



University Faculty Senate
 The Pennsylvania State University
 101 Kern Graduate Building
 University Park, PA 16802

Telephone: (814) 863-0221
 Fax: (814) 863-6012
 URL: <http://senate.psu.edu>

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

THE SENATE RECORD

Volume 41-----January 29, 2008-----Number 4

The Senate Record is the official publication of the University Faculty Senate of The Pennsylvania State University, as provided for in Article I, Section 9 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and contained in the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Standing Rules of the University Faculty Senate*, The Pennsylvania State University, 2007-2008.

The publication is issued by the Senate Office, 101 Kern Graduate Building, University Park, PA 16802 (telephone 814-863-0221). The Senate Record is distributed to all libraries across the Penn State system, and is posted on the Web at <http://www.senate.psu.edu> under "Publications." Copies are made available to faculty and other University personnel on request.

Except for items specified in the applicable Standing Rules, decisions on the responsibility for inclusion of matters in the publication are those of the Chair of the University Faculty Senate.

When existing communication channels seem inappropriate, Senators are encouraged to submit brief letters relevant to the Senate's function as a legislative, advisory and forensic body to the Chair for possible inclusion in The Senate Record.

Reports that have appeared in the Agenda for the meeting are not included in The Senate Record unless they have been changed substantially during the meeting, or are considered to be of major importance. Remarks and discussions are abbreviated in most instances. Every Senate meeting is Webcast via Mediasite Live and may be viewed at <http://senate.psu.edu/agenda/index.html>. All Senate meetings are digitally audio taped and on file in the Senate office. Transcriptions of portions of the Senate meeting are available upon request.

Individuals with questions may contact Dr. Susan C. Youtz, Executive Secretary, University Faculty Senate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Final Agenda for January 29, 2008	Page ii-iii
II.	Minutes and Summaries of Remarks	Pages 1-10
III.	Appendices	
	a. Attendance	Appendix I
	b. Revision to the Constitution, Article II, Section 1 (Membership)	Appendix II
	Corrected Copy	

FINAL AGENDA FOR JANUARY 29, 2008

- A. [MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING](#)
- Minutes of the December 11, 2007, Meeting in [The Senate Record](#) 41:3 Page 1
[\[www.senate.psu.edu/record/indix.html\]](#)
- B. [COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE](#)
- Senate Curriculum Report of January 15, 2008 Page 1
[\[www.senate.psu.edu/curriculum_resources/bluesheet/bluex.html\]](#)
- C. [REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL](#) - Meeting of January 15, 2008 Page 1
- D. [ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR](#) Pages 1-2
- E. [COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY](#) Page 2
- F. [FORENSIC BUSINESS](#) Page 2
- G. [UNFINISHED BUSINESS](#) Page 2
- [SPECIAL INFORMATIONAL REPORT](#)
- [Educational Equity and Campus Environment and University Planning](#) Page 2
- For the Future: The Campaign for Penn State Students
- H. [LEGISLATIVE REPORTS](#)
- Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid; Educational Equity and
Campus Environment; and University Planning
- [Resolution to Endow a Faculty Trustee Scholarship](#) Pages 3-5
- Committee on Committees and Rules
- [Revision to the Constitution, Article II, Section 1 \(Membership\)](#) Pages 5-8
- [Revision of Senate Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6 \(f\), Committee on
Faculty Affairs, and Section 6 \(i\), Committee on Intra-University Relations,
Subcommittee on Fixed-Term Faculty](#) Pages 8-9
- I. [ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS](#) Page 9

J. [INFORMATIONAL REPORTS](#)

Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid

[Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program](#)

Page 9

Elections Commission

[University Faculty Census Report for 2008-2009](#)

Page 9

Faculty Affairs

[Report on Digital Preparation of Faculty Activity Information](#)

Page 9

Libraries

[The Evolving Virtual Library](#)

Page 9

K. [NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS](#)

Page 10

L. [COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY](#)

Page 10

The University Faculty Senate
Tuesday, January 29, 2008, at 1:30 PM

The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, January 29, 2008, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate Building with Dawn Blasko, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Blasko: The December 11, 2007, Senate Record, providing a full transcription of the proceedings, was sent to all University Libraries and is posted on the Faculty Senate Web site. Are there any corrections or additions to this document? May I hear a motion to accept?

Senators: So moved.

Chair Blasko: Second?

Senators: Second.

Chair Blasko: All in favor of accepting the minutes please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Blasko: Opposed say nay. The ayes have it, motion carried. The minutes have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

The Senate Curriculum Report of January 15, 2008, is posted on the University Faculty Senate Web site.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – Meeting of January 15, 2008

Enclosed in today's agenda are the minutes from the January meeting of Senate Council found at the end of your agenda.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Blasko: Out of courtesy to our presenters, please turn off your cell phones and pagers at this time.

We have begun preparing for spring elections. The elected members of Senate Council nominate for secretary and chair-elect of the Senate, Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, and the Committee on Committees and Rules. The Senate Council Nominating Committee is chaired by the Immediate Past Chair of the Senate, Yana Floros. Nominations are also needed for Senate Committee on the Faculty Rights and

Responsibilities, Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, and University Promotion and Tenure Review Committees – these nominations are done by Committees and Rules, chaired by Deidre Jago. Yana and Deidre would welcome nominations from you.

The Senate officers visited the College of Information Sciences and Technology yesterday and will visit DUS and Agricultural Sciences tomorrow. We will visit Arts and Architecture, Business, and University Libraries in February. Please encourage your colleagues and students to attend our meetings.

The Senate office will soon be distributing ballots to retired faculty to elect a retired faculty senator for a four-year term. Committees and Rules ratified the final slate of nominees at their meeting this morning. Those individuals who agreed to stand for election are Peter Deines, Peter Jurs, John Moore, and Peter Rebane.

I have learned from Kim Steiner that the FYS committee had hoped to give their report to the Senate in March, but instead will be having one or two additional meetings and will give their final report at the April 29 Senate meeting.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

President Spanier commented on the following topics:

Roll-out of Penn State's new Capital Campaign
Release of Governor Rendell's budget
Right-to-Know legislation
Status of first-year student applications
March 20-21, 2008, Board of Trustee meeting in Washington, D.C.
Dance Marathon, February 22-24

President Spanier responded to the following questions:

Program proliferation of programs at Penn State
Out-of-state student enrollment
Benefits for retirees in Southeastern PA
Penn State's endowment

F. FORENSIC BUSINESS – NONE

G. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – NONE

SPECIAL INFORMATIONAL REPORT

Rodney P. Kirsch, Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations, reported on Penn State's third comprehensive capital campaign--For the Future: The Campaign for Penn State Students. This presentation can be viewed at:

<http://www.senate.psu.edu/agenda/2007-2008/jan29-08agn/appb.pdf>

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEES ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID; EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT; AND UNIVERSITY PLANNING

Resolution to Endow a Faculty Trustee Scholarship
JoAnn Chirico, Chair

Chair Blasko: The next report is a resolution sponsored by the Senate Committees on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid; Educational Equity and Campus Environment; and University Planning. It appears on today's agenda as Appendix C.

As you entered the room today you received a brochure on the Trustee Matching Scholarship Program. Last year almost 4,500 students representing the lowest income levels and having grade point averages well above 3.0 received a scholarship from this program.

Now I want to say a few words about the resolution for the Faculty Trustee Scholarship.

There are many individuals who have advocated and shepherded this idea of a Faculty Trustee Scholarship over the past several years going back to early discussions in 2003 and 2004 with Chris Bise, Kim Steiner, and Kelly Snyder. In 2005 the Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid Committee chaired by Catherine Harmonosky charged a subcommittee with members Frederick Brown of Liberal Arts; Milton Cole of Science; Anna Griswold, Executive Director of Student Aid; and Randy Deike in Admissions to analyze data, policies, and strategies on topics related to tuition increases, trends in student aid funding, student unmet financial needs, and access programs for low income students. You will see the recommendations from this committee reflected in the resolution you will be asked to vote on.

The cost of higher education continues to have a significant impact on Penn State students and their families. The January 24 online Chronicle of Higher Education reported on the annual survey conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA. This year's class of first-year students are more concerned about affordability and academic quality than they have been in the previous 35 years of this survey. Before turning the microphone over to JoAnn, I want to thank Rod Kirsch, Dave Lieb, and Ed Thompson for their support in enabling us to move forward with the Trustee Scholarship. Joann Chirico and the Educational Equity and Campus Environment Committee along with the Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid and University Planning committees have all invested considerable time this last summer and this fall in framing the design of the Faculty Trustee Scholarship. Educational Equity and Campus Environment Chair JoAnn Chirico will make some brief comments and respond to questions.

JoAnn Chirico, Beaver: Good afternoon. I am honored to be able to make some remarks and to stand for questions for this scholarship resolution. In our Strategic Plan, in our Framework to Foster Diversity, and as you've heard in the Campaign for Penn State students, we state our resolve over and over again to be the number one student-centered

research university in the nation; maybe even in the world. This scholarship is a step in that direction. Every year I have students in my office telling me that they have to leave Penn State for financial reasons. They may not be the 4.0 students, or even the 3.95 students, but they're good students. They're academically able students for whom a Penn State degree would be a very meaningful step ahead. We all have those students, and we all regret losing them to the University.

When the Educational Equity Committee was convened as a committee, we were told to think outside of the box, and the scholarship became one of our primary initiatives; building on the work of other committees, and working in conjunction with other Senate committees. We see it as a very unique opportunity for faculty, number one, to pool our resources into an endowment as though we were a single donor; and number two, to double our impact by endowing a Trustee Scholarship. For every scholarship that we endow, the trustees will match with one; so we get double our impact. That's also an opportunity to target one of the most vulnerable groups; although all of the trustee scholarships are equity scholarships. This scholarship targets academically-able, first-generation, low-income students on a basis of need. I'm very excited to announce that through generous lead gifts, we're already at the \$43,000 mark; close to the \$50,000 required to endow the scholarship. Our faculty has given very generously in past campaigns. We encourage you to support this new scholarship in the campaign for Penn State students, so that hopefully some day soon every student who is willing and academically-able to obtain the excellence that a Penn State degree represents, will receive the financial support necessary for them to do it. Thank you.

Robin Bower, Beaver: I would like to propose a friendly amendment an editorial intervention into this document, at two places. The third whereas, "whereas the report recommends that Penn State," I believe that should be a subjunctive, "emphasize as one of its highest priorities," and then again in point two, "therefore be it resolved, that the University Faculty Senate encourage."

JoAnn Chirico: Fine. Was that emphasize or emphasizes?

Robin Bower: It should be emphasize.

JoAnn Chirico: That's what I have on mine. So it's emphasize and encourage.

Chair Blasko: Are there any other questions or comments for JoAnn?

James Marden, Science: Is it possible to make a faculty contribution before taxes; is there a mechanism to do that?

JoAnn Chirico: Yes, there is the mechanism, it's through payroll deduction. We are still on the quiet phase of this campaign and we can send that out to the faculty, but the person to get in touch with would be Ed Thompson. They set it up through payroll deduction the same way that any of the other contributions would be. This should appear next year on the faculty giving form that we get.

Chair Blasko: Are there any other questions? This resolution has been brought to the floor by the three committees and needs no second. Are we ready to vote? All those in favor of this resolution, please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Blasko: Opposed nay. The ayes have it. The motion passes.

The Senate has approved this resolution. Thank you. All elected faculty senators and administrative senators will be receiving a letter from me in the next few weeks encouraging you to make a one-time gift or multi-year pledge to this scholarship. I hope you will join me and the Senate officers in giving generously to this worthwhile scholarship.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Revision to the Constitution, Article II, Section 1 (Membership)
Leonard Berkowitz, Vice-Chair

Chair Blasko: The next report is from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules and appears on today's agenda as Appendix D.

Because this report is a proposed amendment to the Constitution, it was discussed at the December 11 meeting and will be voted on today. Committee Vice-Chair Leonard Berkowitz will present this report and respond to questions.

Leonard Berkowitz, York: I introduced this report last month; you've had it in front of you twice now, so I won't do any more introductions.

Chair Blasko: Are there any questions?

Mike Jonson, Engineering: I would like to propose an amendment to include research assistants in the membership.

Chair Blasko: Is there a second? Discussion?

Leonard Berkowitz: Let me just respond very briefly on behalf of the committee. The reason this was done this way was we were trying to ascertain whether research assistants indeed assume the role of faculty. The initial report we got back from people who had such positions in their college was, in general, they were not. You and I talked, and you said that it was your view that they did, and indeed the committee takes no position on this because if research assistants do play the role of faculty, we agree they should be included. Since most of us don't have experience with that, we'll simply listen to the debate.

Chair Blasko: Are there any other comments on the amendment?

Mike Jonson: In general, the proposed constitutional amendment does a good job of explicitly spelling out the faculty ranks to be included in the University Faculty Senate.

However, we believe the rank of research assistants should also be included. According to HR-21, the research assistant rank is listed as University faculty; this rank is parallel to lecturer, instructor, and assistant librarian. HR-21 requires lecturer or instructor the rank of a master's degree or equivalent. An assistant librarian requires a master's degree of Library Science. As for HR-21, research assistants are also required to have or achieve a master's degree. Before the 1990s research professionals were categorized by research work into mostly research faculty ranks. Since the early 1990s ARL has added research staff ranks which parallel levels to allow technical professionals who do not conduct publishable research, an avenue for promotion as a professional research engineer. Since that time, many researchers have migrated on their own, or with suggestions from supervisors, to the research engineering staff ranks; however, it accepts that key research professionals have remained as research faculty with a goal of conducting fundamental applied research. For new positions, a deliberate decision is made regarding research aptitude for the candidate. The rationale for this amendment claims that the research assistants perform technical technician work. In fact, ARL does explicitly have technician positions that are a position below research engineering staff ranks, at two plus grades lower. Apparently, ARL has 44 research assistants, 31 have masters' degrees, and 13 have BS degrees. The College of Engineering has 16 research assistants. The research assistants at both ARL and Engineering conduct experiments, write papers, and secure funding by meeting with sponsors and presenting at conferences. In conclusion, I think that since the University has appointed these individuals as research faculty with a parallel rank to lecturers, and this is the University Faculty Senate, their voices should be heard. It is key that the University Faculty Senate be inclusive rather than restrictive. Thank you.

Chair Blasko: Is there any other discussion on the amendment?

Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: I think the problem is that research assistants are definitely doing different things in different parts of the University. In Liberal Arts, they are very often, perhaps even typically, graduate students. I wonder if it is possible to find language that would include research assistants who have faculty responsibilities. If they do, then they should be included, but to put all RA's into the election of the University Faculty Senate I think runs a risk of adding a huge group of people. Many of whom are generally graduate students and do not have any faculty responsibility.

Donald Rung, Retired Senator: Do we know how many there are?

Leonard Berkowitz: Yes, the total of research assistants throughout the University is 128. The largest group is within the College of Engineering, in particular the Applied Research Lab. There are 44 in the Applied Research Lab, and another 16 in the College of Engineering for a total of 60. Keep in mind that what we are really talking about here is who counts as a faculty member for the faculty census in terms of allocating faculty senators. What that would mean, would be two more faculty senators for the College of Engineering. It would be marginal in every other case; where that meant even one more depends on the exact numbers.

Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: I think there is another group of people whose appointment papers may say graduate assistant, but who are assigned and designated as

research assistants. Those are the ones that are definitely graduate students, and the legislation does not distinguish among them. For example, I have a research assistant who is on a graduate assistantship appointment, but on her CV and everywhere else she may put research assistant because that is her designated title for this semester.

Leonard Berkowitz: Is that her academic rank? What we're referring to very specifically here are the academic ranks listed in HR-21. It is certainly possible that people use generic descriptions in lots of different ways. We discovered that last time and we talked, for example, about people called clinical professor, which is not a legitimate HR title, with the possible exception of the medical school. That's the only place where that's legitimately used, but it's used as an unofficial description in a number of other places. Those kinds of descriptions will not be affected here; it's only people with the official academic title. Just as professor, assistant professor, senior research assistant, and so on. That's the only thing we are referring to here.

Chair Blasko: Are there any other comments before we vote on the amendment?

Dhushy Sathianathan, Engineering: For the sake of the language, HR-21 outlines who the faculty are; is that right? I think that it is important that when we define faculty, that we are consistent with that same language. If you redefine faculty in different ways in different documents, I think it will come back to haunt us at a later point, as to who is faculty. Research assistants and all others are listed in HR-21 and basically I think we should use the same language. I understand there are some discrepancies in how it is instituted in various units, but I think Blannie Bowen's office should follow up and make sure the right titles are used for the appropriate ranks. Maybe that should be cleaned up. The faculty titles are already there and that's what we should follow.

Leonard Berkowitz: You are correct in one sense and that's why we used this set of ranks. In another sense we need to be a little careful; HR-21 never uses the word faculty, it only uses the word rank. So there are some administrators for example that hold these academic ranks. It defines academic ranks, it never uses the word faculty, and that's what left this open. I think the points you are making are quite telling.

Chair Blasko: Are we ready to vote on the amendment? We are just voting on the amendment, which will remove the exclusion for research assistants.

Everyone should have a clicker. Raise your hand if you need one. Turn your clicker on. The screen will read "finding class Senate" it should find "Senate one."

Do you want to go ahead and read that?

Leonard Berkowitz: The effect of the amendment would simply be to add the rank research assistant to the list of those you find in the proposed revision. So it is included, instead of being left out.

Chair Blasko: Are there any questions? To accept the amendment, press the letter A and the enter key. To reject the amendment, press the letter B and enter.

The amendment is accepted, 85 to 74.

Let's now go back to discussion of the report. Are there any other comments on the report in general?

Jamie Myers, Education: I just wanted to encourage units to consider nominating and electing a diverse group of faculty as representatives to the Senate. We are expanding, and in some ways the electorate, so it would be nice to have a variety of those voices in the Senate. Thank you.

Chair Blasko: Any other comments? Let's move to the vote. This time we will be voting on the full report. The report has been brought to the floor by the committee and needs no second. To accept the report, press the letter A and the enter key. To reject the report, press the letter B and the enter key.

The report is accepted 132 to 24. Thank you Len.

Do not turn your clickers off; they will automatically go into a sleep mode. We will use them for voting on the next report.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revision of Senate Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6 (f), Committee on Faculty Affairs,
and Section 6 (i), Committee on Intra-University Relations,
Subcommittee on Fixed-Term Faculty
Deidre Jago, Chair

Chair Blasko: The next report is also from Committees and Rules and appears on today's agenda as Appendix E. Committee Chair Deidre Jago will present this report and respond to questions.

Deidre Jago, Hazleton: This is a joint report. Last year there was a forensic session in which the problems and concerns of fixed-term faculty were brought before the Senate for discussion. As a result of the forensic report, the Intra-University Relations Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee, chaired by Amanda Maples and Cynthia Brewer, have worked with the Committee on Committees and Rules to present this legislation. The legislation is found in Appendix E, and what you will see are suggested changes in the makeup of both Faculty Affairs and IRC. The standing Subcommittee for Fixed-term Faculty would have its home in the Intra-University Relations Committee. Both of these chairs are here to help with answering any of the questions that you may have.

Chair Blasko: Are there any questions for the committee chairs?

Denice Wardrop, Earth and Mineral Sciences: I'm a fixed-term faculty member, so I really appreciate this; I know you've worked long and hard. My question is, could there be a change in the language where when you put people on these committees, you make the statement that you believe these fixed-term faculty, represented on page two, could accomplish what no single report could? I really would not want to exclude the necessity

for special or task force charges, because I think it sometimes addresses the nature of a fixed-term appointment. It would be necessary to have those types of episodic efforts. I don't want this to exclude the possibility of those.

Deidre Jago: That's part of the rationale. It describes the background on how the proposed legislation was established, so the comment that you just made doesn't really affect the voting on what the changes in the constitution would incorporate. Right?

Cynthia Brewer, Earth and Mineral Sciences: That's correct. But Denice, you saying it for the Senate record does make the point.

Chair Blasko: Are there any other comments or questions? Seeing none, let's move to the vote. If your clicker has fallen asleep, press any key to wake it up. To accept the report, press the letter A and the enter key. To reject the report, press the letter B and enter.

The report is accepted 150 to 0. Thank you Deidre.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS – NONE

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid

Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program. This report describes reserved spaces for admission of freshmen who have special needs or talents that cannot be met at non-University Park locations and whose predicted GPAs are below those for regular undergraduate fall admissions to University Park.

Elections Commission

University Faculty Census Report for 2007-2008.

Faculty Affairs

Report on Digital Preparation of Faculty Activity Information, Appendix H. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Blannie Bowen presented this report. Vice Provost Bowen and Committee Chair Cynthia Brewer responded to questions. This report is posted on the Senate Web site at <http://senate.psu.edu/agenda/2007-2008/jan29-08agn/apph.pdf>

Senate Committee on Libraries

The Evolving Virtual Library, Appendix I. Nancy L. Eaton, Dean of University Libraries presented this report. Dean Eaton responded to questions. This report is posted on the Senate Web site at <http://senate.psu.edu/agenda/2007-2008/jan29-08agn/appi.pdf>

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS – NONE

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Blasko: Are there any comments?

Frederick Brown, Liberal Arts: I have a few comments about issues that have been troubling me and I want to share them. Today we've heard emphasized maybe three or four times the fact that Penn State University may be one of the foremost, if not the foremost, student-centered University; and that does trouble me. I would hope that it would be education-centered. Certainly this is one of the most "party hearty" schools in the nation, and I wonder whether or not the increase of over 100,000 applicants is for the purpose of students coming here for other than the education. For those of us who have been teaching for a while, and came in to teaching because of the noble ideals of teaching and educating students, it seems that these noble ideals and practices are seen by some as no longer student friendly. One would hope that the educational ideals of senior faculty would be something that could be passed on to younger colleagues. There is no question, no secret, to the fact that our governmental and industrial leaders are very concerned about the deteriorating quality of college graduates. I wonder if, and I haven't heard whether or not, there is some sort of evaluative process regarding the quality of the education of students here at Penn State. What we don't want to see is the quality of the students deteriorating, like many of us see in the classrooms as we are appalled at the decreasing amount of general cultural information that our undergraduate students have. I wonder, is there some sort of procedure or implementation that can address the issue of whether or not the quality of education is increasing, decreasing, or remaining the same at this illustrious University.

Chair Blasko: Thank you. Are there any other comments?

Daniel Frankel, Erie Student Senator: I don't know how many of you are aware but a student senator caucus has formed and met a few times. This caucus includes the student representatives from each campus and college. I just wanted to thank you for the opportunity to meet as a caucus and also thank CC&R for inviting us to the next Council meeting. We are seeking seats on the council and hopefully sometime in the future the students will be able to serve there. Also, I just wanted to thank everybody for that opportunity. If anyone ever has questions, please talk to one of the student representatives; anyone of us would be glad to answer them. We are proud to serve our constituents here at Penn State. Thank you.

Chair Blasko: Thank you. Any other comments? May I have a motion to adjourn?
All in favor please say aye. Motion carries. The Senate is adjourned until March 18, 2008.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revision to the Constitution, Article II, Section 1 (Membership)

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

Background

At the December 2006 meeting of the University Faculty Senate, the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules proposed eliminating the parenthetical phrase that excludes those holding noncontinuing research appointments from the Senate electorate. After much discussion about the nature of these appointments the proposal was defeated.

The history of the phrase is murky. The section on membership had several changes in the early to mid 1970s. In 1972, the section was simple and broad, including all persons who held full time appointments in specified ranks. The next year the section was much more detailed and complicated. It added the word “academic” to “appointments.” The section also specifically included members of the Graduate Faculty who were full-time academic employees. In 1975, the category of research appointments was added for the first time and it was coupled with the parenthetical phrase “excluding non-continuing research appointments.” We can find no explanation for the limitation in the Senate records.

While discussing this change to the definition of the Senate electorate, we were forced to face a more substantive issue—who should count as a faculty member for purposes of the Senate. We are recommending additional changes to this section of the Constitution in order to clarify this important issue.

Rationale

We are recommending that the parenthetical phrase be eliminated, and that the Senate electorate be defined to include persons holding full-time research appointments, whether fixed-term or continuing, with the exception of those who hold the rank of research assistant. We are also recommending other changes to clarify the meaning of “University Faculty” as used by the University Faculty Senate.

Regarding the parenthetical phrase “excluding non-continuing research appointments,” it is clear to us that the limitation, taken literally, makes no sense. Whether a faculty member’s appointment is continuing or fixed-term should have no bearing on that person’s status as a member of the faculty. Teaching faculty with fixed-term appointments are specifically included in the electorate. (Full-time instructors, senior instructors, lecturers, or senior lecturers are included.) Therefore we recommend that the phrase be eliminated.

There is a second issue, however. We want to be sure that the changes we are recommending are in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution of the University Faculty Senate. The changes in the Constitution in the 1970s suggest that the intent of the Senate in revising the definition of “University Faculty” was to distinguish Penn State employees who functioned as faculty from those who functioned in other capacities, such as staff or administration (some of whom have academic ranks). Therefore we asked the units with significant numbers of research appointments to explain how the units actually used the ranks. We were most interested in whether the persons in those ranks func-

tioned as and were regarded as faculty by the units to which they belonged. The units reported that there was a significant difference between those holding the rank of research assistant and those holding other research ranks. While those in most research ranks function as and are regarded as members of the faculty, those with the rank of research assistants were reported to have technician-like duties and were not independent researchers. Units reported that many in these ranks have bachelor's degrees, and some have masters. In short, they were reported to be more like teaching assistants than instructors who have their own classes.

Therefore, we are recommending that the section on membership be revised to include those in research ranks—including those with noncontinuing appointments—except for those in the research assistant rank. We believe this change is within the spirit of the University Faculty Senate: faculty includes all full-time faculty, whether they are primarily teachers or researchers, but does not include staff, or teaching or research assistants.

Finally, the Constitution distinguishes between faculty and administrative members of the University Faculty Senate. Article II section 5 identifies some specific administrative members of the Senate, and section 6 empowers the President to appoint a certain number of additional members to the Senate with the following limitation: “the total number of appointed and ex officio members (not including any members of the Faculty Advisory Committee) shall not exceed a number equal to 10 percent of the elected faculty senators.” However, in a university as complex as Penn State, the distinction between faculty and administration is not a sharp line. Is a department head an administrator or a faculty member? The same question could be asked about a number of other positions. The answer, of course, is that people in these positions have both roles. So the question we must ask is how to classify them with regard to the Senate electorate. Fortunately, the Senate has already faced this issue when deciding who is eligible to serve as an elected faculty member of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. For consistency we recommend that the Senate follow the same guidelines in defining “University Faculty” in Article I of the Senate Constitution. Thus, in defining the electorate of the University Faculty Senate we recommend that the following be excluded: the President’s staff, the immediate staff of the Executive Vice President and Provost, including Vice Provosts and Associate and Assistant Vice Provosts; other Vice Presidents, including Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents, Academic Deans and Chancellors, as well as those holding affiliate academic appointments.

Recommendation

Change Article II Section 1 of the Senate Constitution as indicated below:

Current:

For the purpose of defining the electorate of the Senate, the term University Faculty shall mean all persons who hold full-time academic appointments, and who fall into one of the following categories: those holding professorial, research (excluding noncontinuing research appointees), all librarian titles, full-time instructors, senior instructors, lecturers, or senior lecturers. The faculty of the Pennsylvania College of Technology are not included.

Proposed Revision:

For the purpose of defining the electorate of the Senate, the term “University Faculty” shall mean all persons who hold full-time academic appointments, and who hold one of the following ranks: Lecturer, Instructor, Senior Lecturer, Senior Instructor, Research Assistant, Senior Research Assistant, Senior Scientist, Research Associate, Senior Research Associate, Professor of Practice, Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, Librarian, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor with the following exclusions:

- (a) The President's immediate staff;
- (b) The immediate staff of the Executive Vice President and Provost, including Vice Provosts and Associate and Assistant Vice Provosts;
- (c) Other Vice Presidents, including Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents, Academic Deans and Chancellors;
- (d) Those holding affiliate academic appointments.
- (e) Faculty members of the Pennsylvania College of Technology are not included in the electorate of the University Faculty Senate.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Leonard J. Berkowitz, Vice-Chair

Dawn G. Blasko

Ingrid M. Blood

Laurie P. Breakey

Michael J. Cardamone

Mark A. Casteel

Joanna Floros

Pamela P. Hufnagel

Deidre E. Jago, Chair

Jamie M. Myers

Jean Landa Pytel

Robert D. Ricketts

Tramble T. Turner

Gregory R. Ziegler