



THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

THE SENATE RECORD

Volume 41-----December 11, 2007-----Number 3

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 December 11, 2007](#)
- II. [Minutes and Summaries of Remarks](#)
- III. Appendices
 - a. [Attendance](#)
 - b. [Revision to Senate Policy 44-20 – Corrected Copy](#)
 - c. [Revision to Senate Policy 44-20 – Door Handout](#)
 - d. [Senate Policy HR40 – Corrected Copy](#)

FINAL AGENDA FOR DECEMBER 11, 2007

A. [MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING](#)

Minutes of the October 23, 2007, Meeting in [The Senate Record](#) 41:2
[www.senate.psu.edu/record/index.html]

B. [COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE](#)

[Senate Curriculum Report](#) of November 27, 2007
[www.senate.psu.edu/curriculum_resources/bluehseet/bluex.html]

[2008-2009 Senate Calendar](#)

C. [REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL](#) - Meeting of November 27, 2007

D. [ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR](#)

E. [COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY](#)

F. [FORENSIC BUSINESS](#)

G. [UNFINISHED BUSINESS](#)

H. [LEGISLATIVE REPORTS](#)

Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid

[Revision to Senate Policy 58-50 Conditions for Re-enrollment as Degree Candidate](#)

Committees and Rules

[Revision to the Constitution, Article II, Section 1 \(Membership\)](#)

Undergraduate Education

[Revision to Senate Policy 44-20 Final Examination Policy](#)

I. [ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS](#)

Faculty Affairs

[Policy HR40 Evaluation of Faculty Performance](#)

J. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Educational Equity and Campus Environment

Mid-Cycle Report on the Framework to Foster Diversity
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Faculty Affairs

Associate Professors: Time in Rank

Faculty Benefits

Report of the University's Initiatives on Faculty and Staff Wellness

Senate Council

Report on Fall 2007 Campus Visits

Undergraduate Education

Summary of Petitions by College, Campus, and Unit 2006-2007

K. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

L. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

The University Faculty Senate
Tuesday, December 11, 2007, at 1:30 PM

The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, December 11, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate Building with Dawn Blasko, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Blasko: The October 23, 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 November 27, 2007, is posted on the University Faculty Senate Web site.

The Senate calendar for 2008-2009 can be found as Appendix B in your agenda.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – Meeting of November 27, 2007

Enclosed in today's agenda are the minutes from the November 27 meeting of Senate Council found at the end of your agenda. Included in the minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President at the November 27 meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

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

This is the time of the Senate year that we begin 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, Joanna Floros. Nominations are also needed for 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. We want the best possible candidates for these important positions. Joanna and Deidre would welcome nominations from you or answer your questions.

A national search is underway for the position of Vice President for Student Affairs. Robert N. Pangborn, Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education, is chairing the search committee. Nominations for this position should be sent to Dr. Pangborn at 201 Old Main. The search committee will review applications and nominations beginning January 1, 2008.

At the beginning of the semester I wrote to you to point out Penn State's Academic Freedom policy HR-64. Since then the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has issued a report entitled Freedom in the Classroom that you might find interesting.

As part of my duties as Chair of the Senate, I have the opportunity to serve on the executive board of the Penn State Alumni Association. As many of you know, Penn State's Alumni Association has the largest, and the most enthusiastic dues-paying membership in the country. I gave a presentation about the Senate's activities this fall, and was told over and over how much alumni would like to be more connected to Penn State faculty and students across the state.

On November 2 and 3, I attended a meeting of the CIC faculty governance leaders with Chair-Elect Blood. Topics included faculty involvement in intercollegiate athletics, the cost of fringe benefits, models of presidential searches, diversity and affirmative action, and increasing IRB requirements. One interesting topic was the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA). I have asked Provost Erickson, who has been involved in this initiative, to brief us on how VSA may affect Penn State.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Blasko: President Spanier is unable to be here today. Provost Erickson has agreed to make brief comments and stand for questions. Due to the length of our agenda today, let's try to keep questions to about ten minutes.

Provost Erickson: Thank you Dawn. Let me make just a few comments about the Voluntary System of Accountability. In order to do that, I will need to give a little bit of a prologue. If you recall, last year I spoke to you briefly about the Spellings Commission Report. I said at that time that the Spellings Commission Report was probably one of the most important documents in higher education for many years. It's my opinion that it would have a lasting impact on the business that we are about. I agree, and I think that most in higher education agree with the major goals of the commission. Most of us took some exception to the ways in which the achievement of these goals would be sought. I think it's fair to say that already there are major impacts and implications of the Spellings Commission.

The best thing that has happened out of this is really some good news in terms of student aid. The Spellings Commission Report elevated the discussion in the halls of Congress, the Executive Branch, significantly in terms of the need for more student aid. Over the course of the fall, new legislation has significantly increased Pell grants to \$5,400 a year, and there are a number of other programs that have been added as well. Competitiveness grants have been added and a program called TEACH provides additional grant monies for students who are engaged in education as a career pursuit. Another program has been added that really addresses students who are primarily in STEM, what we call Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math areas. The results have been very impressive and I'm pleased to say that in two of these major programs that have been added to Pell, Penn State ranks first in the nation in terms of the number of students that have taken advantage of the program, and fifth in the other programs. Our folks in student aid have done a wonderful job of making that information available to our students.

The other ways that Spellings is playing out right now that many of us in higher education are concerned about is with respect to the re-authorization of the Higher Education Act that's taking place. The Senate has a version and the House has a version. One of the things that we're concerned about there relates to accreditation. Those of us in this business of higher education want very much to retain control, so that we are the judges of quality of our programs, and really are the foundation for accreditation. In the House version of that legislation, many of us believe takes us, this University, enough out of the direct responsibility here to be somewhat worrisome. This accreditation could become more of a political process than an academic process that we've been used to.

There are a lot of things that have been going on with respect to what's called the three A's: access, affordability, and accountability. The accountability piece really comes in front and center with the higher education re-authorization. As Dawn mentioned, one of the elements is something called VSA; Voluntary System of Accountability. This was

really an effort of two of the presidential associations; the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), as well as the American Association of State Colleges and Universities to really get out in front of this accountability issue. They have developed and proposed with input, certainly not with complete concurrence, on the part of the provosts across the country, among the membership of several hundred of those institutions and the presidents. Both of those two organizations voted last month to endorse the Voluntary System of Accountability.

What does it really mean? Well, what it really means is that universities who agree to participate, and I would say that there will be a lot of pressure on public universities to participate in this process, will be using as part of this process a common template to present various information about our universities to the public (i.e., on the Web). There are about a dozen and a half universities that have already agreed to begin using and populating these templates. The point for us is that this will be a considerable amount of work; it's not something that the faculty, at this point, need to worry about. Most of this, I would say probably between 90 and 95 percent of the information that's on the Voluntary System of Accountability, is already on our public accountability page, or elsewhere on our Web site in some form. It deals with student characteristics; progress to graduation and graduation rates cost; and attendance of financial aid, admission, degrees, area of study, student housing, campus safety, future plans of baccalaureate graduates, and things like that.

We're already well equipped to respond. I think the larger issue, however, is that the system will require in three to four years evidence documented, evidence of learning outcomes. While we are using a number of things here, many of you are aware we have used the NSSE, National Survey of Student Engagement, periodically over the years. We are also piloting some work with the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA). These will be required, or some evidence will be required, of learning outcome. One of our fears of this is that this could become a kind of "no test left behind" where national testing would become the norm for college graduates. My peers and I feel that this is going in the opposite direction of where we're trying to go. This is to move the accountability for learning outcomes and for assessments to the program level where we can really focus in on the impact that we as faculty are having on our students as they come to us. So this is something that we are very much watching, but I would say for now I would not be worried about this and what it implies. I think the issues are really longer run, and I assure you that my colleagues and I all across higher education are watching these developments very closely and will certainly speak the voice of our faculty, our colleagues, as these things unfold. That is in a nut shell where VSA is and some other developments that will have importance for all of us in the higher education arena over the next several years. I'll stop there Dawn, and take any questions that anyone would care to ask.

Chair Blasko: If you have any question for Provost Erickson, I remind you to please stand, wait for a microphone, and identify yourself and the unit you represent before addressing the Senate. Questions?

Michael Anderson, DUS Student Senator: I wanted to ask Dr. Spanier this question, but since he's not here I'll toss it to you. An organization on campus called Safeguard Old State reported on a policy at the University, and the Collegian followed up, that says that for donations exceeding \$5,000 the Office of University Development is holding the donor's money for three months before transferring it to its intended recipient. The allegation being that for those three months, the University is profiting from the interest of having that larger donation of over \$5,000. The Collegian then covered this as well, and confirmed this report. The problem being that the policy isn't disclosed and is not on the books. So my question is does such a policy exist to your knowledge, and if it does, why weren't donors informed of it?

Provost Erickson: Yes, indeed the policy does exist; the donors are in the process of being informed of that as it goes into place. I think the coverage of that was really quite accurate as I recall reading it. Obviously, when you launch a major development campaign, as we've just launched, and bringing on large numbers of staff and all of the other expenses that revolve around that, it's an expensive proposition, even in the case of Penn State, which is among the very most efficient of our peers in terms of what it costs us as to raise a dollar. So there are a certain number of ways that you can support that effort. One of them, and most universities use some combination of several that I mentioned, is to simply use general funds or use tuition to support it. Others are to take a piece of the endowment each year to support it. Other ways of doing that are to take a tax right off the top. We use some combination of ways and one way to get some additional revenue is to hold those for three months. We talked with many of our donors, and they in substantial numbers told us that they think it is a good way to provide some of the funds for that. Obviously money doesn't fall from heaven to provide support for these sorts of things, and we think we have the right kind of balance here where we're spreading the load in several different ways rather than taking it out of one area.

Paul Fogle, Harrisburg Student Senator: A student question of mine was regarding the policy that was recently implemented by the College of Education regarding the computer requirement. Does the administration have a take on that, or a response to that in general?

Provost Erickson: Well, there are actually a number of colleges that require certain kinds of technology, certain kinds of computer equipment for their programs. The dean of the college had alerted me to this before it was implemented. The idea was to go out early in the academic year so those students starting in the fall would have an opportunity to make plans for that. The college has been working very hard to provide additional financial aid for those students who would find it very difficult to do that. It's certainly not the first, and nor will it be the last, I predict, of programs that are requiring particular kinds of equipment or technology.

Chair Blasko: Any other questions for the Provost? Thank you very much Provost Erickson.

FORENSIC BUSINESS – NONE

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – NONE**LEGISLATIVE REPORTS****SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID***Revision to Senate Policy 58-50 Conditions for Re-enrollment as a Degree Candidate*

Lee Coraor, Chair

The first report is from the Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid. It appears on today's agenda as Appendix C. Committee Chair Lee Coraor will present this report.

Lee Coraor, Engineering: Thank you Dawn. This report recommends a minor correction in the policy for re-enrollment of students. We were notified of it from the College of Education. In certification programs in the College of Education there is a state requirement that students must maintain a 3.0 average. Yet policy 58-50 says that a student to be re-enrolled will automatically be re-enrolled if they have above a 2.0. So there was the awkward situation where the registrar re-enrolls a student with a 2.0 and then the college has to turn around and say "sorry you're not re-enrolled because you don't have the 3.0 that's required." So there are just two small addenda that are in the report that list the change that would be necessary. The committee approved this, the people in the College of Education approved it and think it will work, the Registrar's office approved it, and we recommend you approve it also.

Chair Blasko: Thank you. Senators should have received a clicker for voting on three reports today. Please raise your hand if you need a clicker. Turn your clicker on. The screen will read "finding class Senate." You should see the letters ANS and see Senate on your screen once it's ready. Raise your hand if you need help. It looks like we're ready.

This report has been brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. To accept the report, press the letter A and the enter key, the large green arrow. To reject the report, press the letter B and enter.

Are we ready to close the polling? Polling closed. The results are 178 to approve the report, and no objections to the report. Thank you Lee.

Do not turn your clickers off; they will automatically go into a sleep mode. We will use them for voting on two more reports.

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

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 will be discussed today and then voted on at the January 29 Senate meeting. Committee Vice-Chair Leonard Berkowitz will present this report and respond to questions.

Leonard Berkowitz, York: I just want to call your attention to a few things. We are not voting on it this month, but I wanted to clarify some things that people had said they were having trouble understanding. We're only suggesting changes in section one of the membership article that is defining the term University Faculty. We're not saying who may be on the Senate, just who counts as a faculty member for purposes of the Senate. If you turn back to the first page of the proposal, you'll see the background. In December 2006, the Committee on Committees and Rules said "Why is the phrase, 'excluding non-continuing research appointees' here when we can find no reason for it?" So we suggested we get rid of it, but that discussion ended up far field from that, saying "Well who is a faculty member, who counts as a faculty member? Address that and send it back to committee." So that's what we've done here. It turns out there are really two separate issues this report addresses. The first one is the very simple one about the exclusionary phrase where research appointees who are non-continuing appointees don't get to be counted as faculty, which is just silly. The second one is a subset of the first, which is who counts as a faculty member for purposes of the University Faculty Senate.

If you look at the first paragraph, the rationale, that's a summary of the recommendation that we're making. Get rid of the parenthetical phrase and then we'll fix who counts as faculty. The first thing we're doing is recommending just getting rid of that parenthetical phrase, because it doesn't make any difference whether a faculty member's on continuing appointment or fixed-term appointment. If they're faculty, they're faculty. The second issue was who counts as faculty, and we spent a lot of time on that. We wanted to make sure the changes we were recommending were keeping with the spirit of the University Faculty Senate. People had asked what exactly are those faculty that would be added? They're research assistants, research associates, and so on. So we asked the units who actually had faculty in those positions to tell us: are these people faculty; do they act as faculty; are they treated as faculty? The answer we got back was interesting. They said yes, with one exception. They told us that those with the rank of research assistant were more like technicians. They didn't have their own labs, didn't always have advanced degrees, and were more like teaching assistants than instructors of their own classes. That's the reason for that exclusion in our proposal.

Finally, if you look carefully at Article II of the Constitution you'll see that the article distinguishes among three groups of senators: faculty senators, administrative senators, and student senators. The question then was, "Who is to count as a faculty senator, as opposed to one of the other groups?" In a later article, obviously the administrative members are defined, or certain ones are designated and in the administration, the president has given the right to appoint additional members, up to ten percent of the faculty members and student membership is also defined. The question became, "Who is an administrator versus who is a faculty member, for the purposes of the Senate?" Fortunately we didn't have to start that one all over again, because a few years ago, this very body decided that in deciding who should be elected as a faculty member of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. All we did was adopt that same

policy here, as to who counts as a faculty member. For consistency, we thought it was absolutely critical that we use that same definition.

Other issues that came up last time: somebody asked about post doctoral appointments, but that's not covered here because there are two titles for post doctoral appointments according to HR-68 and they're not listed here at all. Those people are to be designated post doctoral fellow, or post doctoral scholars. I'll answer any other questions now or next month.

Chair Blasko: Any questions for Len?

Joseph Keiser, Science: Presumably you not only have a feel for what types of titles would come into this definition of faculty, but how many total people. In other words, what's your estimate of the increase of people counted as faculty if this is approved?

Leonard Berkowitz: In practice, the answer is very few, because for some time some units have already been ignoring the exclusion. In practice, it won't be much of a difference. In policy, it means a few. I was looking for the exact number and I'll have it for you next time. It will be a very few number of senators since we are now moving to one in twenty-five. Here the total number of senior research associates in the University in 2006-2007 was 58. Senior research assistants was 153 in the entire University. Divide those by 25, and that could be the maximum number of increase in senators. As I said, a number of units have been doing that anyway, so the practical increase I cannot tell you. In a sense it makes no difference because if somebody is a faculty member they ought to be counted, whether or not it means that unit gets increased representation.

Chair Blasko: Are there any other questions for Len? Thank you Len; that was very helpful.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Revision to Senate Policy 44-20 Final Examination Policy

Robin Bower, Chair

The next report is from the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education. It appears on today's agenda as Appendix E. Committee Chair Robin Bower will present the report.

Robin Bower, Beaver: The revisions to policy 44-20 were motivated by recognition of the common practice of conducting final examinations during the final week of the instructional semester; which effectively cuts the semester short, precludes study days prior to final examinations, and denies students the opportunity to file for resolution of examination conflicts. We thought that the original policy was clear in its intentions; which were to mandate that final exams be administered during final exam week. However, there was that parenthetical sentence reading in point three, I believe, of the original policy. Quizzes and narrowly limited tests in support of classroom instruction may be given during the final week. There was widely diverse interpretation of quizzes and narrowly defined tests in support of classroom instruction, ranging anywhere from five percent to apparently 33 percent and more of the entire course grade. So we have proposed a revision to the policy which defines quizzes and narrowly limited tests in

support of classroom instruction as those worth no more than ten percent of the semester grade, and stipulating that final examinations worth more than that ten percent be scheduled during the final exam week. This is in today's door handout in order to make provision for cases such as lab exams and lab practica in science classes for project presentations and engineering classes or studio components of Arts and Architecture classes. There is an exception that had been attached to point five of the legislation, which was retained in point five of our revision which stated that unless an exception for educational reasons has been authorized by the faculty of the program offering the course, then any alternative final examination was not being offered. That did not cover the possibility the faculty might be offering a written final examination during final exam week and then also have a need for this ancillary tool, which would be administered during the last week of classes. This new placement of the exception at the end of the policy would cover both of those scenarios for faculty who are and who are not administering final examinations during final exam week.

Chair Blasko: Are there any questions for Robin?

Ralph Crivello, Engineering: I just have a quick question preface before my comments and I was wondering if maybe this is more appropriate for the chair. What is the time frame for implementation? Is this expected to come into effect for next semester?

Robin Bower: The Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education (ACUE) would determine issues of implementation.

Ralph Crivello: So the expectation is that this won't be in effect for next semester undergraduates?

Robin Bower: It would go to ACUE and ACUE would determine issues of those implementations.

Ralph Crivello: Ok, well we already met last Thursday. Students have been discussing this for some time now. I would say cumulatively for about six hours at the UPUA Academic Affairs Committee, on Wednesday at the UP Student Caucus, this past Sunday just at the Student Caucus of University Park students and Commonwealth students a couple of hours ago. The overall revisions are considered decent, and the reason is that it addresses the problems of ambiguous terms of ten percent, where you don't know exactly where or how much is going to be offered at the end. In other words, it spreads out the course work and so forth for the reasons outlined in the legislation. It does provide benefits, but the problem with the policy, and maybe you can clarify this, is that last statement which was revised. There are exceptions to the revisions of the policy that may be granted only for educational reasons, and only is authorized by the faculty of the program offering the course. To me that completely voids the entire policy for what you just mentioned. What is an educational reason? Could that be for majors or a department where most students take major courses, that want to spread out the course work. What exactly does 'educational reasons' mean, and who exactly? Is it the faculty; is it the professor of the class; or is it the faculty as a unit offering the program? I think it is a little ambiguous and the concern more with students is not the fact that professors aren't going to be given the option to have a final. I think every student has a final during finals week. It's a fact

that you can have in all your classes multiple exams the last two weeks of class, counting upwards of 50 percent of your grade. Does University Park Academic Affairs Committee want the Undergraduate Education Committee to look into the fact that maybe a provision should be put in place of granting this broad exception where you potentially can have a final examination the last week of class with no regulation, or no provisions of conflict policy and so forth? Maybe the Academic Affairs Committee would be interested, or I should say the Undergraduate Education Committee would be interested, in looking into trying to regulate the process in which these exemptions can be given. I just wanted your thoughts and for the Senate to be aware of that.

Robin Bower: Well, I think I heard about 12 or 13 questions laced into that open discourse. I think that the original language was retained in that case; exception for educational reasons authorized by the faculty of the program offering the course. The faculty of the program offering the courses view language as the original policy and it was not grappled with as a part of the revision because that was not part of the perceived problem. The perceived problem was that exams worth 20 and 25 percent were being administered during the last week of classes; in lieu of during final exam week and that's what the revision addresses.

Michael Cardamone, Schuykill: I'm going to urge my colleagues to vote against this proposal. For several reasons; the first reason is, in the rationale we are told that this is a relatively common practice without any quantitative evidence of how widespread this practice really is. I don't know how widespread it is. Secondly, on the basis of having an arbitrary ten percent as the amount of material that can be covered in the last week of class, that is a pedagogical decision based on the part of the instructor in the course or the program that's offering the course, and in some instances, ten percent might be an appropriate number. In other instances, 25 percent might be an appropriate number. I don't know what the appropriate number is for every course in this University and I think that the Senate, if it adopts this policy, is overstepping its bounds and imposing the will of the Senate on individual faculty members beyond what it should be doing.

Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: I think we should support this proposal. I think it usefully defines a limitation that is already in there, but is quite vague. In response to the last comment, there can be many valid educational pedagogical reasons. All the individual faculty member needs to do is to get confirmation of that from the proven faculty as a whole. The policy is really intended to have people discontinue the early giving of exams just for convenience. Were there valid pedagogical reasons, then the proven faculty will endorse that, and then exams or other activities counting more than ten percent could, in fact, be included in the last week of classes.

Russell Frank, Communications: I've also heard some grumbling from colleagues that this sort of infringes on faculty members to organizing their classes as they see fit, but there's a more particular objection. I'll try to summarize in this email; it has to do with teachers with large General Education classes and the problem of final exam schedules not coming out at the very beginning of the semester. So students being students often make travel plans for finals week, and then they come to these instructors of large General Education classes saying "I can't be at the final exam because I have a plane ticket to Puerto Vallarta; what should I do?" So you wind up having to make all these special arrangements for a considerable number of students. In order

to avoid that nuisance of having to make all of these special arrangements or just going ahead and failing people for not showing up, people instead go ahead and offer the exam the last week of class to get around that problem. I think what this colleague of mine is suggesting is he didn't like the proposal, but is it ok if the proposal passes? Can't we, as other universities do, include the final exam schedule in the schedule of courses before people even enroll?

Robin Bower: I'll speak to that just very briefly. I think that students who are enrolling in the Pennsylvania State University are enrolling in a 15 week semester of instruction, to which is appended a one-week period of final examinations. If they choose to buy plane tickets to Puerto Vallarta, or any other fabulous destination, that's their choice. I, as a faculty member, am under no obligation to make any provision for that decision that the student makes. Indeed I think that it is out of respect to their maturity in determining their choices and accepting the outcomes of their choices. It would behoove me not to make any provision for that choice. Also, as far as the final examination schedule goes, the registrar's office informed me that scheduling final examinations is done as early as possible after the end of drop/add in order to be able to schedule examinations in such a way that minimizes conflicts for those student who are actually intending to stay for the entire semester rather than take off. So logistically, to do it any other way would invite untold difficulty in terms of the resolution of conflict period so that the registrar's office takes care of it as officially as possible, addressing all areas of inefficiency in their scheduling of final exams.

Tramble Turner, Abington: Like Senator Eckhardt, I rise to support this legislation. For purposes of support, however, I'd like to ask Robin to address two specific examples. The example might put at ease some concerns about the implications of that exceptions clause. Within the English department University-wide, there are not only General Education courses like composition courses in which we have no final examination. There are also General Education arts courses, and creative writing classes. My creative writing class has their portfolio due at the end of this week. As far as I understand this policy, that will be perfectly allowable. I would like clarification because a former committee member on Undergraduate Education is saying no, that's not right. You're the committee chair. I think that needs to be clarified in the minutes today before I can vote in good conscience. Program faculty have already approved it, so I don't know why it shouldn't be in effect.

Robin Bower: Yes, I think that that would be allowable if program faculties are willing to provide an educational justification for that exception. Yes, absolutely.

Ann Taylor, Earth and Mineral Sciences: In addition to some of the concerns already expressed, while I'm very happy to see that the revisions have taken into account that there are other means for doing final student assessment evaluations and a final exam, I am concerned that by default, unless there has been a program-wide exception, that term papers, studio projects, and things like that must be due no earlier than the first day of finals week. If I were a faculty member teaching a course that had that kind of a project in it, this would give me a lot of incentive to give a multiple-choice final exam, which may be totally inappropriate for my discipline, for my subject matter. Simply because waiting until the first day of final exams week, especially for a larger enrolling classes, would not allow time for adequate and meaningful feedback. My second concern is that, while I appreciate the change in what we're trying to

attempt here in solving a somewhat widespread problem, if the current policy is ignored I'm not sure that this is going to be any less ignored. It may introduce newer problems.

Robin Bower: As I've repeated many times, enforcement of the policy is not in the purview of the Undergraduate Education Committee. Issues of enforcement; I don't even want to begin to wrestle with that. However, as for the first issue that you raised, I think that it would be a mistake for faculty to go to a multiple-choice exam during final examinations week because there is specific revision for faculty whose pedagogical purposes are best served by some alternative means in lieu of, or intended with a written final examination occurring during that last week of instruction. That would be kind of the presentation of projects, or the presentation of creative pieces of writing that would require a kind of deliberation of the entire group of students and feedback and comment. The provision is made for that to happen, and it would be simply a matter of faculty members saying, "This is what I'm going to do, and these are my reasons to do it." I think we should all have that in mind as we craft our syllabi anyway.

Chair Blasko: Are there any things we have not heard before or brand new arguments before we go to a vote.

Martin Halstuk, Communications: I'm new to the Senate so there's a lot I don't know about the way the Senate procedures operate, nor do I know a great deal about my colleagues here. It would just be illuminating for me if I could just see a show of hands of senators who teach General Education classes of 300 students or more on a regular basis. Okay, we have one; we have two; three; any one else want to volunteer; four. Well I just wanted to know because I thought that would be illuminating. Thank you.

Chair Blasko: Senator Myers.

Jamie Myers, Education: I just wanted to clarify: If I read this correctly ignoring the exclusion exception provision, I can collect a term paper the last week of class that's worth more than ten percent if I have an exam.

Robin Bower: Excluding the provision, the exception clause, I don't think you can.

Jamie Myers: Well, I think I can. The way this reads is, "where the end of semester examinations are not administered."

Robin Bower: Yes, if you do have an exam.

Jamie Myers: If I administer an exam, then number five is mute. I can collect a term paper as well the final week of classes.

Robin Bower: Yes.

Jamie Myers: Ok then, I just wanted to make sure of that. Understand that's a problem in the way this is written.

Richard Englund, Erie: Being a cranky old curmudgeon, I would suggest that you vote in favor of this. This precise topic has come up in my class this week, it wasn't Puerto Vallarta, it was somewhere else, and fortunately I was not the curmudgeon that said go ahead, but I'm not moving my final. Someone else did that for me. I like there being a policy in existence and I like it being fairly well defined. Maybe this isn't perfect, but it's an improvement. I want to see the policy continue and go forward, so that I have that to fall back on. If someone else chooses not to give a final, that's ok. But I don't want to be forced into that by, "oh your final is at two o'clock, and that's the only final I have." I have a problem with that.

Chair Blasko: One last comment before we have our vote.

Michael Anderson, DUS Student Senator: If this is the last comment, I'd like to give it to the chair of the UPUA Academic Affairs Committee. If you will still hear this comment I'd like to make a brief one. Am I allowed to do that?

Chair Blasko: Very brief.

Michael Anderson: I just wanted to say, I have to do this because I wouldn't be doing my job of responsibilities to my constituencies. When I put this proposal before them, they looked at me like I had four eyes; the DUS Student Council that is. I'm in DUS. The fundamental problem was that students don't mind. One of the advantages to having finals the last week of classes is that it spreads out the finals over two weeks. We don't feel like it cuts down on instruction time because it could be given outside of class the way mid-terms are. The feeling of my constituencies was that by spreading it out you were actually affording students a greater benefit because now we don't have five finals during finals week that we have to cram for. But it can be spread out over that time period and students like the fact that their professors could do that if they so choose. There's definitely that perception among students that spreading it out would actually be a benefit to students. The problem is, if they do both; give one during the last week, and one during the final week. If we could just put it away, and I don't think this does that, it would give professors the option to just give one during the last week of class and not during finals week. I would encourage the Undergraduate Education Committee to look into that. If that's not something that we can do, then I would encourage you to vote against this.

Dennis Gouran, Liberal Arts: I believe that the appropriate way to do this is to end debate and I hope that we can end debate. I think that there are a lot of red herrings floating around in this discussion. The way to do this is to move to end debate, which I do.

Chair Blasko: All those in favor of ending debate, say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Blasko: Opposed, nay.

The ayes have it. Please press any key to wake your clicker. This report has been brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. To accept the report, please press the letter A and the enter key. To reject the report, press the letter B and enter. Go ahead and close polling. In favor 117, opposed 55. The motion passes.

Thank you Robin.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Policy HR40 Evaluation of Faculty Performance

Cynthia Brewer, Chair

This report is from the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs. It appears on today's agenda as Appendix F. Committee Chair Cynthia Brewer will present the report.

Cynthia Brewer, Earth and Mineral Sciences: Victor Brunsten, my vice-chair, is going to help me out. I'd also like to acknowledge Ira Ropson who was chair of the Faculty Development Subcommittee of Faculty Affairs. That group wrote the bulk of this report last year and we've been working on this for about a year and a half.

Post-tenure review (extended review) is already a Penn State policy. It is already mandated in HR40, so the report you have here revises HR40. About two years ago, when the Faculty Senate surveyed tenured professors who had undergone extended review, respondents disliked the current process. It feels like busywork. It is redundant with the annual review. It is unfairly different in content and purpose among units. Some units were not doing reviews at that point when we did the survey and some were not reviewing all individuals. Some faculty members were not receiving feedback. Some faculty members were receiving feedback in a group forum.

The small number of faculty members who were satisfied with their extended reviews were in colleges with more emphasis on professional development in that extended review process. Their reviews were more forward looking. If you look back to the 1999 Senate proceedings, the discussion was around the forward looking policy. That's not how it was implemented in some of the units, but that was the intention.

Faculty peer review is part of many tenure-related procedures. Peers evaluate you for tenure and promotion (HR23). When things go wrong, there are faculty peers on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (HR76) who evaluate your grievances, and there are also faculty on the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure (HR70). Peers serve on committees that award sabbaticals (HR17) and Distinguished Professorships (HR10).

Let's change the extended review procedure from something administrators do to us, to something that we do as a faculty. Every five years, let's get a thoughtful reaction from other PSU professors about our plans for future work and the changes in our careers.

Currently it is a redundant process when the same supervising administrator is looking at similar materials for annual and extended reviews. Changing both the evaluation materials and who responds to them makes this something worth doing, makes it forward looking.

What the committee has proposed is a slim packet of information to support the review procedure; it is a narrative statement emphasizing your future plans in three pages or less. It's your career CV, you should have that going already, always. So print that off, maybe updating it with a few last things. It's an SRTE table for the last five years (for the review period) or other performance documentation, and that's to accommodate some faculty members—for librarians, for example, who wouldn't typically have SRTEs. Also, the last five annual review letters that you've received from the supervising administrator would be included.

These materials will be reviewed by other professors. That could simply be a group of people your unit elects to look over the materials. They will give you some written feedback and you'll meet with a supervising administrator to discuss your plans.

The specifics of which administrative level evaluates you and how the peer committee is selected are to be decided by each unit's faculty. The committee proposed this flexibility to accommodate the wide variation in unit size and structure at Penn State.

So, do I have questions for Appendix F?

Zachary T. Irwin, Erie: I think this is an excellent report and I commend the revision of any kind of legislation. I would like possibly to offer a small amendment. Of course this report, were it implemented, would require a great deal more work, both on the part of the faculty, and the administrators who are planning for the review. It seems to me that this requires more time than a notification. I'm suggesting as an amendment on page five in the first full paragraph, that the sentence read: "To provide adequate preparation time, faculty members should be given notice of at least *two semesters* in advance of the submission deadline," because in effect the submission deadline is noted in the page of the review. In the experience of our unit, unlike annual reviews, it has not always been an entirely obvious matter who was going to be reviewed every five years. Two months prior to that seems far too short a time.

Cynthia Brewer: Thank you Zach. The Faculty Affairs Committee did reflect on comments from the survey that some people were given two days to prepare materials. We explicitly put an amount of time to prepare in there. Zach, I don't think it's much more work. A lot of units have quite a bit more burdensome dossier preparations than what we've described here. We've reduced the amount of work in my opinion to prepare for this, and an annual review is a mandated policy, so it's not something administrators haven't been doing. That's some additional feedback.

Chair Blasko: We have an amendment, so we need a second if anyone is interested in that amendment. Do we have a second to Zach's amendment for two semesters? We'll need to vote on the amendment.

Cynthia Brewer: I don't think the committee would be opposed to that amendment. Is there any discussion on the amendment?

Chair Blasko: Yes, is there discussion? Maybe we can do a voice vote on the amendment and see if it's close. If it's close we can use the clickers. Parliamentarian, is that alright?

Jean Landa Pytel, Parliamentarian: Yes.

Chair Blasko: All those in favor of this amendment, please say Aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Blasko: Opposed, nay.

Senators: Nay.

Chair Blasko: The voice vote was too close to call, so we will go to the clickers. We are just voting for the amendment right now, not on the whole report. Press any key to wake up your clicker again. Go ahead and press A if you agree with the amendment. Press B if you do not agree with the amendment, and hit enter. Does anyone need more time? I think we can close the polling. The amendment passes 93 to 62 opposed. We can go back to the discussion of the report. Other questions related to the report?

Brian Tormey, Altoona: I'd like to offer this as a friendly amendment, if it's acceptable to do that. That would mean we wouldn't have to vote. Two words as an insertion on the last page of the report, second line down, I would like to substitute the word approval for participation.

So that first sentence would read: "Guidelines for five-year extended reviews, consistent with this policy statement, must be established with the *approval* of the unit's faculty by each college or school."

Cynthia Brewer: I consider that a friendly amendment. That language is existing language from the policy that we didn't edit. We tried to keep our editing of the existing policy to a minimum.

Brian Tormey: The second word insertion would be between *similar* and *units*. Following the dash, "which may in turn ask for more precise guidelines from departments or other similar *faculty* units," just to be more specific. It again is consistent with prior legislation.

Cynthia Brewer: I consider those friendly amendments. Thank you.

Dennis Gouran, Liberal Arts: The senators in the Liberal Arts caucus discussed this proposal at some length and we find it internally inconsistent. On page five of the document peer review is mandated, and on page six of the document the line reads that *unit guidelines will establish the level of peer evaluation*, which would seem unprincipled to allow the units that develop those guidelines to say that there will be no peer review. In addition to that, there's strong sentiment against mandating peer review if that is not what the members of the faculty would like to see happen. On behalf of that caucus I would like to amend the policy statement as proposed to make it internally consistent. Yet on page five, that would include in the first paragraph under first-year extended review, in the next to the last line, deleting will, and substituting may, if unit guidelines so permit, and then in the final line inserting after and must involve. On page six, in the underlined material at the top of the page, with the sentence

beginning unit guidelines and the next line after selection of peer committees that should read “if applicable”.

Cynthia Brewer: What the Faculty Affairs Committee intended by *level of peer evaluation* was, is it at the department, the disciplinary, the division, the college level; that’s what we meant by level of peer evaluations. I don’t see that as a contradiction to what’s on page five about requiring peer evaluation.

Dennis Gouran: I didn’t say that it’s apparent contradiction, it allows for that interpretation and that makes it contradictory.

Cynthia Brewer: What interpretation of the level of peer evaluation did you mean?

Dennis Gouran: I was just saying that if the guidelines establish the level of peer evaluation, if the guidelines say that there will be no peer evaluation, which is permitted under the way this is phrased, and also we’re opposed to it. There are two reasons for making this amendment.

Cynthia Brewer: It’s not a friendly amendment. The committee feels strongly that peer evaluation is an important part.

Dennis Gouran: Well, I beg to differ. In the language, there is nothing unfriendly about this amendment, it makes the language consistent.

Chair Blasko: We would need to vote on this amendment, because it does change the policy significantly. This may be a close vote, so I think we can have a discussion on this amendment. Is there discussion?

Leonard Berkowitz, York: I’m very concerned because I agree completely with Dennis Gouran. We’ve had this discussion earlier at the caucus, in fact at Council I raised this issue. The faculties at my campus agree with the Liberal Arts caucus completely, in that mandating a peer review in this case is both unnecessary and unwise. This is overall an excellent document; it creates a number of major changes and major clarifications in the extended review process. What we’re concerned about is mandating a peer review which will increase what is a growing problem in this University, where fewer and fewer tenured faculty are having to take on more and more responsibility. What we have to do is balance whether the usefulness of those extra responsibilities is worth it. Our strong view in this case is that it is not worth it, because quite correctly this proposal explains that the major purpose of the extended review is faculty development, as opposed to what promotion and tenure reviews are, which are mainly evaluative. Therefore, we believe that it’s not as important in this case; it doesn’t meet that burden of necessity. If you hadn’t done it, I was going to propose exactly the same amendment because this still allows every unit that wants it to have the peer involvement. The only thing their version does is mandate it where the faculty don’t want it. I can see no good justification for that.

Cynthia Brewer: The committee felt that it was an important part of making this a faculty-driven process. When I served on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and reviewed grievances,

most of them hinged on a professor who is targeted by an administrator that's unfriendly, an administrator that is not understanding of what their goals are. It's important to have another voice in this process, in my opinion, and in my committee's opinion.

Victor Brunsten, Altoona: Len, I have to disagree. As part of the promotion and tenure process, the second-and-fourth year reviews are explicitly developmental. We already have faculty involved in faculty development. They may not work out that way in practice; however, that is the intent of the second-and-fourth year reviews. Not that mine was particularly developmental, but nevertheless we do have that there, and I think that it is very important to keep peer review in this so that there is feedback by which our supervising administrators are held accountable to our peers. If we lose the mandatory nature of peer review in this then, that's no longer there, and you can bet your bottom dollar in most units it's going to disappear.

Cynthia Brewer: You'll notice that we have the five annual review letters that the peers are looking at. This is a way to encourage administrators to write substantive, helpful, and useful annual evaluations for you. When we go around the room in Faculty Affairs, there's one person from most units. Some people are getting one number; that's the sole feedback they get on their years worth of work. Some people are getting the same bulleted letter every year. Some people are just getting very minimal information every year. So having faculty look at the evaluation that comes to them from their supervising administrator is important.

Tramble Turner, Abington: I am going to speak in favor of the Gouran amendment, and Lenny and I didn't talk about this in advance, but the work load issue is a primary concern. Bear with me one moment. Having been in your shoes, when this legislation was presented in 1999 it was myself and the now retired senator Lou Milakofsky who presented it. There were four amendments at the time. There are two key things I'd like to bring up from that, since I haven't had the opportunity to before. The thrust was always developmental, though it was not carried out that way at many locations as our new Vice Provost revealed with the survey. The context was the outside pressure, as former Vice Provost Bob Secor pointed out, if we didn't do something; Harrisburg might; other states had. The third point, and the sensible way, I suggest, of keeping peer reviews in through the process was presented then, and that some units did, and that was when the results were unsatisfactory in terms of progress in career goals. Then the administrators referred the faculty member to a peer committee that provided advice and counsel. With our work load, at least at locations where many of us are on a multitude of committees, that process made sense. It didn't happen to get implemented, but I think it made sense then and it would make sense now. The reality is the administrator is the one who is going to make the call on the salary increment, and in P&T decisions whether the dossier goes forward or not. In your document on page six after you have the reference to the peer committee, you still say it's going to be the peer committee and the administrator. So I think Dennis had brought up an important point and I hope that there's soon a vote on that amendment, and that people will vote in favor of it or refer it back to committee which is another option

Cynthia Brewer: They are not against peer review because it gives them quality information; they're against it because they don't want to do committee work.

Chair Blasko: Cindy could you make Barb's the last comment, and then vote on the amendment?

Barbara Wiens-Tuers, Altoona: Point of clarification; if the language was changed from mandatory to units may do that, and if they wanted to do that and the administrator didn't, who'd win?

Cynthia Brewer: The faculty would win, because we accepted the previous amendment *with the approval of the faculty*.

Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: The amendment that was just accepted earlier, where participation of the unit's faculty has been changed to approval of the unit's faculty, makes it unnecessary for the report as a whole to mandate peer review committees. In the sense that if the unit faculty want to do that, they'll do that and they now have approval control over the guidelines. If the unit's faculties do not feel that a cost benefit analysis for them makes it worth while, I don't think that the Senate should be ordering them against their own best judgment to do so; and I therefore support the amendment and hope that others will too.

Barbara Gray, Business: Sitting next to Dennis, I think I am going to have to respectfully disagree. I am also a member of this committee, and we began with information suggesting that faculty who were being reviewed, or not, were not being treated fairly and equitably across the University. We have members from units where that was happening, and who described that to us. Our intention with this legislation, with this amendment, is to provide something equitable across the University with faculty. My fear is that if we leave it open to units to decide, that equity will not be in place and will not be obtained. Peer evaluation in my judgment is part of our responsibility as faculty members. That is something that we can do and offer to our colleagues. I know that it is burdensome. I've sat on many committees myself in the almost 30 years I've been here, but I think it's an obligation we do share and I would encourage you not to support the amendment that's on the floor.

Cynthia Brewer: So let's vote, Dennis.

Dennis Gouran: Well, I don't think debate has been shut off. I earlier suggested how you do that, but since you are giving the report I don't think you're in a position to give that motion. I would like to comment on the distinction between friendliness and hostility, because if the amendment contained wording that would remove the possibility for units to establish peer review, I would regard that as a hostile amendment. I do not regard what has been proposed there as a hostile amendment, which allows for any unit that so decides to give peer review as part of the process to do so. It's in that sense that I find the amendment compatible and friendly. As to the distinction between equity and equality, they are not the same thing and for some units equality of procedure would be one of the most inequitable things you could do to them.

Steve Peterson, Harrisburg: I have an ethical question here. I am the one who carries out the annual evaluations. Any number of times, faculty has asked me: will anyone see this, and I will say it is between you and me. I find that making those annual performance evaluations open in a sense may create some problems when there are some people who had operated under the

assumption that these were confidential between the supervisor and the faculty member. If my faculty readily agree to make those available; fine by me, but I would feel very uneasy after having given my word, to all of the sudden see those things released. Now, that may be unique and idiosyncratic, but it's one of the first things that occurs to me as I look at this.

Cynthia Brewer: We're not talking about the salary statement. Do you understand that? Some units already include them as their part of the packet, so that's not a concern across the board.

Kim Steiner, Agricultural Sciences: I sense the discussion is winding down on this, so there may not be much more to say. Let me just point out that I have also served on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, and I've also reviewed hundreds of P&T dossiers. That experience tells me that there have been times that I would have loved to have had peer review more than I would have had a review by the department head. Let me say that I've also been at the University for over 30 years, and I've had good department heads, and I've had bad department heads. But, peer reviews don't guarantee good results, and what you sometimes see is that collegiality insinuates itself into the process. Collegiality is specifically prohibited as criteria in promotion and tenure in HR23. It ought to be something that's not part of our annual periodic reviews either. I say that as one of the most collegial people in the University. Take that for what it's worth. Peer reviews don't guarantee fairness and good judgment and in fact, in my experience looking at P&T dossiers, that may not only be the rule; it may be actually the exception. In departments where it would work well, I think those departments would be free with Dennis' amendment to put that in as part of the process. In other departments, I think it ought to be left out, and I agree with Dennis; equality is not equity. One size doesn't fit all for the whole University.

Chair Blasko: Are there any more comments?

Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: I just had a question about where it says that the peers and administrator may be at the department, division, campus, school, or college level. Who's going to decide for any individual faculty what level they are going to be at? I can see, especially for those of us that work at a campus and that are tenured in a University Park college, a lot of confusion. I'd also like to mention that Lehigh Valley Faculty Affairs Committee met yesterday, and I was instructed to vote against this. They were very much against the idea of peer review as part of the five-year review.

Cynthia Brewer: We were asking units to decide which level is suitable for them. The current HR40 policy does not tell you how a person tenured at University Park and at a campus should be administered. So whatever procedure you're following, you should go ahead and follow that. What you're doing for annual review, you can continue to follow that. For the extended review, you can make a policy on your campus on what group should evaluate everyone who is tenured at University Park. It's not appropriate to do that detail in this policy, it didn't have it before, so it's not confusing that it still doesn't have it.

Roger Egolf: Well, the way it works now is it's done at the campus level by the DAA.

Cynthia Brewer: So make that your campus policy.

Roger Egolf: But which group decides? It says the faculty will approve it, but who decides which faculty approves it?

Chair Blasko: Remember that we're focusing on the amendment now, not the overall report. Are these questions about the amendment? Cindy, whoever's hand was up first—all in favor of ending the discussion say Aye.

Senators: Aye

Chair Blasko: Opposed, say nay.

Victor Brunsten: That last sentence should read *The extended review process may, if unit guidelines so permit, include peer review by Penn State faculty and must involve one-on-one discussion with a supervising administrator.* Then on page six, starting with – *Unit guidelines will establish the level of peer evaluation, the process for selection of peer committees if applicable, and who the evaluating administrator will be.* Is that correct?

Chair Blasko: Are you ready to vote? Just on the amendment, not on the report. So, wake up your clickers. All those in favor of the amendment, please press A and enter. All those opposed, please press B and enter. Votes in favor of the amendment 110; votes opposed 51, so the amendment has passed. Let's go back to the main report. Is there any further discussion before we vote?

Salvatore Marsico, Wilkes-Barre: Just for clarification, can you tell me if this policy applies to all faculty in the extended review?

Cynthia Brewer: For the extended review we clarified, or more narrowly specified, that it was post-tenure review. I understand that some units had been using the policy for all faculty, and that's great. We feel at the current state that the promotion procedures and personnel policies for fixed-term faculty across the board are very poorly defined. So to require units who don't have that policy set in order to do this for their fixed-term faculty seemed like jumping the gun a bit. So you're welcome to continue it and adopt it for fixed-term faculty. We have other reports coming on improving procedures for fixed-term faculty, so we thought we should wait until those committee policies come into place.

Salvatore Marsico: May I have a follow up comment? We have continuing appointments that are basically on a fixed-term line, but they go on perpetually just like a tenure line. So is there a distinction of classes of faculty, and if these are on long-term appointment, why wouldn't they also be subject to the extended review as the tenure line would be?

Cynthia Brewer: Faculty appointments are multiple types. There are standing, multi-year, tenure; those aren't synonyms. We worked on this last year with HR21, if you remember the professor of practice discussion. Again, what we wrote in here specifically was post tenure, so you have to have tenure to be required to do this. If your unit wants to do it for your continuing appointments, that's fine, but it's really inconsistent across units how people who are on

continuing but not tenure line, and who are on multi-year (all those nuances); it's pretty up in the air how those are treated. So we didn't feel like we should put that into the policy currently.

Winston Richards, Harrisburg: My question is, what is a resource target and how does one become a resource target?

Cynthia Brewer: Winston, are you referring to the last page? What are you referring to?

Winston Richards: I'm referring to rationale, the last two lines in the rationale. It says: ***In addition, performance reviews can help identify resource targets.***

Cynthia Brewer: Resources might be more pay; they might be a reduction in teaching load; they might be a different teaching load; they might be lab space; they might be travel money for conferences; they might be teaching release to develop an on-line course to receive on-line development training. There are lots of things that are valuable resources to faculty. So that's what we meant by resource targets.

Leonard Berkowitz: Now you have a good policy. I'm glad to hear you recognize the importance of units making decisions, but that brings me to my question. Could you please clarify for the record what you mean by unit.

Cynthia Brewer: Again, we were editing an existing policy, and the existing policy uses the term unit throughout. So if you see for example on the top of page six; the existing wording was: ***must be established by the participation of the unit's faculty by each college or school, which may in turn ask for more precise guidance from departments or other similar units while keeping the responsibility of oversight.*** So we continue to write consistent with that paragraph; for *faculty units*, it depends where you put your evaluation. There are so many kinds of units here; there are departments, disciplinary groups, divisions, schools, colleges, and small colleges that don't have departments. We seem to function quite well in all of our other HR policies in deciding who's going to do your P & T and things like that, but to write in an exhaustive assignment here seems both unnecessary and counterproductive. We mean by unit, what you meant when you wrote this policy in 1999. That policy was here before the Senate when you were chair.

Leonard Berkowitz: It was my understanding at the time, because this came up, that unit at that time referred to college or school, and that unit could then, as you say, assign it for down the line. The reason it has to be decided right now is this policy now says the guidelines have to be such with the approval of the unit's faculty. So in order for that to work, we have to know what that unit group is. It seems to me if we just say college or the equivalent, which is in some cases school. I just wanted to clarify that on the record, and that's what I thought she would do, but she didn't. So, now I want it on the record that that's what it means.

Cynthia Brewer: So Lenny's suggesting that the existing wording defines unit as a college or school. It's still a little tricky, because there are some schools within colleges. So I'm okay with that.

Barbara Gray: Since there was some confusion, Cynthia, about the wording that we had in there about *establishes the level of peer evaluation*, I wonder if we might want to help with a friendly amendment. We might want to just change that wording to read *Unit guidelines will establish at what level (e.g., department, program, college) the peer evaluation will occur*. So it doesn't reflect that it can be the degree of evaluation; it reflects where it is occurring.

Cynthia Brewer: So that sentence would be: *Unit guidelines will establish at what level peer evaluation will occur (department or college, for example)*. Keep it short; we're not going to try to name every unit. I consider it a friendly amendment, and I do understand it. Does anyone want Victor to write it out; it's pretty straight forward? *Unit guidelines will establish at what level (department or college, for example) peer evaluation will occur*. It has more things going on there. So that would be a friendly amendment. So we don't have to vote on it.

Caroline Eckhardt: I think you have to put in there – *peer evaluation if any*.

Cynthia Brewer: We did that already.

Caroline Eckhardt: *Will occur*; the *will* is a mandate otherwise, and so if you're making the change that you just wrote up there now, you need to include *if any*. Otherwise legislation is inconsistent.

Cynthia Brewer: I think we took care of that with that previous amendment; it says if applicable. We already have wording for that.

Caroline Eckhardt: But you still left *will*.

Cynthia Brewer: Ok, *may*. I don't think *will* is inconsistent. *Will occur if applicable*, that's a reasonable sentence. Ok, we're really doing details here; I don't think this is really key.

Patricia Amburgy, Arts and Architecture: My college caucus also spent some time discussing this. I was elected to bring forth a suggestion for an amendment. I don't know if it's a friendly one or not. Consider changing the five years to seven years to extend the amount of time.

Cynthia Brewer: Discussion on that; second on that? The existing policy has *for example, five years* and most units had adopted a five year schedule, but some had adopted a seven year schedule. The committee is not opposed to that.

David Good, Medicine: I think seven years is personally too long. Having been at other institutions where people are reviewed at five years that seems to work pretty well. Seven years is a little long for feedback to faculty in a formal way, and in my opinion five years is more appropriate.

Cynthia Brewer: Thank you; that was our feeling as well. So there's no other comment on that amendment?

Chair Blasko: Other comments on that amendment? Ok, let's vote on the amendment to change it from five years to seven years. We can do a voice vote. All in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Blasko: Opposed say nay.

Senators: Nay.

Chair Blasko: Ok, the amendment is defeated. Okay, we're back at Tram.

Tramble Turner: I move to call the question on the report.

Chair Blasko: All in favor of ending discussion please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Blasko: Opposed say nay.

Cynthia Brewer: We are voting on the edit to the policy. Our parliamentarian says that we should vote on the whole policy, and that's fine with me. On the whole thing; *if applicable* has been inserted, yes.

<Inaudible discussion.>

Cynthia Brewer: I wrote down *if applicable* when Carey was talking, but either one is fine with me.

Chair Blasko: I think we are now voting on the entire package as amended, including all of the amendments that we approved. All those in favor of this report, please press A and hit enter. All those opposed, please press B and enter. If anybody is having problems with your clicker, raise your hand and we'll get you help. Keep your hand up if you are having problems so we can find you. We can close polling. The final vote is 119 in favor, 29 opposed. Thank you.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment

Mid-Cycle Report on the Framework to Foster Diversity, Appendix G. Vice Provost for Educational Equity Terrell Jones presented this report. This report is posted on the Senate Web site at <http://www.senate.psu.edu/agenda/2007-2008/dec11-07agn/appg.pdf>.

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

Associate Professors: Time in Rank, Appendix H. This report provides information on the time that associate professors are spending in rank, beginning with appointment or promotion to that position. Analysis by gender, minority status, and location is given.

Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits

Report of the University's Initiatives on Faculty and Staff Wellness, Appendix I. A review of past and current wellness initiatives supported by the University and the University's top health risks.

Senate Council

Summary of Fall 2007 Officers' Campus Visits, Appendix J. The Senate officers visited Beaver, Berks, Erie, Lehigh Valley, Mont Alto, Shenango, and York. This report summarizes meetings with students, faculty, and administrators.

Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education

Summary of Petitions by College, Campus, and Unit 2006-2007, Appendix K. This report provides data on the types of student petitions (drop/add, withdrawal, late registration, etc.) by college and location for 2006-2007.

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

NONE

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

NONE

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Blasko: May I have a motion to adjourn?

Senators: So moved.

Chair Blasko: All those in favor, please say Aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Blasko: Motion carried. The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, January 29, 2008, at 1:30 p.m. in Room 112 Kern Graduate Building.