people? Because there's a requirement that you can only review people at your tier.

Chair Bérubé: Below your tier.

John Nousek: Or below, yes. So, in that regard, this means we have someone named an associate professor--

Chair Bérubé: Teaching professor.

John Nousek: Teaching professor, who could, according to the rules, participate in a review of a full professor promotion. Teaching professor promotion. Well, it depends on the specific rules of the unit. Right now- I don't believe--
Chair Bérubé: No, no, no, no. No fixed term faculty can review any tenure-track faculty.

John Nousek: Yeah, I'm sorry. Right. But it is clear that this is the way that the legislation was explained at all the stages that I heard from the beginning. But I'm not sure everyone listening to this understood that this was part of it. So, let's go now, if we could, to the legislation.

Chair Bérubé: Wait, wait. Before you leave, I want to make sure everyone's clear on this. That this means that the person up in the right-hand box, upper right-hand box, associate teaching professor without a terminal degree, would be empowered on a committee to review someone with a terminal degree looking to be promoted from associate to full teaching or research professor. That's really what's at issue.

Unidentified Senator: If you even allowed it.

John Nousek: If the unit allowed it, yes.

Chair Bérubé: If the unit allowed it, now we go to the legislation.

John Nousek: Yes. Okay. Okay, so could we go to the actual-- to try to clarify this. Because the words that we had before did not make this manifestly clear. And my understanding is that in some units, this was used in ways that almost made it impossible for committees to be assembled for promotion to the senior level. Because you sort of-- well, anyway, I think you can understand logic. So, all of these words relate basically to one sentence. But it's an example, if you will.

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. This is an attempt in words to say exactly the same thing that that matrix presented.

And at this point, I believe this is a valuable clarification. It is possible that the Senate will rise up, being unhappy that they didn't realize that this was their implication. But this is the implication, as I believe, that the people that drafted the legislation and presented it to you over the past several years of Senate have understood. So--

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

Chair Bérubé: With the proviso, though, that we're not running roughshod over units with a terminal degree would require you to have certain qualifications.

John Nousek: That's correct.

Chair Bérubé: That would empower you to serve on a review committee for someone with a terminal degree, and your failure to have a terminal degree would disqualify you. If you're in a unit like that, this does not disrupt the way you do business. It just clarifies, as John's saying, what we meant by creating these tiers, and then also by striking that compromise with different nomenclature for people that have terminal degrees.
**John Nousek:** My understanding is there do exist units-- especially in the Commonwealth Campuses--where it's difficult to find a sufficient number of qualified people to serve on promotion committees. So the business of thinning it down to a single column is not practical in those situations. And that's why it's important to be able to go across the columns. Rose, you did participate in this. Would you like to add anything?

**Rose Petrilla:** No, I think you-- I don't want to confuse the situation. No, I think that explained it, yes. I can help answer--

**Chair Bérubé:** Questions? Roger, then Ira.

**Roger Egolf:** I thought I understood this very well. But now I've just been confused. I thought the third level was the third level, and I didn't think units had the right to say, just because the title is not full teaching professor or full something-other professor, to say that they were less than a third ranked person.

I seem to remember very well that we did not want to distinguish between people with terminal degrees and people without terminal degrees when we created the three ranks, which had somewhat different titles depending on terminal degree or not. But they were still the three ranks. At what point did we say unit level guidelines permitted the discrimination against the non-terminal degree holders? I don't remember that.

**John Nousek:** Roger, I will answer. My colleagues may criticize me that I'm not answering accurately. But in my opinion, we never authorized this.

**Roger Egolf:** Then why does it say that?

**John Nousek:** Because it has-- well you're saying this is not a change.

**Roger Egolf:** It kind of codifies the misinterpretation of the legislation.

**John Nousek:** No, it's the other way around. It codifies, I think, the correct interpretation of the legislation.

**Roger Egolf:** That we allowed unit level decisions to freeze people without terminal degrees that were at third rank out of serving on committees where the requirement was third level?

**John Nousek:** Ah, I understand your point better now. I believe the operative word is that there is a 'may' in there. If you look at what is on the legislation, there is a 'may'. Michael was explaining this. I believe the intent of the Senate is exactly as you say, that the fact that you came into this process without a terminal degree. But if you have proven yourself by being successful in getting the two promotions under the standards, which are in theory the same across that, that you in fact should be accorded the right to sit on such committees. However, if a unit feels so strongly that that is a fundamental disqualifying situation, they have the prerogative of setting up their own system. However--

**Roger Egolf:** When did we authorize that?

**John Nousek:** Their system does require that there is a way to get promoted. I should say, it should not be used-- and in fact, that was the abuse that this is attempted to stop. That some people were using that
wording to say, ah, you have to have-- a position doesn't exist, a full professor in that thing, to get a promotion to the top tier. And that was being used to prevent people from getting promotions to that level. I don't know if anyone else-- would you want to add any clarification or comment on that?

**Rose Petrilla:** I'm not aware of what units-- do we have units that are doing this, or want to have that exclusion? Are we aware of any?

**Chair Bérubé:** I hope by units we're not talking-- no one's hearing campuses. At some campuses, fixed term faculty without terminal degree could not serve, and on other ones, they could. That would make no sense at all. It only makes sense in disciplines where--

**Rose Petrilla:** They're disciplines.

**Chair Bérubé:** You're evaluating people where your terminal degree is relevant. But I agree. I mean, the clear spirit of what we passed was, you got promoted to the third tier. You went through two promotions. You're qualified to review people looking for their second promotion.

**Roger Egolf:** Yeah. So why do we have this in here, when no legislation has ever been passed that talked about unit guidelines permitting or non-permitting?

**Chair Bérubé:** Okay, hold on. Ira and then Mohamad.

**Ira Saltz, Shenango:** Okay. I guess I kind of have the opposite end here from Roger. I mean, first of all, I guess-- I know my memory's going, but I could've sworn that the plan we passed had three different titles for faculty with non-terminal degrees than-- so I don't know. But we have already quite categorically said that under no circumstances can a tenure-line faculty member review a fixed-term faculty member, and vice versa. But now we're going to say that somebody who doesn't have a terminal degree could review somebody with a terminal degree because they've proven themselves? Well, then why can't we make the argument that somebody who was on a fixed-term contract who has been promoted twice has proven themselves to now be able to judge a promotion for somebody on the tenure line? I think we're going down a slippery slope.

**Chair Bérubé:** It's a completely different situation, that's why.

**Ira Saltz:** But it's not. It's not different. I mean, I guess to you it's not different.

**Chair Bérubé:** Mohamad. And then--

**Mohamad Ansari, Berks:** Thank you, Michael. John, thank you. Rose, thank you. You've done a great job. You make an excellent argument. And I think I brought this when I was the Chair. I don't remember. We said that the units have to decide. So, with all due respect to both committees-- which I have tremendous amount of respect for both of you and your members of your committee-- I would like to make a motion to strike out that phrase, 'where unit level guidelines permit'. That's my motion, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

**Chair Bérubé:** Second for that motion?

**Roger Egolf:** I second it.
Chair Bérubé: Are you speaking to the motion, or speaking to-- discussion of the motion? This is a motion to strike, ‘where unit level guidelines permit’. I will note, also, it still leaves the word ‘may’ in this. Carey.

Caroline Eckhardt: The situation clearly is very complex. I think I'd like to argue for leaving that phrase in there, partly because I don't know all the individual circumstances, partly because we've been assuming, it seems in our conversation, that the colleagues we're talking about have “proven themselves” by earning the two promotions. There's also the possibility that people are newly appointed from elsewhere.

And I think if you look around, that there certainly are circumstances of that sort. Sometimes it relates to a spouse or partner accommodations. Somebody might be brought in at the level of blank professor blank, and they would not yet have proven themselves within the Penn State situation at all. That might not be a frequent occurrence, but I think leaving some flexibility up to the units and trusting the units to say, we have plenty of people. We don't anticipate needing to do that. Or the opposite, we do not have large enough groups of colleagues in these categories. We are definitely going to need to be able to do that. I don't see any harm in leaving some flexibility for unit level guidelines to come into play in that situation, or in any other situation where local groups have to construct those promotion committees on the basis of the people available to them.

Chair Bérubé: Victor.

Victor Brunsden, Altoona: I'm afraid, Carey, I have to disagree with you. I think that leaving that phrase in and permitting that degree of flexibility at the unit level is what got us into this problem in the first place. So, I really do think we need to make this mandatory. Yes, I agree there are some issues. But how to handle those issues, I prefer it go up to Old Main rather than remain at the unit.

Chair Bérubé: Are there any other comments? Keith.

Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture: I agree with this amendment, this change. We the units-- well, at least the faculty of the units-- already are kind of in control of this, because they're voting for people to be on these committees. Right? So, we do sort of leave it up the units through the vote.

Chair Bérubé: Any further discussion of the motion to strike those words? Are we ready to vote? Should we do this-- yeah, with clickers. This is going to be an interesting one.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

Chair Bérubé: So obviously the chair can't make a motion himself.

John Nousek: You lost him. Mohamad, we can't trust you with anything.

Unidentified Senator: John, [INAUDIBLE].

John Nousek: Yes, all those that are lost will be found.

Chair Bérubé: How do we get that on the floor? Give it to John? John, I have a suggestion. In response to Carey's remark, [INAUDIBLE] further [INAUDIBLE] add the word ‘ordinarily’ after ‘may’-
‘ordinarily serve on committees, except in extraordinary circumstances’ where they just got here or something like that.

**John Nousek**: How should this come up?

**Chair Bérubé**: What's that?

**John Nousek**: How do you want me to bring this up?

**Chair Bérubé**: After we take this vote. Okay, we may have a not lopsided vote for the first time I think in---

**Mohamad Ansari**: I haven't voted yet.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

**John Nousek**: Now you should vote, Mohamad.

**Chair Bérubé**: Yes, please. You still have 30 seconds.

**Caroline Eckhardt**: You're voting on the motion--

**Chair Bérubé**: We're voting on the motion as to whether to strike those five words.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

**Chair Bérubé**: A is to strike them. B is to not strike them. Should we do this again?

**John Nousek**: Yeah, I think we should start it again.

**Chair Bérubé**: Okay. The motion is to strike the words. Therefore, pressing A is a vote for the motion. I know I should have been crystal clear about that.

**Unidentified Senator**: Sorry, I'm confused. What's A, and what's B?

**Chair Bérubé**: A is the first letter of the alphabet. No, ‘A’ is to strike those words, ‘B’ keeps them in.

**Mohamad Ansari**: We are voting on the amendment.

**Chair Bérubé**: This is the amendment. It is the amendment. Poll Everywhere? Not that it matters to the outcome, but I just want to get the numbers.

**Anna Butler**: I had to create this poll manually. So, could you give them just a couple minutes?

**Chair Bérubé**: Sure. Right now we're at, what, 59 to 32. With one person pressing C, which means, I think, I am really tired of this.

[LAUGHTER]
No, in all seriousness, this is a crucial question about how these review committees are going to work. And I'm not at all surprised there's a difference of opinion about it.

**Unidentified Senator**: No idea. No idea.

**[INTERPOSING VOICES]**

**Anna Butler**: Okay. On Poll Everywhere, I have five accept and six reject.

**Chair Bérubé**: Interesting. So, the motion passes. Those words have been struck. The amendment passes. So now we're looking at a report that says-- where the change would be this implies, for example, that faculty who do not have a terminal degree who have been promoted to associate, et cetera, professor, highest rank available to them, may serve on committees to consider promotion to professor for candidates who do have a terminal degree. Yeah.

**John Nousek**: There was a previous question.

**Chair Bérubé**: Oh, I'm sorry, yes. Please.

**Gary Thomas, College of Medicine**: Could you go back just to the slide of the AC21, this slide before this, just one?

**Chair Bérubé**: It's a different thing.

**Gary Thomas**: Yeah, that one right there. You know, the only thing I know when I look at this is that the clinical professor option is available to the Business, Law, Nursing, and Libraries, but not physician or physician assistant. And--

**John Nousek**: That is my error.

**Gary Thomas**: Our most respected physicians, physician's assistants--

**John Nousek**: This is an error on my part. This is not the legislation. This was a visual aid to do this. So, there are-- the enumerated list is in the legislation that we passed at the last Senate meeting.

**Gary Thomas**: Okay, so this isn't correct.

**John Nousek**: This is not correct.

**Chair Bérubé**: Right. This is not a vote about the naming of anything. This is a vote about whether people in the third tier without terminal degrees can review people in the second tier with terminal degrees. That's really it.

**Gary Thomas**: Okay. I just want to clarify that.

**Chair Bérubé**: Sure.

**John Nousek**: Yeah. Any of the places that have clinical ranks would be covered by this.
Brian Saunders, College of Medicine: Just to address Gary's point, the AC21 specifically has an exclusionary clause about the College of Medicine. Non-tenure track, fixed-term track, falls in the leftmost column there. We do not use the clinical term except for adjunct faculty. So, it will not change our titles.

Chair Bérubé: Nothing about this changes any titles- about anything.

Ann Taylor: This doesn't change titles.

Chair Bérubé: I hope that's clear. This is not a proposal about titles. Yeah. In front of the--

Deirdre Folkers: Folkers from York, and I should probably have brought this up earlier, but I was practicing deep breathing techniques.

[LAUGHTER]

So, two comments, one specific and one a little more general. I currently serve on the University College Promotion Committee. And I know that we are trying to work away from the term fixed term.

I find that much like-- and this is where I'll show my age-- if you can remember doing freshman counseling in the summer, where we used to distinguish student success potential by science and non-science. And I felt pretty much the same way then as I do about-- we do have a term we've been trying to use, which is teaching line. And I think that frankly is a perhaps more appropriate term than fixed term or non-tenure track.

John Nousek: Yes, but once again, there are many people who are not on the teaching line.

Deirdre Folkers: True. But it would be nice to come up with a term that is smart rather than identifying what one isn't. But at the same time, the primary point is simply that the standards by which one is judged for each of the two promotion levels are the same. There is not a separate path for those who do not have a terminal degree and those with the terminal degree.

You are meeting the same standards in order to be promoted. You are being assessed on the same things in order to be promoted. So regardless of one's degree, in order to have reached the third rank, they must have met the same standards. National presence, the university-level service, et cetera. So, there is no functional distinction between someone with a terminal degree or without a terminal degree in the assessment to promotion to level of third rank. They are the same.

Chair Bérubé: Yes.

Robert Zambanini, Berks: I'm Bob Zambanini from Berks, and I just want to mention that as a person who is directly affected by this, this has caused a lot of confusion, particularly at Berks. For example, I'm a person in the second column, second block, who's trying to go up to the top block, but there's no one at my campus to review me. So, there was a vacuum that our campus seemed to act indecisively on how to handle that. The end result being that people who don't even know me from Adam ended up reviewing me.
The second thing that happened was that I'm in the second column, second item, but I was reviewing people in the fifth column going up to the top. I don't know if that's right or not, but I was and I did. And now if I'm not successful, they may in turn be reviewing me next year, which just doesn't--

John Nousek: Can I answer that?

Chair Bérubé: Please.

John Nousek: Roger--

Robert Zambanini: I want that on the record.

John Nousek: Yeah, yeah. Roger actually asked is anybody affected. Steve Snyder, who is one of your colleagues at Berks is the person who raised this. He's saying that there were problems, which you have kindly submitted. So that is why we are at this place discussing this, to remove that ambiguity.

Chair Bérubé: Can I just add to this? None of this involves malice or misunderstanding or anything. The real problem is creating a third tier that never existed before, and then populating it with people who can do the reviewing in that tier, and what their rights and responsibilities are if they don't have a terminal degree. This is going to take a while.

And I'm sorry to hear that the procedure for a place like Berks, if you don't have people in the third tier, is to create work-arounds until you do. Including from the tenure line faculty. Because remember, until we did this, there were no non-tenure line faculty at a third tier. It didn't exist. So, it was worse than building the ship as you're sailing it. It was like building the spaceship while you're trying to breathe. All right? There just was nothing there at all.

Unidentified Senator: [INAUDIBLE]

Ira Saltz: We've been heard, and I think Madlyn Hanes said this, that there should never be a tenured person reviewing a non-tenure line faculty member, even when there is a lack of--

Rose Petrilla: That has not happened.

Chair Bérubé: No, that's not true. Except to populate that third tier, and only as a temporary measure.

Roger Egolf: Let's call the question.

Chair Bérubé: There's a motion to call the question.

Unidentified Senator: Second.

Chair Bérubé: All in favor of calling the question.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Bérubé: All opposed? So now what we are voting on-- can we get the legislation back up? This implies faculty who do not have a terminal degree, but if promoted to associate, highest rank available to
them, can they serve on committees to consider promotion to professor candidates who do have a terminal degree. That is what we're voting on. Bonj. Sorry, no, I need a mic and so do you.

**John Nousek**: Right behind you.

**Bonj Szczygiel**: Sorry. I'm talking to you without a mic. I was just saying everyone's talking to the screen, so we can't all hear you back here. So, if you could just clarify where we are right now. That's all.

**Chair Bérubé**: We are voting on the language you see here with these stricken words struck.

[LAUGHTER]

Leave it right there. Don't make it move. And again, I stress, there's a word in there, ‘may’. They may serve on committees. If there are extraordinary circumstances, there are extraordinary circumstances. Are we ready to vote?

**Senators**: Yes.

**John Nousek**: It was called to question.

**Chair Bérubé**: I know, but they called the question, and it was seconded, and it was ‘yay-ed’ Therefore, we're never going to get to vote. So, an ‘A’ vote means you're voting for this, this addition to AC21, that clarifies who may review people up for promotion to the third rank. But ‘B’ means no.

**Anna Butler**: On Poll Everywhere, I have 10 accept and seven reject.

**Paula Brown**: In house, 74 accept, 19 reject.

**Chair Bérubé**: This motion passes. Thank you, John and Rose. I appreciate all your hard work.

[APPLAUSE]

And you can see there is no mystery why this took all year to try to get this one right.

**Chair Bérubé**: The next Advisory/Consultative Report on the agenda is from the Senate Committee on Libraries Information Systems and Technology. It appears as Appendix K. It is titled “Open Access Policy Recommendation”. Chair Roger Egolf will present the report and respond to questions. Roger.

**Roger Egolf**: Thank you. I just want to preface this by thank you from those of you that sent questions to me to clarify, and I hope we were able to clarify and get answers back to you. Just to let everyone know, when the Open Access Policy was first being discussed, our committee spent quite a bit of time-- I think three separate meetings-- discussing even before we got to the Forensic. And at first, I was a little hesitant on this. But we worked through things, and we got some very good assurances.

One thing I had worried about was effect on tenure track faculty. But there is the waiver. So, tenure track faculty that are concerned about Open Access and the effect on their tenure process can get a waiver. They can continue to publish in traditional journals. And eventually, I'm hoping the University will work
through some things on wording that clarifies things more completely. But until that happens, we've got a good policy- what's being suggested.

This is going to help socialize the faculty into using Open Access more without endangering anyone and making people who are not comfortable quite yet with Open Access to need to switch right away. But hopefully senior faculty will lead the way, implement Open Access. This will alleviate concerns by lower ranked faculty about the applicability of using these sorts of journals. And I think we're on our way to a really great policy here. So, I hope you can support this. I'm going to turn over taking questions to Karen Estlund from the Libraries and Greg Madden from IT, who was on the Open Access Committee, to answer any more questions.

Karen Estlund, Associate Dean for Technology and Digital Services: Thank you, Roger. And I'm just briefly going to go over some answers for questions that we have received from Senators and faculty so far. And since Greg and I have now been to one third of the Senate meetings, I think we're well on our way to becoming Senate regulars. So, thank you for being very warm and welcoming.

So, under the proposed Open Access Policy, Penn State researchers would grant the University a non-exclusive license to their articles for inclusion in an institutional Open Access Repository. Waivers would be available and made automatic as requested. This style of policy is sometimes called a Harvard Policy, but don't hold it against us. It is fairly common among US institutions. There are about 78 higher education institutions right now who have this policy in place.

Features of the policy include the policy ensures that researchers will continue to be free to submit their work to 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 the repository. Because the policy does not require submission to an Open Access Journal, it does not require researchers paying any money. The policy does not transfer copyright ownership of your scholarly works to the University. It does not affect IPO1.

The policy's waiver option guarantees that researchers are free to decide for or against Open Access for each of their publications. And finally, the policy increases the availability of Penn State Research. And I want to thank all the faculty who reached out to me to affirm that this policy was an important step in affirming that Penn State scholarship is not solely for Penn State or for a closed group of scholars in a very particular sub discipline, but that Penn State scholarship is about impact for the world. Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

Questions?

Chair Bérubé: Questions?

Jonathan Mathews, Earth and Mineral Sciences: Thank you very much. I did enjoy this document. I am however strongly opposed to the process requiring permission, a waiver, to go into locations for every single article I do. I'd like to do it once, and then continue to move on that policy. I'm vehemently against a continuation of putting things in the way that are unnecessary.
Karen Estlund: I think that one thing that I would add about this is that the compliance part of this is not an enforced mechanism in this policy itself. So, we're trying to make it that your waiver is automatic. You do not have to request a waiver. You submitting to that journal is an automatic waiver.

Jonathan Mathews: That's wonderful then, and you have my full support. Jonathan Matthews, Penn State, EMS.

Chair Bérubé: In the back?

Sue Rutherford Siegel, Alternate Senator, Health and Human Development: Hi, Sue Rutherford Siegel from BBH, research professor. I'm just curious, how is-- I have a lot of research that could be published in the Nature Journal, which is not Open Access. But if I get-- do I get any contributions if I do publish in an Open Access Journal?

Karen Estlund: One of the things that we are working on with the Libraries and with the Open Access Task Force in general is how to show impact of your work in a way that makes it powerful beyond the name of the journal. So no, there isn't a yes, you get a bonus for this for doing Open Access, because all tenure policies we want to leave up to those individual units. However, what we're trying to do is help with the education and how you might argue that your work has a bigger impact by being in an Open Access Journal.

Sue Rutherford Siegel: And there are contributions from Penn State? Because Open Access, publishing in those journals are more expensive.

Karen Estlund: It depends on the journal, of course, and the model. This policy does not address costs because it is a policy. What we are hopeful is that it will be the start of the conversation so that we can create sustainable mechanisms for Penn State faculty to publish in open access venues.

Chair Bérubé: Any other questions?

Jacob Moore: Just like to voice my support for this.

Chair Bérubé: Name and unit.

Jacob Moore, Mont Alto: Sorry? Oh, Jacob Moore, Penn State Mont Alto. I'd like to voice my support for this, but the academic publishing system as it currently stands, we are giving lots and lots of money already as Penn State through the Libraries to these publishers. It's not going to the authors. It's not going to the editors. It's not going to the reviewers. It's going to the publishers, who are simply gatekeepers in this whole system.

The gatekeepers are charging more and more money for access to this information. And short of crashing down the gates, what we should really be concentrating on doing is stop giving the gatekeepers more and more information that they can wall off behind these gates. We have exceptions for this that's in the policy, but we really need to make the default to not give it over to the gatekeepers over and over again. Thank you.

Karen Estlund: Thank you.
Chair Bérubé: Any other comments or questions? Are we ready to vote? The report is brought to the floor by committee, needs no second. MediaSite, Poll Everywhere. This one's easy, right? To accept the policy recommendations, press A. To reject, press B.

Anna Butler: Poll Everywhere, I have ten accept.

Paula Brown: In house, 83 accept, ten reject.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you so much. The motion carries. And thank you all for your work on a really smart policy. It's only the future of scholarly communication, folks.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Bérubé: Next report is from the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity and Graduate Council Committee on Graduate Research. It appears as Appendix L, “Barriers to Sustainability and Growth of Intercollege Graduate Degree Programs”. So, Siela Maximova and Janet Hughes will present the report and respond to questions.

Siela Maximova, Agricultural Sciences: Okay. I have prepared five slides. I'm going to try to go as fast as possible. This is a report prepared jointly by the Committee for Research and Creative Activities, the Senate Committee for Research and Creative Scholarship and Creative Activity, and the Graduate Council Committee on Graduate Research.

The reason this effort was taking place is because there was a report back in 2008 that has produced a report, almost 11 years ago, that evaluated the impact in some of the barriers for intercollege graduate degree programs, at that time, under the leadership of Eva Pell. And the report was generated as a result of the task force effort of 15 members.

And the task force, at that time, was charged with assessing interdisciplinary graduate education at Penn State, in particular contrasting intercollege versus departmental based programs and again identifying institutional burdens and possible solutions for the success of those programs. The task force came-- slide two, please. Do I have the clicker?

So, the task force came with multiple conclusions related to the importance, the funding, and the characteristics of interdisciplinary graduate education and published a report. And the report at that time pointed to substantial issues limiting the sustainability and the growth of Penn State IGDPs. But at the end of the day, the final number six conclusion stated that existing institutional structure of resources allocating to colleges departments is limiting the proliferation, scope, and impact of intercollege programs, and mandate the colleges to support and invest in such programs, as well as essential resources for incentives are needed. That was back in 2008.

Given the importance of the IGDP for interdisciplinary research education at Penn State, and the fact that with almost ten years elapsed since the graduate school task force report was released in December of 2017, the Senate Committee for Research partnered with the graduate school and the Graduate Council Committee for Research to survey the IGDP leaders to assess the current status of these important educational programs.
So, we have-- after reviewing the survey, we have multiple conclusions. And the main conclusions are that funding is a problem. And the IGDPs seek funding from varieties of sources, from extramural grants to internal grants, and so on. But the fact is that IGDPs do not receive instructional budgets, which results in not availability of teaching assistantships, which are an important source of funds to support PhD students.

In addition to that, there is-- IGDP students are sometimes viewed as a second-class students compared to students in departmentally based programs. And the third outcome was that the faculty who are participating in this program, by limited number, especially on the part of senior faculties.

So, in addition to our report, what I would like to share with you is something that was made available to us by Oregon State. The Oregon State had undertaken a massive effort in evaluating interdisciplinary graduate education across multiple institutions. The task force there evaluated 29 different schools, from which 11 [INAUDIBLE] universities. And what you can see here is that they have come up with very similar conclusions as we did.

But the bottom line is, the institutions with successful IGDPs reported major benefits to their research and training missions, including greatly increasing quality, ethnic diversity, and technical backgrounds of incoming students, improved training of students in both soft and technical skills for professional developmental classes and laboratory rotations. And reading this directly from the report, I think it's important.

And increased success with research and training, grant proposals, and increased institutional reputation. At UNC, participation of underrepresented minority students grew from 6 percent to 33 percent over the ten years after the introduction of the Umbrella Graduate Program for the Life in Biomedical Sciences.

And what I would like to point is that the two main factors of success that are highlighted in the report is the strong consistent financial support from the central administration of the University and the colleges, and also strong champion in the graduate school. With that said, our joint task force, our joint committees, we have made a conclusion that the following actions are needed.

We need to identify sustainable and appropriate funding for the IGDPs offering the PhD, and departmental and college practices that discriminate against IGDP students need to be ended. And we need to understand and address the reasons why funded senior faculty members have limited participation in the IGDP programs.

The recommendations that our joint committees are putting forward are to establish 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, and also to mitigate the perceived second-class status of these students.

And I have to say that at Penn State, we have 11 IGDPs. And some of those are ranked very highly. And I am very proud to be part of actually one of the highest ranked programs in the nation, the Plant Biology Program. So, with this, I'm just going to open the floor for questions. And I have a few other people that can help me out.
Chair Bérubé: Any questions? That was a pretty comprehensive presentation. The report is brought to the floor by committee, needs no second. Are we ready to vote? MediaSite, Poll Everywhere. To accept this report, press A. To reject, press B.

Anna Butler: Poll Everywhere, I have ten accept.

Paula Brown: In house, 76 accept, seven reject.

Chair Bérubé: Motion carries. Thank you, Siela.

Chair Bérubé: The next report is from the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity as well. “Proposed Revisions to Penn State Policy HR68, Post-Doctoral Appointments”. It is your Appendix M. Committee Chair, Janet Hughes, will present the report and respond to questions. Janet.

Janet Hughes, Libraries: Okay. So, this report originally was supposed to come up in October, but there were a lot of questions that came out when it was first published onto the agenda. And there were a lot of faculty who believed they didn't have an opportunity to give feedback. So, this came from the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs. They went back. They revised certain things, changed some wording, and then went out and got feedback. They presented to the Associate Deans for Research, who were then supposed to their faculty, tell them what's happening, and get the feedback. They got that feedback. They went off to all the HR departments of any places that had postdocs to get that feedback. And this is the revised policy. It is not a perfect policy, and they know it.

But what it does is it-- really, what it's meant to do is to answer the questions that they get asked all the time. How much leave does a postdoc get? How much vacation does a postdoc get? Does a postdoc have to work on a holiday? Da da da da da, and those sorts of things. So that is what it's supposed to do. It's articulating policies that have been in place. They simply were scattered. And that's what this is hoping to do.

Chair Bérubé: Paula, can you pull it up? I just want to do one PS. One of the questions we also get, a less pleasant question, is what do you do about postdocs behaving badly? I wanted to make it clear-- because it's one of the things we had to work out in the course of coming up with a faculty misconduct committee-- we also went back and revised AC76. That will come before you briefly. It's in the shop, because AC76, at present, is profoundly unclear as to who it covers. It will not cover postdocs. Postdocs will have their own--

Janet Hughes: Pages and pages down.

Chair Bérubé: Length of Appointment. [INAUDIBLE] keep going.

Janet Hughes: I believe it's just called ‘Terminations’.

Chair Bérubé: Well, there's also-- wait. Keep going. [INAUDIBLE] Go that way. Thanks. So, ‘Expectations of Performance’, that whole clause. If you're not familiar with it now, read it later. Because we're not reading it now. Keep going. Expectations of Performance, Terminations, and one more- Grievance Procedure. This will all be separate from Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. It will all be
separate from any other faculty [INAUDIBLE]. Postdocs will have their own procedures for-- and I think that's worth pointing out as well.

Janet Hughes: Okay. Are there any questions?

Chair Bérubé: Are we ready to vote? MediaSite, do your thing. Folks here, to accept this report, press A. To reject, press B.

Anna Butler: Poll everywhere, I have ten accept.

Paula Brown: In house, 81 accept, five reject.

Chair Bérubé: Motion carries. Thank you, Janet. And no blame about taking this amount of time to get to this. This was a tricky one. Thank you.

Chair Bérubé: The next report is a report from the Special Committee on Tenure and Equity, Appendix N. Committee Co-chairs, Cynthia Young and Delia Conti, will present the report and respond to questions.

Cynthia Young, College of the Liberal Arts: Good afternoon. I should also add that Clio Andris is here, who was our data person, one of our data people anyway, in case there are questions about that. So, we were charged with looking at the discrepancies, the gender discrepancies, in tenure and promotion rates. And so that's what we tried to do. We looked at 20 years’ worth of these reports. What we found, we couldn't fully-- what's the word-- we couldn't fully explain, because we didn't have enough data. So, the short version of what we found is that at years two and four, for reviews, the positive recommendations for both men and women were roughly the same. So, there were many, many positives. But there's a drop off between year four and year six, and fewer women end up going up for tenure and promotion. But as I said, we can't say why that is, because we don't have the data to tell us.

The other thing that might be of note is that more men than women go up for early tenure and promotion. There's a big disparity there. Did I get everything [INAUDIBLE]? Okay. All right. So, we actually have some recommendations. But the first recommendation is that we cannot actually know what the tenure inequities look like unless we actually have the data in order to find that out. So, we're an outlier here. The University is an outlier. Other Big Ten universities do actually have this data, and we don't. So that's one of the big issues, is that the Office of Planning and Assessment could not actually give us the data that we need.

So, what data do we need? We need to have tenure and promotion rate data that's actually parsed out by demographic slices. So, we need to know whether or not there are disparities based on race, based on gender identification, based on sexuality. We can't do that now. We need to know who's leaving before tenure and promotion. Same thing.

So, we need to know it by demographic slices. We need to know whether people who-- broken down by second year review, fourth year review. So, basically, all the way along through the whole process, we need to actually have the information parsed by demographic slices. And that includes separating out international Asian scholars from Asian-American, Latinx from Latin American, et cetera.
The other thing that we need in terms of the kind of data asks are that we need to find out who's being counseled out. In other words, we think that there are people who, after the fourth-year review, are basically told, “You should look for another position.” But again, we can't tell you if there's any kind of disproportionate impact on particular groups.

The other thing is, people who are granted tenure and promotion and still leave. So, basically, it's a larger issue of climate and trying to find out what the climate looks like. So, our biggest recommendation is that we actually have access to this information so we could actually look at it and find out. We suspect if Penn State is like every other institution in the country, that we're going to find lots of things that explain why tenure and promotion rates look different based on demographic slices.

And, so, we looked at the kind of national picture to come up with some recommendations. Because that was the other piece of what we were supposed to do. And so those recommendations include reviewing service requirements across colleges and campuses to see how they can be equalized across various categories, so that there are not gender and race imbalances. Because the national studies tell us that that typically happens, that women and people of color have a larger service burden.

Secondly, reviewing teaching requirements so that teaching loads are not disproportionately-- and advising loads are not disproportionately distributed. Looking at family-- faculty leave policies. Oh, yeah. Thank you. Looking at family leave policies to see whether or not different kinds of issues are at play there. A method of accessing and tracking department, college, and campus efforts to create a welcoming environment. So, what's the environment like, and what are the efforts to make it? And then a menu of mentoring options, because we know that mentoring is one of the most critical things that often women and people of color don't have the same access to as white men. So those are our recommendations, and I'm happy to take questions.

Chair Bérubé: Or comments. Over here, and then---.

Brian King, Earth and Mineral Sciences: A comment. Just-- Brian King, College Earth and Mineral Sciences. We caucused yesterday. And speaking for all of us, we're very impressed with this report. The level of detail-- I'm not surprised it was a geographer, Clio, my colleague, responsible for that. But this is very, very-- if folks in the room haven't read this closely, do please read this one. And I want to applaud you very much. Thank you for your hard-- you clearly put a lot of time into this. Thank you very much.

Clio Andris: Thanks. Appreciate that.

Chair Bérubé: Here.

Julie Gallagher, Brandywine: I'm Julie Gallagher, Penn State Brandywine. I also really want to say thank you so much for this report. I guess I just have one comment. It's hard for me to get my head around the fact that Penn State has not collected this data before this point in time. This is really essential information that-- I guess I'll just leave it at that. And so I'm very grateful, but we are way behind on this. And the cost of faculty lives over decades has been significant. So, we have a lot of catch up to do. So, thank you.

Cynthia Young: I just want to add to that that Kimberly Blockett, who's on our committee, attempted to get this data several years ago and was told exactly the same thing. We don't have the data, and we can't
parse it out for you. So, this is not-- I mean, we've asked before, other people have asked before, and we still don't have it.

Renata Engel, Vice Provost for Online Education: Hi, Engel, World Campus. My question related to that is, is the data something we don't collect? Or is it just not organized in a way that you can pull it? Because I think there are two different solutions based on what that issue is. And I'm just curious if you know.

Cynthia Young: So, my impression is that some data we actually don't collect. Especially around sexual orientation. I don't think we do gender identification. I mean, we do it as binary categories. So that's part of it. But then some of it is that there is-- what were we told? There is no easy mechanism to actually parse out those things. So, we do collect it, but--

Chair Bérubé: Yes.

Laurie Hancock, Guest: Hi, I'm Laurie Hancock from the Office of Planning and Assessment. And we do acknowledge that there are some significant gaps in our data longitudinally over time that we are working with our HR partners and IT and Senate to work on resolving. What Cynthia said is absolutely correct. it's a combination of factors, Renata. It involves some of the data we have difficulty stitching together from our pre-Workday world to our post-Workday world.

Some of the issue involves business processes surrounding tenure review and decisions that don't track at the various levels of review. So, we don't have certain data that we can reliably use at this point. So that's a significant gap. And then other data we hope that we can put together to answer these questions more readily in the future.

Chair Bérubé: Any other questions or comments? Are we ready to vote? MediaSite, Poll Everywhere. Everyone here, clickers. To accept this report, press A. To reject it, press B.

Anna Butler: Poll Everywhere, I have 11 accept.

Paula Brown: In house, 74 accept, five reject.

Chair Bérubé: Motion carries. Thank you so much, Delia and Cynthia.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Bérubé: I have two editorial remarks on this report. First of all, to underscore how important it is and how valuable it is for all of you to read, and how impeccably well researched it is. First of all, I feel to issue a kind of structural apology, given what the report turned up about gender disparities in service, for having two of my most awesome female colleagues devote two years of their work to this. So there.

And the other thing, the one issue about faculty leave policies, I want to throw this gauntlet down for next year. We did four years ago revise our policies on stoppages of the tenure clock. The person primarily responsible for that was then Vice Chair of Faculty Affairs Esther Prins, and it was very much a gender equity issue. What we need to know now is-- and that tenure clock can be stopped for any family reasons, just as this report recommends. Doesn't have to be childbirth. It can be adoption. It can be eldercare. It can be whatever.
But we want to make sure that people who do request that second stoppage-- first of all, are people doing it? Is this widely known? B, or two, are they stigmatized if they do? Are they set at a discount because they have two stoppages? So, this is a thing, well, we got this done so many years ago, but we've never really followed up on its implementation. Now would be the time under the heading of this question.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Chair Bérubé: Okay. Informational reports. On April 9, Senate Council members voted to place the following eight Informational Reports. Do we have a list of these? I'll just read them. These Informational Reports are on the Senate agenda, and they are online at the website, as with our other reports. I encourage you to read them, disseminate them to the faculty of your academic units. There is one from ARSSA, “Annual Report on the High School Students Enrolled Non-degree in Credit Courses”, Appendix O. From Curricular Affairs, “One Semester Experimental Course Offerings Procedures”, Appendix P. That one's got little gnarly things in it. Check it out. These are standard X97 courses. But apparently, they're supposed to have a three-year window on them, and we've not been observing that, and there's some other questions about that report, about those procedures.

From the Elections Commission, there's a “Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2019-2020”. That's Appendix Q. From Libraries Information Science Systems and Technology, “IT Fee Usage”. That's Appendix R. From Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, there's the “Graduate School Exit Survey Report”, Appendix S. One comment on that; most people who took that exit survey are happy. But that's because they completed their degrees. So we're going to look forward to a report that the Graduate School is in process of tracking people mid-graduate career to see what was going wrong for people who had things going wrong, and how we can better not only assess, but treat students who are having difficulty midstream.

Appendix U, the Student Life Committee, the “Penn State Student Drinking Data, Interventions and Impact…” I did get a question about this before this meeting. That report I hope will be more newsworthy next year. It goes up through 2017-18. And if you look at it, you'll find student drinking holds pretty steady, with only minor blips over the last seven years. What we really want to know is what the initial data we heard last year about a decrease in alcohol related incidents last fall, the first semester we decoupled rush from the football season, delayed rush until the spring.

Appendix V, reports from University Planning on “One Penn State 2025”. Obviously, we'll be coming back to that over the next six years. And Appendix W, the “Report of Senate Elections”. These reports will not be discussed at today's meeting. If you have questions or comments about them, you can email senate@psu.edu. And your questions will be forwarded to the appropriate committee chair for response.

UNIVERSITY FACULTY OMBUDSPERSON REPORT

Chair Bérubé: The remaining Informational Report on the Senate agenda-- one-- will be discussed today. It is the Report from Senate Council on the University Faculty Ombudsperson Report, Appendix T. Mohamad Ansari, University Ombudsperson, will give this report. Ten minutes has been allocated for presentation and discussion. Mohamad, take it away.

Mohamad Ansari, Berks: Thank you, Chair Bérubé. And good afternoon. Thank you all very much for staying. This is wonderful. It's a long day, but I'm very pleased to be here. I'm presenting this report on
behalf of our colleagues in the roles of ombudspersons and alternate ombudspersons. They provide a valuable service to our faculty- 6,400 across the University.

This report is based on a questionnaire that was sent on May 1 to all the ombudspersons and the alternates across the University. And there were ten survey questions. And Paula, of course, Senate Office, under the leadership of Executive Director, Dawn Blasko, has been extremely supportive of my role. And Paula and everybody else in that office collected about 93 percent in response rate, which I think it's a record, isn't it, for this year? Because they kept after the ombudspersons, saying, “Where is your report?”

And, so, we have a comprehensive report, based on that. And I hope that you had a chance to read the report and if you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer. Thank you.

Chair Bérubé: Thank you.

Mohamad Ansari: And if you don't, I don't get hurt. I guess we don't have any questions.

Chair Bérubé: You must be doing a really good job.

Mohamad Ansari: Yeah, well, or they are very tired.

[APPLAUSE]

Thank you so much. Thank you.

**REPORT OF SENATE ELECTIONS**

Chair Bérubé: Okay, next I draw your attention. Do we have the report of Senate Elections in Appendix W? Can we put that up?

Oh, let's see. Oh, just scroll down. This is like the credits at the end of the movie. And not the funny ones. I want to say thank you to everyone who stood for election this year, and congratulations to the folks who won. And now we could do ‘Comments by the Outgoing Chair’. This is-- let's see. Now you can see the last two new officers, Judy Ozment and Elizabeth Seymour.

**COMMENTS BY OUTGOING CHAIR BÉRUBÉ**

Chair Bérubé: Yeah, well, we're not yet at 5 o'clock. They say this job ages you. We have a picture from last year this time. Because I didn't really buy it. It did. Timing is everything. That's-- yeah.

[LAUGHTER]

You know what I'm saying? So, I want to keep this part as brief as I can, because I want also to ensure a smooth transition of power.

It is customary for the outgoing Senate Chair to offer the incoming Senate Chair a gift of some kind. Now, I learned over the course of this year-- we did much traveling, of course, to the campuses-- I learned to my shock that Nicholas drives an Audi. Now, those of you who are wise in the ways of
highway science know, you do not mess with Audi drivers. So, I hope everyone's on notice. I had this little item embroidered with a 54. He will be the 54th Senate Chair.

[LAUGHTER]

And a little “NR” on the back. And without even telling you what it stands for, it just looks badass. Nicholas, congratulations.

[APPLAUSE]

And it fits.

SEATING OF THE NEW OFFICERS

Chair Bérubé: Now we turn to the ‘Seating of the New Officers’. Beth Seymour, you may take Nicholas's seat; Nicholas will come stand by me; Judy Ozment, you come join us and take Annie's seat. Annie is cast into the outer darkness.

[LAUGHTER]

Please join me in congratulating Beth and Judy.

[APPLAUSE]

And now, the sacred ritual. There's a sword. There's a stone. No, Nicholas, I am pleased to present you with your gavel. Please join me in welcoming our new Senate Chair, Nicholas Rowland.

[APPLAUSE]

Oh. You have the gavel. You want the mic also?

Chair Rowland: I also got you something. It turns out it looks terrific with your outfit.

[LAUGHTER]

[APPLAUSE]

A comically large bottle for your-- oh here, that'll be good-- for a terrific year. Thank you so much. There's so much to celebrate.

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Rowland: First things first, is there any ‘New Legislative Business?’ Seeing none, gladly.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Rowland: Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the University?
Mohamad Ansari: I do.

Chair Rowland: Yes please.

Mohamad Ansari: Do I need a microphone?

Chair Rowland: Yes.

Mohamad Ansari: You know no one gets to thank these guys, that they do such a wonderful job. I want to take the time. Thank you, Michael. You did a great job. Your leadership was fantastic. And there was impact on what you did. Not only this year, as Chair of the Senate, but also when you chaired Faculty Affairs. And I am most grateful. I would like to congratulate Beth and Judy on their new roles, and I would like to wish you lots of luck next year. You don't know what you're signed up for. Thank you.

[LAUGHTER]

[APPLAUSE]

COMMENTS BY INCOMING CHAIR ROWLAND

Chair Rowland: So, I just have a few brief remarks. And thank you all so much for staying. As you know, my name is Nicholas Rowland, and I have a brief speech that I've named One Penn State, One University Faculty Senate. One Penn State 2025 represents a fluid, personalized, and collaborative environment that enables students, alumni, faculty, and staff to achieve their goals. And to achieve those goals, I quote, "regardless of their location." The overall aim is to be more integrated, flexible, and responsive as an institution, to be more diverse and inclusive, to serve people's needs where they are, and to provide access to curricula and process across all Penn State campuses.

The plan next year is to orient the work of the Senate around One Penn State 2025. And this means orienting the agendas of the Senate's 15 standing committees to serve the One Penn State vision. We will do this and serve the University, our students, alumni, staff, and faculty, and we shall do this with resolve and without reservation. So, I guess Nick Jones was right. We will all participate in One Penn State. Though he's not here.

However, before we do, there are a few caveats. One Penn State 2025 has five guiding principles. And while each principle implicates significant potential faculty contributions, and in some cases sacrifices, two of the principles directly implicate the Senate. And it is to these two that we now direct our attention.

The two principals to which I refer are-- and I quote-- "Principle Two, Achieve Curricular Coherence; and Principle Three, Design Relevant and Responsive Programs." After consultation with senior administration, we've received much needed clarity on these two guiding principles. First, the effort to achieve curricular coherence is not based on the foundational thought that our current curriculum is in some way deficient, that our efforts in the Senate to create, maintain, and improve our curriculum have been for naught, or that our curriculum is currently so incoherent that it needs to be centrally featured as a major agenda item in a vast multi-year vision for the University's future well-being.

This is not what achieve curricular coherence means. However, one would be remiss not to sympathize with faculty members concerned about this possible interpretation. It only means that like all things at the
University, our faculty driven curriculum can be improved by sustained, selective, appropriate transformation. And this will ensure the future betterment of the University as a whole.

In support of this line of thinking, President Barron is routinely quoted defending and praising Penn State's curriculum, indicating that it is nearly miraculous that we at Penn State, with one University so geographically distributed, can start students in one location and graduate them in another successfully, and in the process create successful students.

So, as we in the Senate approach the One Penn State 2025 Guiding Principle to Achieve Curricular Coherence, we will not operate under the foundational assumption that our curriculum is deficient or incoherent, and instead endeavor to continue the long tradition wherein we are the proud authors of our faculty driven curriculum. And we'll see if along the way we can enhance curriculum coherence at least a little.

Second, the second point may not be so belabored as the first, but suffice it to say, we will also not approach the Guiding Principle- Design Relevant and Responsive Programs from the foundational assumption that we currently design irrelevant programs--

[LAUGHTER]

--and that when we are not busy doing, that we focus our attention on designing unresponsive ones. None of Penn State 2025 comes from a position of deep dissatisfaction with the work of the Senate or faculty and staff around the Commonwealth. The all too familiar phrase, more and better, captures the core intent, that our work is good, maybe even excellent, but we can do more, and we can do it better, and we will.

Shifting gears. The One Penn State vision reflects another essential truth about the University. Just as we are One Penn State, we are also one University Faculty Senate. For all our programmatic, methodological, and geographic diversity, we all meet here in the Senate as one body to oversee our curriculum and provide advice on matters pertaining to the health and vitality of the University.

Decades ago, the University Faculty Senate chartered a Graduate Council to maintain specialized curricular issues associated with graduate education. As a fail-safe, the actions of the Graduate Council were subject to rigorous oversight and systematic review by our Senate Council. Over the years, however, through what I can imagine is the bureaucratic equivalent of continental drift, the Graduate Council was subjected less and less to the oversight of the Senate, acting almost like an autonomous entity.

When members of Graduate Council brought concerns about the Council's internal processes to the Senate-- in particular, the inability to elect their own chair from among their faculty-- there was significant initial doubt that the Senate could intervene at all in the inner workings of Graduate Council. In the end, Senate leadership concluded that just as we are One Penn State, we are also one faculty, a faculty overseen by the Senate. Whatever our flaws in the Senate, we have a strong and admirable democratic tradition. And it is within our authority to require that bodies we delegate authority to adopt democratic procedures, including the election of a chair from among the faculty.

[APPLAUSE]
Indeed, this month, Graduate Council took steps towards reform, passing important legislation to create its first elected chair, consistent with our 2018 legislation requiring that all bodies chartered by the Senate must operate under basic democratic rules. The decision to require an elected chair reflects an optimism that Graduate Council can and will be reformed. Indeed, among the standing Senate committees, the reconfiguration of the Undergraduate Education Committee into the Education Committee under the leadership of Chair-elect, Beth Seymour, reflects a similar sense of that optimism from within the Senate.

But reversing decades of drift will not be easy. We in the Senate shall foster efforts to spur reform. However, like President Barron's reforms, we should not shy away from bold action, particularly when the future vitality of the University is at stake. So that's why we want the very best, and we are hopeful for the future. We must also prepare for the very worst.

Graduate Council is delegated authority as a function of the Senate. The failure or inability to share governance in that body over a long enough period would make inevitable the need for the University Faculty Senate to dissolve the authority of Graduate Council and absorb those responsibilities within the organ of the Senate. While the Senate will do everything-- and I mean everything within its power and purview-- to help Graduate Council share governance, it would be unconscionable for the Senate not to devote significant time and attention to establishing a transparent and fair process whereby we might do what has not been done in an age. We determine how to dissolve a unit that we have historically delegated authority. Thus, next year as we embrace the bold vision set out by One Penn State 2025, we'll embrace it as one University Faculty Senate. Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

Thank you so much. Okay, so are there any additional Comments for the Good of the University?

Unidentified Senator: [INAUDIBLE]

Chair Rowland: Seeing none.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Rowland: May I have a motion to adjourn? All in favor, please say aye.

All Senators: Aye.

Chair Rowland: Motion carries. The Senate is adjourned until September 17, 2019.
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