

**Penn State Harrisburg
Faculty Senate Agenda
Tuesday April 15, 2014**

Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room C300 11:50-1:20 p.m.

- A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING
Approval of Senate Minutes February 27, 2014 Appendix "A"

- B. APPROVAL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Approval of Minutes from the March 6, 2014 meeting Appendix "B"

- C. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE
Findings from the Athletics Committee Questionnaire Appendix "C"
Faculty Affairs Large Enrolled Course Survey Appendix "D"

- D. REPORT OF THE SENATE PRESIDENT
 - a. Update on prior meeting agenda items:
 - i. Maymester thoughts
 - ii. Weather delay condensed schedule to be recommended as a charge for Enrollment Management and Outreach
 - iii. Summary of Tobacco Usage Task Force Forum, April 7

- E. COMMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR

- F. COMMENTS FROM THE UNIV. COUNCIL REP

- G. NEW BUSINESS
 - i. Hand over the reins to President-Elect Rich Young

- H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- I. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

- J. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

- K. FORENSIC BUSINESS

- L. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE COLLEGE
 - Athletics Committee April 3, 2014 Appendix "E"
 - Faculty Affairs Committee March 27, 2014 Appendix "F"
 - International and Intercultural Affairs Committee February 19, 2014 Appendix "G"

The end of year meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 13, 2014, from 12-5pm in C300.

THE CAPITAL COLLEGE
 JOINT MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE & ACADEMIC COUNCIL
 MINUTES
 February 27, 2014

Attendees:

Capital College Senators: S. Agili, E. Delozier, R. Gray, G. Mazis, C. Rios, C. Sabina, M. Strickland, G. Subramanian, P. Thompson, R. Young

Academic Council: R. Bachnak, G. Crawford, P. Idowu, P. Johnson, S. Peterson, C. Surra, M. Walters

Administrators Present: O. Ansary, M. Kulkarni

Student Representative: K. Seaman

Catherine Rios, Faculty Senate President opened the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

A. Minutes Approval for Faculty Senate Meeting

Rios requested a motion to approve the minutes from the January 23, 2014 meeting. A motion was made by Mazis/Young to approve the minutes and they were unanimously approved.

B. Minutes Approval for Academic Affairs Meeting

Rios requested a motion to approve the minutes from the February 4, 2014 Academic Affairs committee meeting. Gray would like to have IUG (Integrated Undergraduate and Graduate) spelled out in the minutes. A motion was made by Thompson/Subramanian to approve the minutes, with noted change, and they were unanimously approved.

C. Communications to the Senate

Rios received an e-mail message concerning the Maymester. The faculty member questioned the integrity of the course offerings and the content of the courses. Rios would like to place the item on the agenda for the next meeting.

D. Report of the Senate President

a. Update on prior meeting agenda items:

- i. Senate Notes were distributed prematurely, before the Faculty Senate was able to review. The notes provided information on the University General Education Task Force (GEFT). Faculty is encouraged to visit the web page that was established for the task force at <http://gened.psu.edu/>.
- ii. Senate Notes also included links for resources for providing make-up classes due to snow days. The Faculty Center has resources that they can provide to faculty to make up the classes. They include podcasts, videotaping lectures and posting information to ANGEL. McQuiggan would appreciate any ideas that faculty members would like to share. Ansary would like to have a Senate committee review the possibility of creating a condensed schedule on days when there is a delay.

Considerations should also be given to students with limited access to technology.

- iii. Two faculty forums have been scheduled on campus internationalization. The first will be held on Tuesday, March 18, 2014 from 12-1:15pm in TL-128. A panel of international students representing multiple countries and academic programs will share their adjustment to life in Middletown and learning at Penn State Harrisburg. The second will be held on Tuesday, April 1, 2014, from 12-1:15pm in W107. This forum will discuss resources available to faculty and their international students. Faculty panelists will share the instructional strategies that are working well in their classes, the resources they have used, and how they have addressed the challenges and benefits of a diverse class.
- iv. Recommendations from Tobacco Usage Task Force – Thompson reported that the task force met and much discussion occurred regarding a smoking policy. They will explore best practices at other universities. They may establish a physical space on campus for people to smoke, along with a marketing campaign to promote and support smoking cessation programs.

E. Comments by the Chancellor

- Kulkarni reported that the effects of the football scandal are now waning and enrollment numbers for Fall 2014 are strong.
- The college strategic planning has begun and Rios, Young and members of the faculty senate strategic planning committee have been meeting on Fridays. All units have submitted their plans and they are in the review process. The process will be complete by the end of March. Once the college and campus plans are completed, the University will begin on creating a University wide plan.
- Penn State's new president, Eric Barron, will visit campuses before the end of the academic year.
- The design of the new Student Enrichment Center is moving quickly and the architects are working on the design.

F. Comments from the University Council Representative

Ruiz was not available and did not provide notes for the meeting.

G. New Business

- a. Discussion points for joint meeting with Academic Council
 - i. Protocol and culture of dealing with student complaints was presented. Often times, there is not a consistent protocol to handle complaints. Peterson offered the example of the protocol for the School of Public Affairs: student takes issue to the faculty member, then program coordinator, then school director, then, if necessary, Don Holtzman or Ansary. Bachnak noted that is it important to listen to both sides of the issue before making a judgment. Peterson also noted that World Campus has a help desk that addresses student issues. Strickland recommended the

creation of a student complaint checklist to provide students with the proper procedure.

- ii. General Education Review – discussed previously.

H. Unfinished Business

None

I. New Legislative Business

Two new University Senate Representatives have been elected. Rajarajan (Roger) Subramanian, Lecturer in Civil Engineering and Samuel Winch, Associate Professor of Communications and Humanities were elected for a four year term. Matthew Wilson will be the new University Council Representative from Penn State Harrisburg.

J. Legislative Reports

None

K. Forensic Business

None

L. Advisory/Consultative Reports

The senate members were asked to review the policy for supplemental compensation for faculty with standing appointments and the policy for summer compensation for faculty members with standing appointments and fixed-term 1 appointments. Ansary would like to post this information on the web site.

M. Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the College

None

A motion to adjourn was made by Young/Delozier at 1:23pm.

The next meeting of the Penn State Harrisburg Faculty Senate is Tuesday, March 25, 2014 – 11:50-1:20pm in the Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room.

/slp

**MINUTES
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Thursday March 6, 2014
12:00 – 12:50 P.M.**

Members present: Rick Ciocci, Gregory Crawford, Jennifer Hirt, and Linda Null

Members voting via e-mail: David Witwer and Odd Stalebrink

Invited guests: Patricia Kaley, Katina Moten, and Richard Young

Senate Liaison: Girish Subramanian

1. L. Null opened the meeting at 12:00pm.
2. The minutes from the February 4, 2014 meeting were available for review in the ANGEL folder. A motion to approve was made by Crawford/Ciocci and was unanimously approved.

3. **Approval of Courses/Programs Proposals**

The Humanities Program change and courses were considered together as a packet. Dr. Patricia Johnson

As requested by the Core Council, the Interdisciplinary Humanities major is replacing its legacy "Bachelor of Humanities degree" with the Bachelor of Arts degree. The program is also restructuring its degree requirements. The program has not been revised since 2001 and since that time Penn State Harrisburg has begun offering courses for first and second year students. The existing program was developed as a junior-senior transfer program. The new program has been directed at four year majors.

The major changes in the proposal are:

- a. To change the program name from Interdisciplinary Humanities to Humanities. This will allow the program to cohere with the existing Humanities M.A. program. The plan is to develop an IUG for the two programs once the undergraduate program changes have been put in place.
- b. To add two new courses, HUM 100 and HUM 200, as required courses for the major. These two courses will introduce students to the terminology and interpretive methods of different fields in the Humanities. They will also provide students with a broad overview of major works in different fields.
- c. To specify that students pick two subfields for coursework, one requiring 12 credits and the second 9 credits.

The following courses were reviewed with the program change:

I HUM 150, I HUM 300W, I HUM 311, I HUM 400, I HUM 410, I HUM 430, I HUM 453, I HUM 460, I HUM 461, I HUM 491, I HUM 495, I HUM 494, I HUM 496, I HUM 497, I HUM 499, HUM 200

All courses above will be changed from I HUM to HUM. Null questioned the number of course credits for I HUM 460 and I HUM 461 (listed as a maximum of 99). Credits also needed to be revised for I HUM 491 and I HUM 495. HUM 100 was going through the

approval process in CSCS. The Committee reviewed the course during the meeting so that the packet would not be delayed.

A motion to approve the Humanities program change and associated courses, with noted changes, was made by Ciocci/Crawford and was unanimously approved.

ENVE 411 and ENVE 470 – Dr. Shirley Clark

The undergraduate Environmental Engineering program is merging into the Civil Engineering undergraduate program. Therefore, CHEM 301 will no longer be offered at this campus (it is not a required course in the Civil Engineering undergraduate program) and needs to be removed from the prerequisite list. This change will align the course with the program of study offered by the Civil Engineering undergraduate degree.

The Committee requested that wording be added in the justification regarding the removal of the chemistry prerequisite.

A motion to approve, with noted changes, was made by Ciocci/Crawford and was unanimously approved.

CE 445, CE 449 and CE 456 – Dr. Seroj Mackertich

In order to comply with ABET accreditation, the Civil Engineering program is changing the prerequisites for these courses. CE courses are engineering courses and CET courses are technology courses. According to ABET, engineering and technology courses should not be mixed together. The content in the CE and CET courses is the same; however, this change must be completed for accreditation.

Witwer requested that the justification include more information about the change and the ABET requirements.

Several typographical errors and grammar were noted and will be corrected before final submission.

A motion to approve, with noted changes, was made by Ciocci/Crawford and was unanimously approved.

4. Old/New Business

The subcommittee is still working on the Program and Course Handbook. The members are awaiting information on the new online program proposal system. Discussion ensued regarding the General Education Task Force and the changes that will be coming about from that committee. Members can check <http://gened.psu.edu/> for more information.

Dr. Ansary's office will be offering a regional meeting regarding the changes on Wednesday, March 26, 2014. All faculty members will be invited and more information will be forthcoming.

5. Final Spring 2014 meeting date
Tuesday, April 22, 2014 12-1:20pm W207

Adjournment at 12:50pm

Appendix “C”
Athletics Committee of the Faculty Senate
Penn State Harrisburg
Athletics Questionnaire Summary
2013 – 2014

In evaluating the questionnaire responses, the committee found the following to be common themes among the comments regarding class syllabi and expected student-athlete absences:

- **Communication** is a key element to a productive faculty/student-athlete relationship. This was perhaps the most common theme among the responses.
- **Notification** of expected absences. This should occur early in the semester as well as when the expected absence is approaching. Documentation should be provided by the athletic department.
- **Definition of excused absences.** Several respondents chose to define excused and unexcused absences.
- **The expectation of making up all aspects of missed work.** Ultimately, the responsibility of making up the work falls on the students, though several respondents listed avenues to assist the students with this.

The committee recommends that faculty members:

- Familiarize themselves on Faculty Senate Policy 42-27 Class Attendance
- Include and/or stress the above topics in syllabi for all classes
- Should continue to include any specifics regarding absences, excused or otherwise

The committee also offers the following section to include in syllabi:

“University Related Activities and Class Attendance: Refer to policy 42-27 (insert link) regarding absences due to university related activities. Student athletes are required to provide professors with a team schedule and a class absence form at the beginning of each season. Student athletes are encouraged to meet with the professor the week before the athletic event to try to discuss any missed work due to the athletic contest, and to notify the professor of any changes or updates to the season schedule as soon as possible.”

The following is a summary of the responses, with some examples of syllabi sections or comments about syllabi that the committee found to be effective in conveying the recommended information.

Do you have a specific policy in your respective syllabi addressing class absences?

58% - Yes

42% - No

When do athletes approach you to discuss their schedules regarding missed classes?

81% - beginning of the season

55% - week of event

Given the options in above question, when would you prefer to hear from the athlete regarding a missed class?

66% - beginning of the season

33% - week of event

How do you accommodate a student when they miss a lecture due to an athletic event?

69% - Make up the work on their own

76% - Have them check the power point in Angel or information posted on a professor's website

73% - Talk with another student in the class

66% - Have the student stop by your office during office hours to review

Syllabi excerpts offered by faculty members:

“Your presence in class is essential to your ability to understand and apply the material covered in this course. It should be obvious that missing multiple class sessions will jeopardize your ability to fully grasp the course material. If for some reason, e.g., illnesses, travel related to team sports or other university activity, injury, family emergency, or religious observance, you cannot attend a class, please inform me as soon as possible prior to the missed class session. I will determine the minimal attendance and participation required to meet course obligations. Penn State University maintains a policy on absences (University Faculty Senate Policy 42-27: Class Attendance). The policy recognizes that on occasion, students may opt to miss a class meeting to participate in a regularly scheduled university-approved curricular or extracurricular activity or due to unavoidable or other legitimate circumstances. For acceptable and appropriately documented absences, students will be provided with a reasonable opportunity to make up missed work.

The procedures for Senate Policy 42-27 are implemented as Academic Administrative Policy and Procedure E-11: Class Attendance. The policy indicates that, whenever reasonable (e.g., for athletic event participation, religious holidays, etc.), a student should submit a class absence form (<http://www.psu.edu/oue/aappm/classabs.pdf>) at least one week in advance.

In cases of emergencies (e.g., hospitalization, death in the family), the student is responsible for contacting the instructor as soon as possible, typically within 24 hours, regarding the absence.”

“Student athletes will be excused from class for games as long as they inform me in advance and provide a form signed by their coach.”

“If you must miss an exam it is your responsibility to notify the instructor PRIOR to the exam, either by telephone or in person. As a temporary measure, you may leave a voice-mail message or send an email, but it is still your responsibility to get in touch with the instructor personally as soon as possible. Failure to follow these instructions may result in a deduction of points on the exam or possibly a grade of zero on the exam. Make-up exams will ONLY be given for valid and verifiable reasons. Valid reasons include illness, family emergencies, and school-sponsored trips.”

“There is no penalty for legitimate, excused absences, including participation in athletic events, when the professor is informed about them in a timely, respectful manner; however, you are responsible for all class work and assignments. An excused absence is defined as an absence that the professor has been advised about prior to the date, and the event is serious and beyond your control, or it’s an absence due to an unforeseen situation (illness, car accident, death in family).”

Additional comments made by faculty members regarding attendance policies on syllabi:

“This is the blanket policy for my courses, if a student athlete needs to miss a class, I explain to them on the first day of the course that I need a schedule of all conflicts for the semester, signed by their coach or the AD. Because athletics is a school sponsored activity, I excuse those absences, however it is the students responsibility to make up all work and hand in assignments when due on Angel.”

“I discuss this policy on several places on my syllabi. Please note that I count athletics absences as an excused absence as long as the athlete shows me the form from the athletics office indicating which days the student will need to miss class.”

In the invitation to participate in the anonymous survey, faculty will be asked:
The Faculty Senate’s Faculty Affairs Committee is collecting information regarding large enrolled courses. Based on your personal definition of a large-enrolled course, if you have taught or are currently teaching a large-enrolled course at Penn State Harrisburg, please follow this link to provide us with more information on your experience <link>.

In defining a large-enrolled course, which factors did you consider? Select all that apply.

- The standard class size for courses previously taught in this subject in my school.
- The increase in class size from previous semesters.
- The workload.
- The number of students.
- Other _____

What is the largest enrolled course you have taught at Penn State Harrisburg?

- 0-20
- 21-35
- 36-50
- 51-65
- 66-80
- 81-95
- 96 and over

What is the level of the largest enrolled course you have taught at Penn State Harrisburg? Select all that apply.

- General Education
- Undergraduate
- Graduate
- Writing Intensive
- Honors
- Other _____

For your large enrolled course, what is your **primary** means of teaching? Select only one.

- lecture with no visuals or multimedia
- lecture with textbook publisher PowerPoint
- lecture with my own PowerPoint
- lecture with multimedia other than PowerPoint
- discussion
- inquiry
- group work
- Other _____

For your large enrolled course, what kinds of assignments/methods of assessment do you use to measure students’ learning? Select all that apply.

- Multiple choice and/or true-false exams
- Short answer exams
- Essay exams
- Multiple choice and/or true-false quizzes
- Short answer quizzes
- Essay quizzes
- Clicker questions
- Class participation/discussion
- Online discussion
- Class presentations
- Group projects
- Individual projects
- Short writing assignments (no more than 5 pages in length)
- Research writing assignment (longer than 5 pages in length)
- Interviews
- Other _____

Does your department provide additional support for your large-enrolled course? If yes, please indicate what support is provided (e.g., a TA for grading).

Please share what has worked well for your students in learning within a large enrolled course.

Did you notice a change in your SRTE scores for the large-enrolled course?

- No, my SRTE scores remained relatively the same.
- Yes, my SRTE scores were higher.
- Yes, my SRTE scores were lower.

Please share your challenges in teaching a large enrolled course.

Please share your students' challenges in learning within a large enrolled course.

Given an opportunity for professional development on teaching a large enrolled course, what specific topics would interest you the most?

Thank you for your participation!

Athletics Committee of the Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
Olmsted
April 3rd, 2014

Attendees: David Buehler, Tom Arminio, Hossein Jula, Richard Young, Becky Weiler-Timmins

1. Approve minutes from November 7th and February 6th meetings:
Motion by David Buehler, second motion by Hossein Jula with all voting yes to approve.
2. Write a summary report with recommendations for faculty to present at the senate meeting on April 17th. The summary report was written during the meeting and included an overview of the statistics, thematic findings from the data, and examples of policies from faculty submitted to the survey. A suggestion for including a syllabus statement regarding excused absences will also be added to the summary. Summary is forthcoming.
3. Continue discussion on Faculty Athletic Representatives: the committee also suggested/prepared to provide a brief overview of Faculty Athletic Reps to the Senate at the April 17th meeting. More information is needed to understand the depth with which these representatives will interact with their respective teams. For example, will this person be another connection to the academic side of the team so that student-athletes have one more avenue that they might feel comfortable talking to about academics. OR will this person be more of a moderator of grades by having access to the early progress reports and grades in order to be proactive with the athletes. We also discussed the means by which a representative will be chosen. Should the school directors provide information to the faculty and have volunteers or should the athletes find their own representatives?
4. Review information for final senate report and vote on Chair. The final senate report will encompass the summary that was produced today, the information discussed regarding Faculty Athletic Representatives, and an addendum including all data from the questionnaire.

Charges for committee:

- Review the integration of athletics into the campus community.
- Continue to evaluate the current communication process between athletes and faculty regarding absences from classes.
- Address the issue of needing athletic tutoring from the learning center for athletes missing classes due to contests, especially 300 and 400 level courses or labs.
- Inform the campus faculty and staff about the responsibilities of being a Division III school

Harrisburg Faculty Affairs Meeting Minutes, March 27, 2014

Attendees: Ma'moun Abu-Ayyad, Jane Beckett-Camarata, Catherine McCormick, Ilya Shvartsman, Pete Swan, Robin Veder

Absent: Carol McQuiggan (excused), Robin Veder (excused)

The committee discussed how to proceed with the Healthcare Initiative charge. A faculty survey was drafted and forwarded to Catherine Rios for Faculty Senate approval.

**Penn State Harrisburg Faculty Senate
International and Intercultural Affairs Committee
Minutes of the Meeting on Feb. 19, 2014, 2:00 p.m.**

Members Present:

Robin Redmon Wright, Chair
Marie Louise Abram
Lewis Boahene
Anthony Buccitelli
Karen Buhr
Donna Howard
Indrit Hoxha
Martha Strickland
Xie Yuefing

Members Absent:

Michael Barton
Michael Becker
Richard Young

Invited Guest:

Shivaani Selvaraj

Following a brief discussion of the suggestions sent to Dr. Kulkarni for the Strategic Plan, Robin introduced Shivaani Selvaraj. Shivaani was there to give a presentation on the World Wide Narratives project.

World Wide Narratives creates intentional spaces in which members of the Penn State community tell their own stories of lived experience and listen to those told by others. The project explores who we are as a community, giving voice to what is often unheard and unnoticed with the aim of shifting awareness of difference, and provoking new approaches to addressing it. The process is grounded in the assumption that meaningful human interaction involves risk, care, and openness. Access to these video stories could be valuable to any effort to internationalize the educational experience of PSU Harrisburg students and would work for a variety of topics and disciplines.

The Program Team for World Wide Narratives includes:

Dr. Martha Strickland mjs51@psu.edu

Dr. Jo Tyler jat235@psu.edu

Dr. Heather Hughes hhughes@psu.edu

Shivaani Selvaraj sas82@psu.edu

Ms. Selvaraj showed us 5 short videos dealing with experiences with an international component. The World Wide Narratives Project fits well with the focus on diversity in the strategic planning process that is currently taking place and encouraging faculty to include them

in class activities was added to our suggestions for the strategic plan. Since the program began in 2011, project staff have recorded more than 250 stories, which are currently used in training and professional development and climate assessment research. The program team is interested in engaging with faculty to help them integrate the video narratives, as well as other parts of the program, into teaching and/or other programming.

During the IIAC meeting, we discussed:

- the importance of staff and faculty telling their own stories
- the assumptions exhibited in the stories (the recorders, tellers, and us as listeners)
- the usefulness of hearing from people with different positionalities for facilitating discussions around issues of international and intercultural differences and likenesses
- the learning taking place for the story recorders—the importance of listening critically. The stories are not meant to be “truth” or “authority” on some topic, but are reflections of experiences.

Various members expressed interest in how they might access stories that touch on certain themes. The team is in the process of tagging the stories for faculty use. Please contact Shivaani Selvaraj for more information, including curated playlists for targeted purposes.

Robin pointed out that one of our charges is to conduct focus groups or panels with international students, and we decided to also investigate doing focus groups or panels with faculty.

Fortuitously, Carol McQuiggan, from the Teaching Center is doing that as part of her efforts to help faculty with international students. Therefore, it is our obligation as a committee to participate in those activities (rather than duplicate what she is already doing). Therefore I, as Chair of the IIAC, have volunteered to facilitate the **Faculty Panel, Tuesday, April 1, 12:00-1:15pm, in the Gallery Lounge, and Lewis has volunteered to be a panel member. Each member should attend this panel session if possible. Carol has arranged an international student panel on Tuesday, March 18, 12:00-1:15pm, in TL 128. We should make every effort to attend this panel as well. It is from those panel presentations that we will make our report to the Faculty Senate.**

Meeting adjourned at 3:15.

**CAPITAL COLLEGE FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
END-OF-YEAR MEETING
MAY 13, 2013**

Attendees:

Capital College Senators: S. Agili, E. Delozier, K. Sprow-Forte, J. Gibbs, R. Gray, P. Kavanaugh, G. Mazis, C. Rios, G. Subramanian, P. Swan, P. Thompson, and R. Young

Committee Chairs: R. Gibney, L. Null, G. Mazis (for C. Welsh), D. Meister, R. Redmon Wright, I. Shvartsman, Z. Taran, and R. Weiler-Timmins

Administrators/Academic Council: G. Crawford, P. Idowu, M. Kulkarni, S. Peterson, S. Schappe, and C. Surra

I. Welcome and Introductions

Richard Young, Senate President, opened the meeting at 12:25 p.m. Introductions were made around the table.

II. Remarks from the Senate President

Young began his remarks by thanking everyone for their participation in the senate over the past year. He thanked the new senators for stepping forward to serve the college and their schools.

Young thanked Rios for her leadership over the past year. A certificate of appreciation honoring C. Rios' presidency was presented. Rios thanked everyone for their work and support over the past year.

The Faculty Senate members for the 2014-2015 academic year were reviewed. University Senators for the 2013-2014 academic year were also reviewed.

Nominations for the office of Secretary of the Senate were sought for the 2014-2015 academic year. E. Delozier nominated himself to serve as secretary. A motion to close the nominations was made by Thompson/Subramanian. Delozier is now secretary of the faculty senate.

Nominations for the position of Parliamentarian of the Senate were sought for the 2014-2015 academic year. Thompson nominated J. Gibbs. A motion to close the nominations was made by Subramanian/Thompson. Gibbs is now parliamentarian of the faculty senate.

III. Committee Chair Reports

Academic Affairs Committee –Chair Linda Null

The report was available for review.

- The committee still receives a large number of questions regarding course submissions and program changes. Senators are urged to encourage their faculty to attend trainings when offered and to do some research before picking up the phone to ask questions. Gray suggested that videos be created to walk faculty through the process.
- Mazis expressed frustration to obtain names for external consultation. It would be helpful if the University compiled a list of program coordinators available for consultation.
- The committee has completed a handbooks for curricular review and was waiting to receive information regarding the new on-line program proposal system, however, that

process is proceeding slowly, therefore, Null will work with Marketing to get the manual online.

A motion to accept the report was made by Mazis/Subramanian and was unanimously approved.

Athletics Committee – Chair Rebecca Weiler-Timmins

The report was available for review.

- The committee is working on ways to integrate athletics and academics and is doing well in its second year.
- The committee created a best practices policy for all faculty to include in their syllabi. The policy will be distributed to school directors.
- Rashaan Carlton, Athletic Director, would like to meet with each school when they have their school meetings to share the NCAA Division III philosophy and answer any questions that faculty may have.
- The committee would also like to see a Faculty Athletic Representatives for each team (there will be 14 teams for the 2014-2015 year.) They still need to outline the specifics of such a program.

A motion to accept the report was made by Thompson/Delozier and was unanimously approved.

Enrollment Management and Outreach Subcommittee – Glen Mazis

The report was available to review.

- Committee chair, Craig Welsh, noticed that there were six other committees that were working on similar charges as the enrollment management committee.
- It was discovered that a Student Success and Retention Committee was recently created. It is led by Rob Coffman and the goal of the committee is to encourage staff to help students succeed. Welsh would like the two committees should work together.
- The committee would also like to have an ongoing stable charge to work on each year.

A motion to accept the report was made by Thompson/Delozier and was unanimously approved

Faculty Affairs Committee – Chair Ilya Shvartsman

The report was available for review.

- The committee had three charges for this year; to review and respond to the new healthcare policy, how to engage faculty in governance, and large class size.
- A survey was conducted regarding the new health care policies. Forty-six responses were received and the majority of respondents expressed negativity toward the policy. Only eight positive comments were received.
- The committee addressed the importance of service to the college and encouraged school directors to discuss service expectations with new faculty as they are oriented to their new positions. Possibly have some type of document that outlines service expectations.

- The large class size charge was tabled for this year, however, Carol McQuiggan, in the Faculty Center will be conducting a faculty survey on the topic.

A motion to accept the report was made by Gibbs/Subramanian and was unanimously approved.

Human Resources and Business Services Committee – Co-Chair Ray Gibney

The report was available for review.

- The committee was asked to review policies related to healthcare. The consensus was that the process lacked transparency, as it was rolled out during the summer months when many faculty and staff are not on campus.
- The University Senate task force released their report on April 18, 2014. The committee fears that any implementation will again occur over the summer. The full report can be found at <http://senate.psu.edu/agenda/2013-2014/apr2014/apps.htm>.

A motion to accept the report was made by Subramanian/DeLozier and was unanimously approved.

Information Systems Technology and Library Committee – Chair Zina Taran

The report was available for review.

- The committee looked at new learning environments and the improvements that are occurring in IT. There are many exciting changes occurring on our campus. The library is a wonderful example of where some of the best practices are occurring.
- The committee will continue to work with the Physical Plant committee to create technology spaces on campus that benefit both faculty and students.
- The committee reviewed the Horizon report; examined MOOCS, tablet computing, and social media.
- Thompson recommended that a faculty member that teaches through the World Campus be assigned to the committee.
- Rios would like to see a future charge exploring how collaborative spaces add value to programs and coursework.

A motion to accept the report was made by Subramanian/Rios and was unanimously approved.

International and Intercultural Affairs Committee – Chair Robin Redmon Wright

The report was available for review.

- The committee was active throughout the academic year. The committee was asked to provide input towards the strategic plan and provided 12 recommendations. Some of the items suggested include having a trained faculty member to work with international students and to provide better resources to visiting scholars.
- The committee worked with the Faculty Center to support two panels that were held regarding international students. The first panel allowed the students to talk about their experiences and concerns. The second panel engaged faculty in discussions regarding how to work with international students.

- Another charge was to assist faculty in infusing internationalization into their courses and programs. The committee met with Shivaani Selvaraj and learned about the World Wide Narratives project and how the stories could be integrated into coursework.
- The committee would like to explore University policies related to LGBTQ issues in foreign countries.
- Anthony Buccetilli volunteered to chair the committee next year.

A motion to accept the report was made by Delozier/Mazis and was unanimously approved.

Physical Plant Committee –The report was available for review.

Strategic Planning – Catherine Rios

The report was available for review.

- The committee met every Friday throughout the Spring semester. They gathered information from the various academic units, as well as supporting units in the college that were asked to contribute to the strategic plan.
- A first draft of the vision statement, mission, and value statement was revealed to faculty and staff during two town hall meetings held in April.

A motion to accept the report was made by Subramanian/Thompson and was unanimously approved.

Student Affairs – Denise Meister

The report was available for review.

- The largest charge of the committee is to award financial aid through the financial aid office. This year \$369,242 was awarded to deserving students.
- The committee explored first year seminar offerings, and learned through Janice Smith, in the Learning Center, that students had the opportunity to select from 32 sessions. Smith welcomed suggestions for future seminars.
- Due to the change in the course template that will be implemented in Fall 2014, the committee tabled the exploration of changing the common hour.
- It was recommended that Student Affairs and International and Intercultural work together to address international student concerns. Since many of our classes are discussion based, faculty need to work with international students to give them time to comprehend what is happening in the classroom.

IV. **Report from the Chancellor, Mukund Kulkarni**

- Kulkarni thanked everyone for their service to the college.
- Dr. Eric Barron began his term as president on May 12, 2014. It is time to put the institutional crisis in the past and move forward.
- Our college has a strong financial foundation. Over the next three years, critical investments will be made on the campus to attract new students and keep them on our campus.
- The Educational Activities Building is set to open in late May. The design for the new Student Enrichment Center will go to the Board of Trustees in July.

- Penn State Harrisburg anticipates record enrollment for Fall 2014, 4,550+. We graduated the largest number of students this Spring, 796. We are the fifth largest college to award degrees, the largest outside of University Park.
- While our graduate school enrollment has dropped over the past several years, we are

V. **Report from Academic Council**

- Ansary was not available to attend the meeting, however, members of the council reported that the school directors are meeting monthly to discuss and implement action points that are important to the schools.

VI. **Report from the University Council Representative**

None

VII. **Recommended Committee Charges for the 2014-2015 Academic Year**

Committee charges will be compiled from the recommendations of the committees and will be disbursed to senators to make comments and additions.

VIII. **Identify Forum Topics for the 2014-2015 Academic Year**

- Athletics – informing faculty about policies, emphasizing the importance of athletics in academia
- General education changes
- Mentoring of international students

IX. **Identify Agenda Items for the 2014-2015 Academic Year**

- General Education
- Strategic Planning
- Wellness Issues
- Effectiveness and Efficiency

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

/slp

**Penn State Harrisburg
Faculty Senate Agenda**

End-of-Year Meeting

Tuesday, May 13, 2014

Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room C-300/12:00-5:00 p.m.

- I. LUNCH, WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (12:00 P.M.)
- II. REMARKS FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT, Richard Young
 - a. Presentation to the Outgoing President
 - b. 2014-2015 List of Capital College Senators Appendix "A"
 - c. 2014-2015 List of University Senators Appendix "B"
 - d. Election of Faculty Senate Secretary
 - e. Election of Parliamentarian of the Faculty Senate
- III. COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE CHAIRS
 - a. Academic Affairs – Linda Null Appendix "C"
 - b. Athletics Committee – Rebecca Weiler-Timmins Appendix "D"
 - c. Enrollment Management and Outreach – Glen Mazis Appendix "E"
 - d. Faculty Affairs – Ilya Shvartsman Appendix "F"
 - e. Human Resources – Ray Gibney Appendix "G"
 - f. Information Systems and Technology – Zinaida Taran Appendix "H"
 - g. International and Intercultural Affairs – Robin Redmon-Wright Appendix "I"
 - h. Physical Plant – Parag Pendaharker Appendix "J"
 - i. Strategic Planning Committee – Catherine Rios Appendix "K"
 - j. Student Affairs – Denise Meister Appendix "L"
- IV. REPORT FROM THE CHANCELLOR, Mukund Kulkarni
- V. REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
- VI. REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE
- VII. COMMITTEE CHARGES FOR THE 2014-2015 ACADEMIC YEAR
- VIII. IDENTIFY FORUM TOPICS FOR THE 2014-2015 ACADEMIC YEAR
- IX. IDENTIFY AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE 2014-2015 ACADEMIC YEAR

APPENDIX "A"

**CAPITAL COLLEGE
FACULTY SENATE
2014-2015**

	NAME	SCHOOL	ROOM	WORK #	E-MAIL ADDRESS
1.	Gautam Ray (School – 2 yrs.)	SET	W239	948-6125	Gxr6@psu.edu
2.	Glen Mazis (School – 1 yr.)	HUM	W356	948-6530	Gam7@psu.edu
3.	Mukund Kulkarni (Chancellor)	ADMIN	C-119	948-6105	mks5@psu.edu
4.	Jennifer Gibbs (At-Large – 2 yrs.)	SPA	W160N	948-6046	Jfc25@psu.edu
5.	Karin Sprow-Forte (School – 2 yrs.)	BSED	W331	948-6295	kms588@psu.edu
6.	Eric Delozier (LIB – 1 yr.)	LIB	LIB	948-6373	epd103@psu.edu
7.	Philip Kavanaugh (School – 1 yr.)	SPA	W160L	948-6778	prk114@psu.edu
8.	Rhoda Joseph (At-large- 2 yrs.)	SBA	E335	948-6144	Ruj1@psu.edu
9.	Girish Subramanian (School – 1 yr.)	SBA	E355	948-6150	ghs2@psu.edu
10.	Peter Swan (At-large – 2 yr.)	SBA	E356	948-6443	Pfs4@psu.edu
11.	Catherine Rios (1 yr.) Immed. Past President	HUM	W356	948-6659	car33@psu.edu
12.	Richard Young President (1 yr.)	SBA	E355	948-6151	rry100@psu.edu
13.	Paul Thompson President Elect (1 yr.)	SPA	W157e	948-6755	pbt1@psu.edu
14.	Siddharth Dahiya – SGA President	SGA			Syd5144@psu.edu
Non-Voting Member:					
14.	Matthew Wilson Univ. Senate Council Rep. – 1 yr.	HUM	W356	948-6191	mtw1@psu.edu
15.	Staff Asst. – Stephanie Ponnett	Admin.	C-114R	948-6062	SLP29@spsu.edu

1 year denotes 1 year remaining on a 2 year term while 2 years denotes 2 years remaining on a 2 year term of service.

APPENDIX "B"

CAPITAL COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY SENATORS
2014/2015

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | Gregory Crawford (LIB)
717-948-6079
Room 115, Library
Term: 2011-2015
Gac2@psu.edu | Alternate:
Seroj Mackertich (SSET)
717-948-6313
Room W236, Olmsted
oct@psu.edu |
| 2. | Jane Wilburne (BSED)
717-948-6615
Room W331, Olmsted
Term: 2013-2017
Jmw41@psu.edu | Student Representative
Andy Dessel (GRAD)
ard5274@psu.edu |
| 3. | Matthew Woessner (SPA)
717-948-6489
Room W160, Olmsted
Mew10@psu.edu
Term: 2013-2017 | *Denotes Council Representative |
| 4. | Rajarajan Subramanian (SSET)
717-948-6124
Room W-235, Olmsted
Rus30@psu.edu
Term: 2014-2018 | |
| 5. | Samuel Winch (HUM)
717-948-6391
Room W365 Olmsted
spw10@psu.edu
Term: 2014-2018 | |
| 6. | James Ruiz (SPA)
948-6292
Room W-160, Olmsted
JMR33@psu.edu
Term: 2012-2016 | |
| 7. | Matthew Wilson (HUM)*
948-6191
Room W356, Olmsted
Term: 2011-2015
Mtw1@psu.edu | |

**FINAL REPORT
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
2013-14**

Attendance

Name	9/3/13	10/3/13	11/5/13	12/12/13	2/4/14	3/6/14	4/22/14
Richard Ciocci (SET)	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Greg Crawford (LIB)	Present	Present	Present	Excused*	Present	Present	Excused*
Jennifer Hirt (HUM)	Present	Present		Present		Present	Present
Scott Lewis (BSED)		Present		Present	Present		
Jesse Middaugh (SBA)	Present		Present	Excused*			Present
Linda Null (SET) Chair	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Odd Stalebrink (SPA)	Present		Present	Present	Present	Excused*	Present
David Witwer (HUM)		Present	Present	Present	Present	Excused*	Present

* Electronic participation or proxy

Committee Accomplishments

Courses Reviewed and Approved/Approved Pending Changes/Not Approved

Course	Title	Course	Title
ACCT 532	Accounting Information and Decision Systems	HUM 100	Foundations in the Humanities: Understanding the Human Experience
ACCT 550	Professional Responsibilities and Ethics	HUM 200	Explorations in the Humanities: The Quest
CE 445	Advanced Structural Analysis	I HUM 150	World Mythologies in the Arts
CE 449	Advanced Structural Design	I HUM 300W	Interpretations in the Humanities
CE 456	Planning and Scheduling	I HUM 311	The Western Tradition
EDMTH 301	Mathematics in Elementary Education I	I HUM 400	Expressions in the Humanities
EDMTH 302	Mathematics in Elementary Education II	I HUM 410	Religion and Culture
EDUC 303	Sensitivity to Special Learners	I HUM 430	Philosophy and Literature
EDUC 305	Creative Arts	I HUM 453	Texts and Culture
EDUC 322	Adolescent Literature and Developmental Reading	I HUM 460	Thematic Studies
EDUC 402	Language Development, Self-Expression and Literature in Early Childhood Ed	I HUM 461	Selected Periods in the Humanities
EDUC 415	Teaching Secondary Social Studies	I HUM 491	Seminar in Interdisciplinary Humanities
EDUC 416	Teaching Secondary English	I HUM 494	Research Project
EDUC 417	Teaching Secondary Mathematics	I HUM 495	Internship
EDUC 463	The Internet and K-12 Education	I HUM 496	Independent Studies
ENVE 411	Water Supply and Pollution Control	I HUM 497	Special Topics
ENVE 470	Air Quality	I HUM 499	Foreign Studies
HLS 540	Comparative Homeland Security and Related Methods	MATH 410	Complex Analysis for Mathematics & Engineering
HLS 575	Homeland Security Law	MNGMT 511	Organizational Behavior

Programs Reviewed and Approved/Approved Pending Changes/Not Approved

B.S. in Criminal Justice
Ph.D. Public Administration
American Studies Minor
Elementary Education
Online Master's of Accounting
Extend delivery of BS Elementary Education Program to York
Sociology (options)
BS/MA Applied Research Psychology IUG
Humanities (BHum to BA)
Phase out of Applied Behavioral Science
P-3 to offer the BS in Project and Supply Chain Management at PSH
BS/MS Electrical Engineering IUG
M. Eng in Environmental Engineering
Mechatronics Minor
Mechatronics Technology Minor
BS CE/M. ENG Environmental Engineering IUG
Online Criminal Justice Minor

Other Committee Accomplishments

A subcommittee was formed to develop a Faculty Course and Program Proposal Handbook detailing how course proposals and program changes are done and explaining the various steps involved in the process. Because PSH has not yet switched to the online version for program proposals, the subcommittee has postponed the final version of the handbook until it determines the appropriate information to include. The Committee has successfully continued a "paperless" operation; all course proposals are available via CSCS, while program proposals, agendas, minutes, and other supporting documents can be found on ANGEL.

Committee Concerns

A recurring concern of the Committee is the on-going problem with lack of proper external consultation on both course and program proposals. Faculty members often do not know who should be included in this consultation. The Committee recommends that each School provide one or two contact people responsible for providing this consultation information when faculty members are submitting proposals.

The Committee also notes that a number of faculty members encounter problems and have many questions when using the CSCS system and creating program proposals. The Committee recommends continued CSCS training sessions and also suggests that School Directors encourage their faculty to attend. In addition, the proposed handbook should assist faculty members not only with the CSCS system, but also with the entire curricular process.

The Committee also notes the complexity in coordinating paper-based program changes with on-line course proposals. While faculty members submitting changes to both courses and programs have generally presented their course and program changes as "packages," the Committee encourages continued development and implementation of the on-line program proposal system so all curricular changes are handled in a uniform manner.

Suggestions for Charges for 2014-15

- Once the proper format is determined, release the Course and Program Proposal Handbook developed for faculty members (preferably on the college website)
- Continue to collaborate with the developers of the on-line program proposal system to assure that campus-specific issues continue to be addressed in the system
- Assist in the roll-out of the on-line program proposal system, when completed
- Organize CSCS training sessions (and offer online program proposal training if appropriate) for PSH faculty.

**Athletics Committee of the Faculty Senate
Penn State Harrisburg
2013 – 2014**

Duties: The Athletics Committee shall advise and monitor athletic standards related to the educational function of the College and University, help promote a sound academic climate for the intercollegiate athletic program, and support the NCAA Division III Philosophy Statement. The report is submitted by Rebecca Weiler-Timmins (chair) on behalf of committee members:

Thomas Arminio
David Buehler
Rahsaan Carlton
Kara Hoy
Hossein Jula
Charles Kupfer
Joe Cecere

Attendance: The Athletics Committee met a total of four times during the 2013-2014 academic year (September 12, November 7, February 6, and April 3). The committee also communicated via email throughout the year in order to complete a survey and prepare documents for presentation to the Senate.

Charges for the 2013-2014 Academic Year:

1. Continue to evaluate the current communication process between athletes and faculty regarding absences from classes.
2. Inform the campus faculty and staff about the responsibilities of being a Division III institution.
3. Review the integration of athletics into the campus community.
4. Address the issue of needing athletic tutoring from the learning center for athletes missing classes due to contests, especially 300 and 400 level courses or labs.

Fulfillment of Charges:

Charge One: Evaluate the current communication process between athletes and faculty regarding absences from classes.

The committee continued efforts from last year to evaluate the communication of faculty and student-athletes. The committee was asked by the Senate to create a “Best Practices” to enhance the communication process of faculty members and student-athletes in regards to class absences. The committee created a questionnaire for faculty via survey monkey. The survey was sent to the faculty in November of 2013. The committee received 41 responses from the survey. A summary of this report is attached as an addendum. In short, the main themes found were communication, notification, defining excused absences, and providing expectations for all aspects of missed work. The committee recommends that faculty members familiarize themselves with Faculty Senate Policy 42-27 Class Attendance, and include topics such as communication, notification, excused absences, and expectations for making up missed work within the syllabus.

An email was sent to school directors asking them to highly suggest or require their faculty members to add a statement regarding absences to their syllabi. The following is a sample statement:

“University Related Activities and Class Attendance: Refer to policy 42-27 http://senate.psu.edu/policies/separate_policy/42-27.htm regarding excused absences due to university related activities. Students are required to notify the professor of potential absences at the beginning of the semester (example: Team schedule and class absence form for athletes). In addition, students are encouraged to meet with the professor the week before the absence to discuss any missed work due to the absence.”

Charge Two: Inform the campus of the responsibilities of being a Division III institution.

Over the last two years members of the Athletics Committee presented at their respective school meetings. The goal of these presentations was to create a link and a connection to the faculty as well as provide information about policies in place for athletes missing classes. The committee suggested that it would be helpful for Rahsaan Carlton to present at each school meeting in the fall. Rahsaan will present on the philosophy and responsibility of Division III institutions. This will create a direct connection of athletics with the faculty on campus.

In addition, Catherine Rios is in the process of creating the Senate Newsletter for Spring 2014. It was suggested that the Athletics program on campus be highlighted in the newsletter to promote the student-athletes and provide support for the programs. The underlying themes of the article will stress engaged scholarship and the important educational experience of student-athletes in terms of teamwork, motivation to succeed, and the balance needed to excel in both academics and sports.

Charge Three: Review the integration of athletics into the campus community.

The committee continues to discuss the notion of creating Faculty Athletic Representatives (FAR) for each athletic team as another way to provide athletes with a connection to faculty members. The FAR would be another touch point for each team and encourage proactive communication with faculty. The faculty could also be a liaison to the Senate Athletics Committee. This would encourage the coaches to become acquainted with faculty as well. The FAR idea was proposed to the Senate and the committee was given the go ahead to create such a program. Further discussion needs to occur in order to create guidelines for the FAR.

In addition, the committee continues to place emphasis on providing the faculty and staff with as many positive message regarding athletics during the opening meetings of every academic year. Dr. Kulkarni continues to provide this message about athletics at school convocation for faculty/staff. The committee would like to discuss the marketing objectives and opportunities for athletics in order to provide more opportunities to showcase events.

Charge Four: Athletic tutoring from the learning center

Rahsaan continues to work with the learning center to provide the best services for the student-athletes. Encouraging the student-athletes to use the learning center and discuss making up missed course work with professors has been a two pronged effort for the committee. In addition, Joe Cecere, NCAA Faculty Academic Representative, continues to reach out to other campuses to find new ways to approach this charge. We will continue to discuss this charge next year.

Suggested New Charges for the Upcoming Year 2014-2015:

1. Integrate faculty athletic representatives for each team.
2. Continue to review the integration of athletics into the campus community (marketing).
3. Address the issue of needing athletic tutoring from the learning center for athletes missing classes due to contests, especially 300 and 400 level courses or labs.



**Athletics Committee of the Faculty Senate
Penn State Harrisburg
Athletics Questionnaire Summary
2013 – 2014**

In evaluating the questionnaire responses, the committee found the following to be common themes among the comments regarding class syllabi and expected student-athlete absences:

- **Communication** is a key element to a productive faculty/student-athlete relationship. This was perhaps the most common theme among the responses.
- **Notification** of expected absences. This should occur early in the semester as well as when the expected absence is approaching. Documentation should be provided by the athletic department.
- **Definition of excused absences.** Several respondents chose to define excused and unexcused absences.
- **The expectation of making up all aspects of missed work.** Ultimately, the responsibility of making up the work falls on the students, though several respondents listed avenues to assist the students with this.

The committee recommends that faculty members:

- Familiarize themselves on Faculty Senate Policy 42-27 Class Attendance
- Include and/or stress the above topics in syllabi for all classes
- Should continue to include any specifics regarding absences, excused or otherwise

The committee also offers the following section to include in syllabi:

“University Related Activities and Class Attendance: Refer to policy 42-27 (insert link) regarding absences due to university related activities. Student athletes are required to provide professors with a team schedule and a class absence form at the beginning of each season. Student athletes are encouraged to meet with the professor the week before the athletic event to try to discuss any missed work due to the athletic contest, and to notify the professor of any changes or updates to the season schedule as soon as possible.”

The following is a summary of the responses, with some examples of syllabi sections or comments about syllabi that the committee found to be effective in conveying the recommended information.

Do you have a specific policy in your respective syllabi addressing class absences?

58% - Yes

42% - No

When do athletes approach you to discuss their schedules regarding missed classes?

81% - beginning of the season

55% - week of event

Given the options in above question, when would you prefer to hear from the athlete regarding a missed class?

66% - beginning of the season

33% - week of event

How do you accommodate a student when they miss a lecture due to an athletic event?

69% - Make up the work on their own

76% - Have them check the power point in Angel or information posted on a professor's website

73% - Talk with another student in the class

66% - Have the student stop by your office during office hours to review

Syllabi excerpts offered by faculty members:

“Your presence in class is essential to your ability to understand and apply the material covered in this course. It should be obvious that missing multiple class sessions will jeopardize your ability to fully grasp the course material. If for some reason, e.g., illnesses, travel related to team sports or other university activity, injury, family emergency, or religious observance, you cannot attend a class, please inform me as soon as possible prior to the missed class session. I will determine the minimal attendance and participation required to meet course obligations. Penn State University maintains a policy on absences (University Faculty Senate Policy 42-27: Class Attendance). The policy recognizes that on occasion, students may opt to miss a class meeting to participate in a regularly scheduled university-approved curricular or extracurricular activity or due to unavoidable or other legitimate circumstances. For acceptable and appropriately documented absences, students will be provided with a reasonable opportunity to make up missed work.

The procedures for Senate Policy 42-27 are implemented as Academic Administrative Policy and Procedure E-11: Class Attendance. The policy indicates that, whenever reasonable (e.g., for athletic event participation, religious holidays, etc.), a student should submit a class absence form (<http://www.psu.edu/oue/aappm/classabs.pdf>) at least one week in advance.

In cases of emergencies (e.g., hospitalization, death in the family), the student is responsible for contacting the instructor as soon as possible, typically within 24 hours, regarding the absence.”

“Student athletes will be excused from class for games as long as they inform me in advance and provide a form signed by their coach.”

“If you must miss an exam it is your responsibility to notify the instructor PRIOR to the exam, either by telephone or in person. As a temporary measure, you may leave a voice-mail message or send an email, but it is still your responsibility to get in touch with the instructor personally as soon as possible. Failure to follow these instructions may result in a deduction of points on the exam or possibly a grade of zero on the exam. Make-up exams will ONLY be given for valid and verifiable reasons. Valid reasons include illness, family emergencies, and school-sponsored trips.”

“There is no penalty for legitimate, excused absences, including participation in athletic events, when the professor is informed about them in a timely, respectful manner; however, you are responsible for all class work and assignments. An excused absence is defined as an absence that the professor has been advised about prior to the date, and the event is serious and beyond your control, or it’s an absence due to an unforeseen situation (illness, car accident, death in family).”

Additional comments made by faculty members regarding attendance policies on syllabi:

“This is the blanket policy for my courses, if a student athlete needs to miss a class, I explain to them on the first day of the course that I need a schedule of all conflicts for the semester, signed by their coach or the AD. Because athletics is a school sponsored activity, I excuse those absences, however it is the students responsibility to make up all work and hand in assignments when due on Angel.”

“I discuss this policy on several places on my syllabi. Please note that I count athletics absences as an excused absence as long as the athlete shows me the form from the athletics office indicating which days the student will need to miss class.”

Enrollment Management and Outreach Committee

Chair: Craig Welsh

Committee members: Ozge Aybat, Christina Daley, Brian Maicke, Glen Mazis, Karin Sprow Forte, Roger Subramanian, Craig Welsh

Report Prepared by Craig Welsh

May 6, 2014

Charges for 2013-2014

- Connect with other committees or groups assessing students’ needs and request to streamline data collection process, particularly the DEEC subcommittee
- Continue data collection through surveys or focus groups
- Address student requests through action steps
- Work with the Marketing department to develop better communication between the schools and their office

Actions:

- A review of existing committees and offices which assess student needs was conducted. There is a much greater overlap of efforts than was previously recognized. The following all have some form of regular activity related to assessing student views and needs:
 - Diversity and Educational Equity Committee
 - Enrollment Management & Outreach Committee
 - Marketing Offices: University-wide and Penn State Harrisburg
 - Student Affairs Committee
 - Student Affairs Research and Assessment Office (Student Experience Survey)
 - Students’ Success and Retention Committee
- Committee members Ozge Aybat and Karin Sprow Forte met with Yvonne Harhigh and Robert Coffman in the Penn State Harrisburg marketing office in December 2013. Additionally, Harhigh and Coffman participated in the committee’s April 2014 meeting. A discussion about the marketing office’s activities and an overview of a new committee, Students’ Success and Retention Committee, chaired by Rob Coffman, highlighted the meeting.
- Committee members provided a list of potential survey questions to be used by the Students’ Success and Retention Committee to evaluate students’ attitudes and awareness of summer session course offerings, particularly the new “Maymester” option. The following is the edited list of survey questions:

What is your current academic status? - Undergraduate student - Graduate student
What will your employment status be during the summer? -No summer employment plans at this point - Internship

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Part-time employment (less than 30 hours/week - Full-time employment (more than 30 hours/week
<p>What factor(s) is most important when considering a summer course?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Course(s) offered - Dates offered - Time (of day) offered - Cost - Location - Housing availability - Instructor - Other (please specify)
<p>What day(s) of the week is best to take a summer course? (select all that may apply):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monday - Tuesday - Wednesday - Thursday - Friday - Saturday
<p>What time(s) of day is best to take a summer course? (select all that may apply):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Morning - Afternoon - Evening
<p>Where are you interested in taking summer courses? (select all that may apply):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On campus - Online - Blended (on campus and online)
<p>Are you aware of “Maymester” at Penn State Harrisburg?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes - No
<p>Are you planning to take courses this summer?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes - No
<p>If you answered “Yes” to the last question, at which school(s) will you be taking summer courses?</p>
<p>Any other comments?</p>

- Given the timing of the meeting with Rob Coffman of the new Students’ Success and Retention Committee taking place in April 2014, gaining IRB approval for the survey of students and conducting the survey was not reasonable to undertake in late April/early May given end-of-semester time constraints.

- After speaking with Rob Coffman about the Students' Success and Retention Committee and following up via e-mail, the approach that seems most sensible moving forward is as follows:

If the Faculty Senate continues to have an Enrollment Management & Outreach Committee, its best service to students appears to be as a liaison between the Students' Success and Retention Committee and the students. In other words, the Students' Success and Retention Committee would be working with the administration and marketing staff to implement initiatives, while working with the Enrollment Management & Outreach Committee to have direct access to students (undergrad and grad) and gain feedback and reaction to initiatives being considered by the Students' Success and Retention Committee.

Recommendations for next year:

- Determine the specific role(s) of the Enrollment Management & Outreach Committee given that so many other committees and offices overlap efforts in this area
- Consider the possibility that the Enrollment Management & Outreach Committee works in tandem with the new Students' Success and Retention Committee (Enrollment Management & Outreach to directly interface with students and Students' Success and Retention to directly implement initiatives)
- Engage faculty and/or student groups in surveying students; IRB approval needed

**The Final Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate
Penn State Harrisburg, 2013-2014 Academic Year**

Committee members: Ma'moun Abu-Ayyad, Jane Beckett-Camarata, Catherine McCormick, Carol McQuiggan, Ilya Shvartsman (Chair), Pete Swan, Robin Veder.

The charges of the Faculty Affairs Committee at the beginning of the year were

- Monitor the implementation of the new Healthcare policies and make recommendations for faculty response. Consult with the Human Resources and Business Services Committee, which is charged with reporting on recent and planned policy changes.
- Determine ways to get the faculty more involved in governance (UP Faculty Senate, Capital College Faculty Senate and committees); address service participation and annual reviews – how do the Schools communicate expectations of service in the annual reviews and quantify it's value in the P&T process?
- Examine the impact of larger class sizes on faculty and support staff

Later in the year the senate recommended withholding the last charge until more contextual data could be provided regarding classroom sizes and facilities at other campuses.

Regarding the Healthcare charge, a survey on faculty response was distributed on April 28, 2014. The summary of the received responses is attached.

On November 14, 2013 we invited Dr. Thang Bui, associate director of the School of Science, Engineering, and Technology, Dr. Kathryn Robinson, director of the School of Humanities, and Dr. Catherine Surra, Director of the School of Behavioral Studies and Education to our meeting to find out expectations of service in the annual reviews and its value in the P&T process at different schools.

The committee concluded that there are no consistent policies on service expectations, and those that exist are subjective. We suggest introducing guidelines for service expectations for each school, which should be available for faculty to access. In particular, all new faculty at all levels should get that information. For instance, tenure-track faculty should know that at certain years they are expected to have certain kinds of service, such as service at a specific college, university, or national organization level. It was noted by the school directors that there is no way other than salary increase considerations to motivate tenured faculty to get involved in governance and other types of service.

Summary of the Survey on Faculty Response to the Healthcare Initiative

Between April 28 and May 5, 2014, forty-three responses were received, which are summarized below.

Did you complete the WebMD Wellness Survey?

Yes 76%

No 24%

Were you impacted by the spousal/same sex partner surcharge?

Yes 30%

No 70%

Were you impacted by the tobacco usage policy?

Yes 2%

No 98%

Did you enroll in any program offered by WebMD after the survey?

Yes 5%

No 95%

What parts of the survey did you find particularly useful, if any?

26 people answered this question, 17 people skipped it. Out of the 26 responses 11 were "None". Longer than one-word responses are quoted below:

- None. I already see my physician on an yearly basis.
- None. I'm not a child. I don't need a survey to tell me to exercise, eat right and watch my stress. Being healthy is difficult. I manage to stay fit without forced information from WebMD.
- I don't remember the details of the survey.
- I don't really remember it.
- NONE OF IT. That survey is idiotic
- all
- I continually make sure to "Know My Numbers" and take care of my health.
- None. I go to the doctor regularly and do not have any need for a summary of my data in one place.
- None...I lied on the whole thing.
- After completing the survey, it was indicating what type of changes we need to do for healthier life.
- Do not remember.

Did you find any questions in the survey not relevant or inappropriate?

Yes 57%

No 43%

All responses to this question are quoted below.

- If one plans on getting pregnant... very inappropriate
- Invasive of privacy, yes.
- Questions on mental health and drug use, especially. I think it's only appropriate for health care professionals in one-on-one interactions with their patients to be asking these questions.
- Asking about depression, marital problems, drinking, was way over the line.

- I felt very uncomfortable with questions pertaining to my marriage and sexual practices. I understand that these topics are important to mental health, but I didn't feel comfortable with my employer's designee asking them. Even though WebMD is a third party, I didn't trust that such data wouldn't be "leaked" to my employer or the general public.
- I did not feel comfortable filling out the majority of the survey. I didn't trust that my health history was going to be kept confidential. At times, I felt very torn between being honest so I could get an accurate assessment and providing answers that I knew wouldn't raise any red flags. I suffer from a health condition that has many stigmas attached to it. Nobody I work with knows anything about it, and frankly I'm not comfortable with Penn State knowing about it. It's something I'm receiving medical treatment for and something that in no way affects my job performance. My health is my business--not Penn State's.
- The survey was not helpful, and I found it intrusive and inappropriate.
- I don't remember at the moment. When I was answering it, I kept thinking you've got to be kidding me.
- Questions about decisions to have children Questions about weight. Sometimes the weight gain is the result of medicine and not the result of a lack of exercise or eating healthy.
- Information about my habits, such as how much I drink/exercise, etc., should be between my doctor and me. I'm not sure that even my insurance company needs to know this, much less a 3rd party supplier.
- I don't recall the specific questions now.
- I do not remember
- Don't recall, but thought it rather invasive
- N/A
- It is none of WebMD's business.
- Many were inappropriate and in fact only tagged illnesses such as overweight and alcoholism. Extreme underweight and indices of health issues related to underweight were not tagged or were ignored (was tested by responses). Thus, the survey was obviously tagged to save money and very little to due with employee health.
- It asked about information that I don't know without having visited a doctor and requesting those numbers.
- Much of them.
- I would not let you enter data and submit incomplete until you got the missing data, so I made it up.
- Sorry...not giving my age, weight, etc., to a website.
- Do not remember.
- Most of them were a violation of privacy and not related to my ability to be a highly functioning employee

Do you have any comments on the Take Care of Your Health Initiative?

- It would have been better had the university made this an option rather than penalizing those who did not comply... but you already know that
- Stay out of my personal business.
- A heavy-handed means of expressing concern about my health.

- Many...but I'll keep it short. Let incentivized voluntary participation be the driver for this sort of thing. Focus on non-sensitive population based data collection that can focus university efforts on ways to create health work environments (inexpensive yoga, exercise, and similar classes during work hrs on campus are good examples).
- This was a serious failure by the administration. It wasn't well researched. It was overly intrusive. It had no prospect of saving serious money. Penn State harmed its credibility by pushing such an ill-conceived plan.
- Moving on....
- I didn't mind the survey or initiative. I felt that faculty were acting entitled when they protested. No one is guaranteed health care, and I'm appreciative for what we're offered. If I have to take some steps to ensure affordable coverage then I'm willing to do so.
- The sleazy way this initiative was rolled out by university administration (not carefully vetted by HR, unleashed over the summer, with little faculty and staff input) has destroyed my good faith in my employer, especially following on the heels of the Sandusky scandal, and followed up by the hiring of a football coach and college president who seem to have questionable pasts in terms of rape scandals. I still give my 110% best effort to local colleagues and students, but I have lost any motivation to give extra time to promoting/advancing the university writ large. I will not attend sports events; I will not plant a "We Live Here" sign on my lawn; etc. In other words, my "school spirit" is gone. I am very loyal to Penn State Harrisburg, but not to Penn State as a whole.
- I would rather see a plan that rewards healthy choices/lifestyles/changes rather than one that punishes people who don't comply. Being forced to submit to a barrage of tests and to fill out a lengthy and at times rather invasive survey isn't going to motivate people to live up to the name of the initiative and take better care of their health. Instead, it's going to be something people resent, which makes them less likely to actually be more proactive in maintaining and/or improving their health.
- I don't believe anyone is going to take care of their health because of a survey. I eat well, exercise, and take care of myself because I care about my body.
- I think it is fine to try to incentivize healthy behavior, by subsidizing exercise or health programs, gym memberships, etc. I think that the mandatory and punitive nature of the TCYH initiative made for a hostile work environment.
- It was a waste of time. There must be another way.
- This is idiocy. STOP THIS NONSENSE
- It is a good idea to have the initiative. I do notice that there are more activities for individuals to participate in during the day. I also liked the Jingle bell walk. I think that this type of campus wide walking initiative could be planned throughout the year.
- I don't believe it will have any effects on insurance costs.
- Being better informed would have been appropriate for everyone. Do not penalize folks for not participating.
- Was very useful to me.
- I feel that all employees should be required to take the health care initiative as PSU is paying for health insurance for us. I should be required.
- I take charge of my health and did even before a cancer diagnosis (I am cancer free now). I found the survey intrusive, and the follow up emails about completing "tasks", eg a

colonoscopy, invasive and inappropriate. Ditto the follow up emails any time I ordered a prescription, when to my GP, etc.

- The whole thing was a fiasco. I object strongly to the fact that my personal health information is being uploaded to WebMD without my consent. This university has a lot to learn about ethics, integrity, privacy, voice, and respect for employees.
- I find it tiresome that this has become a constant public issue, pursued with energy by one faculty member in the SPA, to support the idea that this is an assault upon our "freedoms" and he/she can go on the national stage to criticize Penn State. I am more upset by the increases in charges for those of us planning to stay on the regular Blue Cross HMO, than these issues regarding the "wellness" program. So that one faculty member, with a conservative political agenda, can continue to publicly denigrate our institution and policies, in national forums, hurts our image and ultimately makes us look bad, as if we already haven't had enough negative publicity. Yes, the program was not well thought-out. But if one would look to the private sector, these practices, such as the tobacco surcharge, have been in place for years. In addition, the spousal/same sex surcharge is not an unreasonable policy, considering that Penn State offers better insurance than many employers. Ultimately the wellness program is going to encourage people to go to the doctor who would normally ignore symptoms until it is too late. This faculty member, from the SPA, does not speak for all faculty at Penn State Harrisburg. Rather, I would like to see a re-evaluation the high-deductible plan that the University is trying to push, so that those of us who do not want such a plan, can not see such high increases in the regular HMO plan. To me, this is the real cause of concern.
- Invasive, punitive, corrupt, and obviously leading the university to impose future penalties on other health issues. The entire process destroyed employee trust with the university.
- Having worked in other types of institutions and businesses, I did not find this out of the ordinary for healthcare coverage.
- It was rolled out poorly. The bioscreening was not explained well. When it was made optional, I chose not to do it. I assumed it was simply taking blood and measurements; only when discussing it with friends who did it did I learn that there were people present to discuss the implications with the employee. If the BENEFITS had been clearly explained, I would have gone, but instead the program was sold strictly as a punishment for nonparticipation, so when the punishment was removed, I did not participate.
- Why do I have to pay more for the same product. If I go into McDonalds and order a hamburger, they don't ask me how much I make and charge me differently for a commodity. Why is Penn State redistributing my salary to other employees? If you want them to have a better life style, pay them more and do not take my salary. I will choose to share my earnings with whom I choose. Why does not Penn State provide a flat amount to all employees and if you choose to cover more people, you pay the difference. Why does Penn State discriminate on marital status and pay married employees with children more (through benefit contributions) than single employees doing the same job?
- PSU should eliminate the surcharge for spouse.
- It's bullshit.
- It raises awareness. It's a good initiative. However, the problem is the way it was implemented at the beginning. It was forced upon.

- I did not have the time to meet with the BlueShield representative, so I still have many questions unanswered.

**Human Resources and Business Services Committee of the Faculty
Senate
Penn State Harrisburg
2013-2014 Report**

(prepared by Dr. Nihal Bayraktar and Dr. Raymond F. Gibney)

Meetings: The committee met 2 times in Fall 2013. Since charges have been completed in Fall 2013, the committee communicated through internet in Spring 2014.

Voting members

NIHAL BAYRAKTAR (CO-CHAIR) – attended 2 meetings
RAYMOND F GIBNEY JR (CO-CHAIR) – attended 2 meetings
EILEEN AHLIN - attended 2 meetings
JEREMY BLUM – attended 2 meetings
DANIEL HOWARD- attended 2 meetings
MARGARET JASTER - attended 2 meetings
SAIRAM RUDRABHATLA – attended 2 meetings

Non-voting ex-officio members

DOROTHY JEAN GUY – attended 2 meetings
JOSEPH STEIBEL – attended 0 meetings

Guest (Faculty Senate representative)

ERIC DOERFLER – attended 2 meetings

Charges and Accomplishments for the 2013-2014 academic year

Charge I. Provide a report on the changes in the Healthcare plan and its implementation, paying special attention to recent and planned policy changes over the next year. Consult with the Faculty Affairs Committee, which will focus on the impact of the changes on faculty and staff.

Accomplishments:

- 1) The co-chairs of the committee met with Dr. Ilya Shvartsman (the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee) to discuss how the committees could accomplish the charges.
- 2) The committee has prepared a detailed report named “Report on Documents Related to Take Care of Your Health Initiative” (see Appendix A)
- 3) Due to the intense, collective work of the committee members, the report was ready before the end of October as requested by Dr. Rios. After approved by the members, the report was submitted to Dr. Rios on November 4, 2014.
- 4) The main concerns on the new health initiative: Lack of transparency of the process; lack of enough discussion enough among faculty and staff; security concerns on health information provided to WebMD; questions about the

quality of Highmark in providing good health services. There are also concerns on the report that will be prepared by the Task Force on Health Initiative. It will be submitted on April 29, 2014 and not much time will be left to discuss it before the end of the semester.

- 5) The members found the following document very relevant: Scanlon, D. and Shea, D. (2013) "Assessing the Evidence for Penn State University 'Take Care of Your Health' Benefits Program". In the document the authors were asked to provide a scientific assessment of the evidence regarding Penn State's proposed "Take Care of Your Health" Initiative. The authors conclude that the current state of evidence suggests there is mixed support regarding the cost savings that will be realized. In addition, these results exist due to a variety of reasons ranging from poorly constructed definitions to confounded results. The authors conclude that as part of the fiduciary responsibility of the University, Penn State should utilize an independent evaluation of the program due to Highmark's vested financial interest in the plan. Finally, the authors pose a list of 7 questions that, if answered by the University Administration, would lead to increased transparency.
- 6) In November 2013, a Task Force on Health Benefits was established by the University to research and resolve the issues that arose during the initial implementation of the health care initiative. The committee reviewed the documents and procedures regarding the task force. The committee noted that the faculty requested that a third of the health care task force be elected by faculty and staff. This request was not honored. The Task Force was scheduled to provide the University Faculty Senate with its findings two weeks before the end of the semester (i.e. last week of classes). The scheduled reporting period could create the same issues as the original roll-out. The timing of announcements is during a period when most faculty are not on campus.

Charge II. Review policy regarding naming conventions of events and traditions across campuses with the impact on inclusion and exclusion of various groups.

Accomplishments: Naming of events and traditions differ significantly across campuses. The committee members (Dr. Daniel Howard specifically worked on it with his assistant) could not find any university or college policy related to this issue. The committee recommends developing a policy regarding the naming of events across campuses and colleges.

Possible Charges for Next Academic Year (some suggestions are from the report submitted in 2012-13 academic year)

- 1) Review the report of the Task Force on Health benefits which will be submitted to the University Faculty Senate on April 29, 2014.
- 2) A faculty forum can be organized on changes in health benefits.
- 3) Assess stakeholder perceptions of policy implementation and impact on diversity and perceptions of inclusion.
 - a. Focus on specific policy and gain greater understanding of issues surrounding specific policy.
- 4) Promote better understanding of school or program administered events through greater transparency.
 - a. Each program and school within the college has individualized method for determining program coordinators. More explicit explanation and documentation would aid in preventing perceptions of poor climate.
- 5) Review business policy for faculty copy and scanning allowances. In addition, review policy for security and retention of documents on printers and scanners.
 - a. Each faculty is allocated 200 copies a month in the home department. A change was made that when the limit is reached scanning capabilities cease. This is problematic. Faculty are allocated 110 pages in open labs.
- 6) Review business center policies to facilitate efficiencies and timeliness regarding copies.
 - a. Faculty are requested to provide copies to administrative assistants 48 hours (2 business days) in advance. Faculty are not respecting this policy. Also, consistency on what is to be sent to copy center. (ex. Do syllabi need to be printed?)
- 7) Review book ordering process.
 - a. Faculty are requested to place:(a) "No textbook" book orders and (b) book orders for low enrollment classes such as independent studies.
- 8) Review the final exam schedule and overload process.
 - a. Having students inform registrar regarding faculty who are violating University policy is an unworkable system. A review of the business process of exam scheduling and process should be undertaken.

APPENDIX A.

Report on Documents Related to Take Care of Your Health Initiative

Prepared by the Members of the Human Resources and Business Services Committee

Submitted to: Dr. Catharine Anne Rios, the President of the Faculty Senate at Penn State Harrisburg

October 29, 2013

This report has been prepared based on committee charges assigned during 2013/14 academic year.

The committee charge is:

Provide a report on the changes in the Healthcare plan and its implementation, paying special attention to recent and planned policy changes over the next year. Consult with the Faculty Affairs Committee, which will focus on the impact of the changes on faculty and staff.

Dr. Catharine Anne Rios, the President of the Faculty Senate at Penn State Harrisburg, shared the files with the HR&BSC. They are located in a folder on the email account website. They require access permission by Dr. Rios. The file names and reviewers are listed below. All voting members of the committee contributed on the report.

- **Dr. Raymond Gibney** reviews:

ScanlonShea_PSUWellness_Whitepaper_2013_09_09.pdf (38 pages)

- **Dr. Eileen Ahlin** reviews:

ARTICLES.docx (26 pages)

- **Dr. Daniel Howard** reviews:

Altoona Wellness Letter.pdf (3 pages)

employee health benefit.pdf (7 pages)

Health Care Forensic Fact Sheet.pdf (4 pages)

Health_Forensic_AB_REVISED.docx (3 pages)

- **Dr. Sairam Rudrabhatla** reviews:

letter to President Erickson.pdf (2 pages)
 Ltr from ACFS to President Erickson.pdf (1 pages)
 Resolution regarding Health Care.docx (1 pages)
 Revised Wellness Motion.doc (2 pages)
 Senate Resolution 9-24-13.pdf (1 pages)
 webmd_Your Rights.pdf (1 pages)

- **Dr. Nihal Bayraktar** reviews:

Forensic minutes.pdf (19 pages)

- **Dr. Jeremy Blum** reviews:

Highmark Medical Cost Savings Study.pdf (10 pages)
 Highmark ROI study.pdf (11 pages)
 webmd_Terms of Use.pdf (7 pages)

- **Dr. Margaret Jaster** reviews:

WebMD wellness survey-00002.pdf (11 pages)
 webmd_Privacy Policy.pdf (10 pages)

APPENDIX – A suggested document on ranking of insurance providers in the US and PA

Scanlon, D. and Shea, D. (2013) “Assessing the Evidence for Penn State University ‘Take Care of Your Health’ Benefits Program”

Reviewed By Dr. Raymond F. Gibney Jr.

Abstract: The authors were asked to provide a scientific assessment of the evidence regarding Penn State’s proposed “Take Care of Your Health” Initiative. The authors conclude that the current state of evidence suggests there is mixed regarding the cost savings will be realized. In addition, these results exist due to a variety of reasons ranging from poor construct definition to confounded results. The authors conclude that as part of the fiduciary responsibility of the University, Penn State should utilize an independent evaluation of the program due to Highmark’s vested financial interest in the plan. Finally, the authors pose a list of 7 questions that, if answered by the University Administration, would lead to increased transparency.

Review: The authors provide a limited, but more comprehensive than Highmark, review of the published literature regarding wellness programs and health administration. The authors state that the intended focus of the manuscript is to review the evidence regarding the University’s expressed goals of health care initiative of reduced cost and improved the health of covered lives. Drs. Scanlon and Shea also note the apprehension, concern and loss of morale of all covered lives, but most importantly employees and retirees, are also goals of the plan. While the authors

note that they were requested to review the literature, they do not state where the request originated.

Health care insurance costs, both privately purchased or employment based, have been rising for a considerable period of time. The authors note that all health care costs, or per annum spending, are dependent on covered lives and cost per life. Based upon this simplistic formula, the key drivers of each of these factors are then broken down into various drivers of those costs.

Technology, malpractice insurance, demographics, lifestyle and health behaviors, provider practice patterns, insurance benefits, income, health care prices and administrative costs including waste, fraud and abuse are the key drivers.

Evidence suggests that technology (drugs, devices, tests, treatments, etc) account for 40-60% in the growth of health care costs over time. Estimates suggest that increased malpractice insurance and defensive medicine accounts for approximately 2% of costs at any given time. The aging population of the United States explains about 2% of health care costs increases. Due to societal and media focus on obesity, the authors provide an extensive review on the obesity and health care cost literature (obesity accounts for 8-9% of the increase in health care spending), but note that obesity is just one aspect of a healthy lifestyle. Drs. Scanlon and Shea suggest that 25% of the increase in costs is attributable to disease prevalence. The remaining 75% of the increase in costs is based on treatment choices.

Treatment varies based upon geographic location both globally and domestically. Not only does the cost vary between nations vary, cost varies within nations. However, cost is not the only consideration. Benefit quality must also be considered. The authors note that research has “found little evidence that the higher spending areas demonstrate consistently better quality or better outcomes than other regions. However, our ability to measure differences and quality of care remains limited. “

Plan designs can also be utilized to attempt to control health care spending through utilization. Plan designs, such as high deductible plans, shift the cost structure to a greater shared cost with plan members. Thus, plan members might utilize less insurance since they have a greater share of the cost. This type of plan could reduce the effectiveness of a wellness plan that relies on covered lives to spend out of pocket for visits. Similarly, income growth makes health care more accessible and is a primary driver of the increase cost of health care. The authors note that 30-40% of the total increase in health care is the growth in income.

Overall, the authors conclude that “research suggests that technology, income, lifestyle, practice patterns and prices may represent the most important parts of these other cost drivers, there are still questions about their relative importance compared to illness severity and income and insurance related demand factors.”

Next the authors reviewed the scientific evidence of employment based wellness and prevention programs. Based upon their review, Drs. Scanlon and Shea concluded the theoretical impetus of wellness programs is based upon the cost saving results of Safeway Company’s wellness program. However, the Washington Post detailed that Safeway stated results were false.

While the initial reports were false, workplace wellness have become a large industry in and of itself. In total, the evidence is equivocal where some studies find positive returns and some negative returns. A non-exhaustive list of theoretical and design issues are noted. The first issue noted is a lack of definition or commonly agreed upon criteria of what constitutes a wellness program. Also, measurement of these programs is also a concern. For example, many studies only report decreased cost. Employer costs can decrease because employees are paying a greater share of the plan.

The vast majority of the evidence supporting wellness programs is predicated on case studies. However, the external validity of these studies is always a concern. Some of the limitations of generalizability stem from benefit plan design, employee demographics and corporate intentions. Also, wellness plans, as well as all voluntary plans, suffer from self-selection bias. An employee who is already predisposed to a healthy lifestyle is more likely to engage in wellness plan initiatives in much the same way that an individual with poor dental habits will select dental coverage. Beyond self-selection issues, employers often roll-out multiple changes simultaneously which confound the results. Some additional concerns are that wellness programs take substantial time to recoup initial costs but research designs may not have appropriate timelines and publication biases exist.

Drs. Scanlon and Shea reviewed the evidence provided by Penn State regarding the decision to implement the health care initiative. They noted that Penn State only provided evidence which support the decision to implement the plans. In addition, a full reading of the referenced evidence suggests that caveats and limitations were discussed in those articles going as far to suggest that current research designs have not answered the question regarding the effectiveness of these plans.

Penn State utilized Highmark's research but the others note Highmark has a vested interest in providing favorable results of Highmark's internal results. In fact, Highmark's results were estimated to be a per annum cost savings of approximately \$177. Given these results, the authors question why employees would be penalized \$1,200 for lack of participation. An additional study by Highmark is plagued with many of the same limitations noted previously.

The authors provide additional suggestions for reducing costs, but without access to actual data, the usefulness of the suggestions is unknown. These include reference pricing, price transparency, competitive bidding, quality based payment, and high deductive plans. The authors suggest that a thorough review of the return on investment with Highmark should be undertaken. In addition, the increased number of plans is contrary to Penn State's previously stated goal of administrative cost reduction through the reduction of plans. Therefore the addition of the high deductible plan and the low deductible plan goes backwards in plan administration cost and design.

The manuscript concludes with a list of seven questions that the authors believe the administration should answer in the spirit of transparency and morale. They are:

- 1) What specific methodology did Penn State use to make a return on investment calculation for the "Take Care" initiative
- 2) Did the program administration costs include all fees paid to consultants and third-party administrators?
- 3) How was the \$1,200 penalty determined if the research suggested approximately \$175?
- 4) What evidence exists that the exclusive relationship between Penn State and Highmark has benefited Penn State if Penn State's costs are increasing by double digits per annum?
- 5) What has Penn State done to drive health care providers to operate more efficiently?
- 6) What analysis has Penn State and Highmark done regarding the factors driving Penn State's cost increases and why hasn't this been shared?
- 7) What analysis\exploration has Penn State and Highmark done regarding reference pricing, competitive bidding, pay for performance and other innovative approaches?

File name: “ARTICLES.docx”

By Dr. Eileen M. Ahlin

Abstract: This summary covers the various newspaper articles, blogs, and website postings published about the PSU WebMD health initiative. The wellness initiative was enacted by the Administration because Penn State is trying to reduce the costs of its self-funded health insurance plan while not increasing tuition. The cost of the plan is anticipated to have increased by 13-20% (depending on the source) in the past two years and is expected to cost more than \$217 million in 2013-2014 (to cover 40,000 employees and dependents). The plan was not well received by faculty and staff, and many concerns with the plan were identified and covered by various news outlets. The perceived benefits of the plan (perhaps by administrators only) are to reduce the costs of insurance overall and insurance premiums and to save employees money and improve their health by providing them with feedback about their BMI, cholesterol, and blood pressure.

A summary of the plan and concerns identified by faculty and staff covered by these articles include:

Concerns generated by the initiative:

- Faculty/staff failure to comply with directive would result in a \$100/month surcharge to their health insurance premium (interpreted by many as a fine); one of the most severe financial penalties to be imposed by a U.S. employer
- The plan also calls for a \$75/month surcharge for smokers and \$100/month surcharge to carry a spouse on the PSU employee’s health insurance policy (if the spouse is offered health insurance through their own employer)
 - The coercive nature of the fine is not typical
 - Helen Darling, president of the National Business Group on Health, says that over 85% of employers nationally have health improvement programs but most offer incentives for participation, not fines
 - Many offer incentives for engaging in health initiatives for things such as:
 - Partaking in health counseling or physical exams
 - Healthy behaviors (e.g., quitting smoking, losing weight)
 - Only 2% of employers penalize employees for not participating in a wellness program
 - There is no federal cap on penalties that can be levied by employers for nonparticipation in wellness programs not linked to employees health status (e.g., questionnaires)
- Personal medical information would be collected and stored on WebMD’s website and Penn State would receive deidentified aggregate data on its employees
- Data security may be compromised and digital medical records are often sold to state health agencies
 - Even if data are stripped of personally identifying information, there is no guarantee that people could not be identified
 - The data are often sold to marketers, insurers, and drug manufacturers

- The health data mining business generates big money (i.e., to top \$10 billion in revenue by 2020)
- Latanya Sweeney, director of Harvard's Data Privacy Lab, has been able to identify patients based on data she purchased and news reports and other public records
- John Morrow, executive vice president of IVantage (a Portland, ME evaluator of hospital performance), states that his company scrubs data files clean of information such as zip code because it, in combination with other patient data, increases the ability for someone to identify a particular patient
- The Faculty Senate, nor any other faculty or staff group, was not approached for comment on the health initiative before it was released
- University experts in health policy and administration were not consulted
- The plan was announced during the summer 2013 when most faculty were not on campus
- There was one mention that the health care initiative, on top of the Sandusky scandal, has decreased employee morale and suggestions that the imposed fee is to off-set fines associated with the Sandusky scandal
- Mark Pauly, professor of health care management and business economics at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School, commented that forced wellness is not supported by the research evidence

Actions taken by faculty/staff:

- An online petition was started by University faculty to protest the health care initiative, and request an end to the surcharges until employees could be consulted on the matter
- Faculty/staff encouraged other faculty/staff to visit their primary care physician instead of the Highmark Mobile Units to gather the biometric screening data and, ultimately, charge Penn State for the doctor's visit
 - Increased doctor's visits may very well be an incentive for medical consultants because it would result in increased profits for the medical field (e.g., physicians, medications, lab work)
- Faculty have formed an advocacy chapter of the American Association of University Professors to encourage transparency and shared governance which is lacking in the current Faculty Senate structure

File name: Health_Forensic_AB_REVISED.docx

By Dr. Daniel Howard

8/1/2013- An invitation from the Abington College Faculty Senate chair to concerned parties to attend a forensic (apparently a forum to discuss and respond to concerns). The forensic is to have a two-part agenda: 1) to discuss the issues and concerns around the Take Care of your Health (TCOYH) Initiative, and 2) to draft a letter to PSU administration. Letter contains an aggregation of concerns already expressed and a list of individuals acknowledged by the Chair as being helpful in the process to date.

1. Concerns already expressed
 - a. The punitive nature of the initiative has been hidden in its dissemination
 - i. brochures that share the visual cues of junk mail,
 - ii. generic emails without clear articulation of the penalty in a subject line
 - b. Timing of implementation and limited biometric screening times limit ability of individuals to comply with the requirements
 - i. Thus, incur penalties
 - c. The penalty is the equivalent of a regressive tax
 - d. TCOYH initiative may not be legal/ethical under
 - i. HIPPA
 - ii. ADA
 - iii. respect for civil liberties or accommodation for religious beliefs
 - iv. those who practice alternative or non-Western approaches to wellness.
 - e. WebMD survey results seem to be:
 - i. skewed
 - ii. inaccurate
 - iii. lacking in the rigor that we as faculty expect of properly conducted research and survey instruments.
 - f. no clear articulation confidentiality or future use of survey and biometric data
 - i. used in the future to potentially deny benefits or to segregate beneficiaries into wellness categories?
 - g. The initiative contains financial incentives that benefit Highmark for Penn State employees not to comply, potentially creating perceptions that Penn State is complicit with Highmark in not adequately alerting employees of the punitive \$1200 increase in premiums imposed for non-compliance.

File name: Health Care Forensic Fact Sheet.pdf

By Dr. Daniel Howard

8/20/2013 (minutes reported from a meeting on this date)- Minutes from the TCOYH forensic at Abingdon. Broken into 4 sections: 1) A general timeline, 2) Security and privacy issues, 3) cost models, and 4) penalties and ramifications.

1. Timeline: a timeline of committee meetings, communications, and forensic investigations regarding TCOHY
2. Security and Privacy
 - a. Data and security
 - i. Assurances of confidentiality but confusion remained as to
 1. who has access
 2. when/how shared
 - ii. Vulnerabilities
 1. Concerns about hacking
 2. Disingenuous re: 3rd party sharing
 - iii. No control over biometric data
 - iv. WebMD profile:
 1. No way to delete
 2. Disabling is line-by-line, wastes time
 - b. Ethical research
 - i. The TCOYH initiative does not meet standards of ethical research
 1. Multiple parties collecting data
 2. NO informed consent
 3. NO clear or binding statement of confidentiality, for now or future
 4. Coercive data collection: regressive (flat fee) \$1200 penalty
3. Cost models:
 - a. I'm not really sure what the point is here
4. Penalties and ramifications
 - a. Non-compliance penalty amounts to a regressive tax
 - b. Other ramifications (selected from document)
 - i. Wastes time
 - ii. Data can be exploited
 - iii. Corporate eugenics?
 1. Tiered wellness categories
 2. Penalty for not meeting a wellness ideal?
 - iv. Ethical behavior:
 1. TCOYH may be *legal* but it's not *ethical*

File name: Altoona Wellness Letter.pdf

By Dr. Daniel Howard

9/17/2013- A letter to President Erickson from the Altoona Faculty Senate expressing faculty and staff concerns about the TCOYH initiative. Specific concerns are laid out. The Senate calls on Erickson to end/delay the TCOYH initiative.

1. Altoona Faculty Senate expressed strong disapproval of the Take Care of Your Health initiative
 - a. Lack of transparency during implementation
 - b. Faculty not consulted during implementation
2. Faculty/staff morale has suffered
3. General concerns
 - a. Is this initiative legal?
 - b. Will it be effective in achieving stated goals?
 - c. Will data be secure?
4. Voiced a preference for less intrusive health-promotion methods
5. Other concerns:
 - a. Salary is a sliding scale but \$100 penalty is a flat fee
 - i. Disproportionately impacts lower-salary employees
 - ii. Corollary: disproportionately affects employees with
 1. Lower job stability
 2. Less voice in governance
 - b. The term “voluntary “ is disingenuous; \$100 penalty is coercive
 - c. This initiative may influence our ability to attract competitive job candidates
 - i. Note: This was listed in the same pgf as the previous concern but I think it deserves its own consideration
 - d. Spousal fee:
 - i. The idea that this is an *option* (as it is characterized by the initiative) is deceitful
 1. Again, coercive
 - ii. Amounts to a pay cut of 1% to 5%
 - iii. Unfairly targets those employees with working spouses
 - e. There are differences between privacy assurances given by PSU/Highmark and those on the form signed at the biometric screening
 - i. Former solid, but the latter described limited or nonexistent protections
 - f. Doubts about the accuracy of the biometric screenings
 - i. In some cases, results differed significantly from those given by doctors
 - g. Altoona local hospital being sold to UPMC and concerns were expressed about the quality of local care
 - i. More a local concern
 - h. Quality of the evidence of the effectiveness of wellness programs has been questioned

- i. Concern that the administration is relying too heavily on Highmark- an interested party- as a source of info
- 6. Conclusion: Take Care of Your Health initiative is fatally flawed
 - a. In both development and implementation
 - b. Concur with Abington and Hazleton that it should be ended or delayed

File name: employee health benefit.pdf

By Dr. Daniel Howard

March 2013- An article in *Academic Medicine* describing an evaluation of Penn State Hershey Medical Center's adoption of a consumer driven health care plan (an approach to medical insurance that has high deductibles offset by employer-seeded health care savings plans). Not directly related to the above letters/minutes.

Marshall, J., Weaver, D. C., Splaine, K., Hefner, D. S., Kirch, D. G., & Paz, H. L. (2013). Employee health benefit redesign at the Academic Health Center: A case study. *Academic Medicine*, 88(3), 328-334.

1. Health care costs are rising
2. One approach is the "Consumer-driven plan"
 - a. high-deductible health plans
 - b. Combined with health savings plans
 - i. In this case, seeded by PSHMC and ultimately vested to employees after 5 yrs
 - c. Give consumers more
 - i. Control over expenditures
 - ii. Responsibility for expenditures
3. Hershey MC adopted a consumer-driven plan
 - a. Because the health care cost forecast was untenable
 - b. Idea was to:
 - i. Reduce medical care cost
 - ii. Reduce administrative fees
4. Changes:
 - a. Moved from choice of PPO options to only one option
 - i. Contracted through one carrier to negotiate lower admin fees
 - b. Instituted of the plan itself
 - c. Created incentives to go in-house for care
5. Tried to make the change as transparent as possible
 - a. Meetings w. employees
 - b. Mailers
 - c. During switch, offered individualized sessions
6. Impact:
 - a. Reduced increase in employee total cost from 8-10% to 4% per year
 - i. Partially from a reduction in administrative fees
 1. Accounted for 20% of the savings
 - b. Reduction in % of premium paid by employee
 - c. Increased in-house care
 - d. Health savings plans generate \$ as investments
 - e. Incentives have increased the use of preventative measures
 - f. Employees seem happy: 55% satisfied, 15% unsatisfied

i. No trend data available, though

7. Conclusions

- a. Reduced increase in healthcare costs
- b. Employees happy
- c. A useful plan

File name: "Letter to President Erickson.pdf"

By Dr. Sairam Rudrabhatla

Abstract: The file contains concerns and recommendations from 133 members of Library faculty organization with respect to Take Care of Your Health (TCYH) initiative. It was sent on 9/23/2013

There are still concerns regarding the Take Care of Your Health (TCYH) initiative that were not resolved with the recent suspension of the \$100 per month surcharge for noncompliance with it. The first and foremost concern is that mandated policy that Penn State faculty and staff must share highly sensitive health information on a third party commercial website. Faculty and staff are concerned that their online privacy rights have been violated and are certain that the Penn State Institutional Review Board would have never approved the policy.

Faculty and staff ask that certain actions be done. They would like all faculty and staff record to be expunged from WebMD and all their back up systems. They would like those individuals to have the option to retract their agreement that their information can be shared with a third party website. They would like TCYH to be suspended until a new plan is made. They would like existing staff at Penn State to have a say in designing an alternative to TCYH. They would also like a central website that holds all information about Penn State health care plans.

The library faculty has also voiced concerns about the risk of a privacy breach when information is stored with a third party site. They also concerned about the cost to the university from WebMD and whether or not this method is efficient. The librarians also voiced concern that the timing of the TCYH policy violates the university's pledge of openness and the fine or noncompliance does nothing to alleviate those concerns. They would like transparency in regards to all plans and they would like no decisions to be made on the data collected and for there to be alternatives of the TCYH in place.

File name: "Letter from ACFS to President Erickson.pdf"

By Dr. Sairam Rudrabhatla

Abstract: The file contains a letter sent from Abington college Faculty Senate to President Erickson with respect to Take Care of Your Health Initiative. It was sent on 8/9/2013

The Council urges and speaks about the need for being transparent and shared governance. They suggest a few actions which include immediate suspension of TCYH initiative, purge the database of individuals who completed the online survey, develop trust and have a University wide dialogue and present new initiative for discussion at University faculty senate.

Several other concerns were raised with respect of timing and communication of this initiative, lack of complying with legal requirements of HIPPA, ADA and others, security concerns with release of personal data and finally no explanation of cost savings.

File name: "Resolution regarding health care .docx"

By Dr. Sairam Rudrabhatla

Abstract: The file contains a letter from Members of Penn State York Faculty senate to President Erickson with respect to Take Care of Your Health Initiative. It was sent on 9/23/2013

The faculty senate joins with other campuses in their concerns with respect to TCYH. They mention although Penn State followed the legalities associated with launching this initiative through HR, Public Relation, it still lacks the ethical principles and is trying to force employees submit their medical information. They acknowledge administration move to suspend the \$ 100

penalty for noncompliance but are concerned there is several other employees who have provided their data to meet deadline. They would like to see this data be purged from database. They conclude with University action to delay due to concerns and also the formation of Joint task force.

File name: “Revised wellness motion .docx”

By Dr. Sairam Rudrabhatla

Abstract: The file contains Abington Faculty Senate Motion on TCYH initiative. This was sent on 9/23/2013

ACFS requests PSU immediately suspend the implementation of TCYH initiative and purge the database of individuals who completed the WebMD survey and/or biometric screenings. ACFS further would like to see a University wide dialogue and coming up with an effective plan. ACFS passed an vote of lack of confidence in incumbent VP Human resources and requests immediate suspension from his duties.

File name: “Senate Resolution .pdf”

By Dr. Sairam Rudrabhatla

Abstract: The file contains resolution to be voted by University Faculty Senate. This was set for 9/24/2013

The University Faculty Senate agrees to declare a one-year moratorium on TCYH initiative and during this period they will call on experts from senate and faculty to evaluate alternatives to controlling health care expenses. Any reforms will be brought at last Faculty Senate meeting in April 2014 for vote of approval.

File name: “webmd_your rights .pdf”

By Dr. Sairam Rudrabhatla

Abstract: The file contains what can be expected from the WebMd health services group . This was prepared on 8/20/2013

This document speaks for products, services and programs, qualifications of staff and any contractual relationships with third parties.

File name: "Forensic minutes.pdf"

By Dr. Nihal Bayraktar

Abstract: The file contains forensic Q&A with S. Basso and Forensic among faculty and staff members of Penn State Abington. It was on 8/20/2013.

Important points from forensic Q&A with S. Basso

Before taking any questions, S. Basso points out two "not-highly publicized" features of the health initiative: 1) values based benefit design (incentive driven program designed for individuals with chronic illness or disease); 2) Incentive driven, qualified high deductible plan.

Based on questions received people have concerns on: 1) privacy of biometric screening process and sharing its results [Basso replied saying that it can be taken from personal physician];

2) Whether or not collected information is sold to WebMD and how data collection by Highmark, ICH, WebMD helps to lower cost. [Basso replied saying that they rely on the expertise of Highmark; 500,000 members are using WebMD; familiar with the PA State System of Higher Education; Highmark and WebMD do not share; they do not sell information; no individual data will be provided to the university, only aggregate;

3) Time framework of the process is asked. Basso replied that "I made first presentation about this three---year strategy to full Faculty Senate on 10/11/11. That full presentation contained every element of this strategy." She got her charge from University's 2009 strategic plan. She adds: "Goal over next year will be to review and keep eye on what is going on with costs. Assuming we see positive trajectory, which many institutions are seeing, related to strategies similar to this, we'll be talking about what future years need to look like."

4) In March 2013 Benefits Committee was charged with sharing with faculty and seeking feedback. The concern is what stopped that charge from being carried out. April minutes of that Faculty Benefits committee said that feedback had been negative. But no changes made in the project. [The response is not clear] RO states that they considered it (!) "The major feedback received was that originally proposed employees would have to follow the preventive schedule and receive the exams required by Highmark's preventive schedule. We received a lot of feedback with concerns about that so we did change directions, so we did change to individuals just getting an annual physical."

5) A question on why not Hershey Medical Center model is adopted. [I think it is a voluntary plan] RO and Basso state that fiscal situation is different; incentives not working as well as disincentives; voluntary wellness program did not work before; the university pays 80% of healthcare, employees pay 17%; the university wants to stay at 17.5%.

6) A question on whether "office of OHR consider effects of punitive charges on morale and the loyalty of PSU employees ". Answer by Basso: "we considered it" and "It is a charge that I was given by the president and my boss, David Gray, the Senior VP of Finance and Business. We took months pouring over data, looking at other institutions, looking at how we could reach goal set for us." And she adds "employees still have choices. They still have the choice to smoke, they still have the choice not to do any of the things that we are asking of them. But based on those choices there will be financial consequences."

7) A concern on how successful Highmark and other plans are. National press is calling those successes into question. Basso answers: "For every piece of research that says this doesn't work, there is research that says it does. And there are companies and other institutions like Highmark that have these programs in place and are seeing great success."

Important points from forensic

BC lists concerns about the new take care of your health initiative:

- 1) Time line of the process: On 3/12 presentation of the strategic plan, outlined by OHR, to the University Faculty Senate Benefits Committee. On 3/23 the committee reported negative feedback. In July the plan announced with no changes. On 8/9 Abington drafted a letter. 3-years health benefits strategic plan is mentioned. The wording of the plan was “encouraged to perform wellness activities”, but it changed to punitive plan. There are concerns about shared governance. The feedbacks from the UFS were ignored. Poor and one-way communication among the stakeholders.
- 2) Security and privacy of collected data: Integrated Corporate Health (ICH) was hired to administer Take Care of Your Health. ICH hired webMD for surveys and database. The database linked to Highmark health claims. The collection of biometric screening data by the ICH is another concern. “Despite assurances of confidentiality, we are not sure of who has what, when they have it, how it might be shared, and under what authority these things might be shared, how this might relate to HIPPA.” The process did not follow PSU policy for ethical guidelines of research and gathering data.
- 3) Cost models: “concerned about the transparency on the process of selecting a model and the cost savings that are associated with this.” What are the differences between “self-insured” and other options? The cost of hiring ICH, WebMD, and Highmark needs to be considered. Health cost per individual is much less than cost per employee (below national average). Additional hidden costs for employees such as it could be more expensive for spouses to go on own plans.
- 4) Penalties and ramifications: Data has potential use for discrimination. Concerns on the eventual rollout of tiered plan with wellness categories. Individuals may be blamed for health problems.

Additional concerns pointed out in forensic:

- 1) Concern about whether anyone will be penalized if one fills out the forms honestly.
- 2) Faculty were not given chance to provide feedback.
- 3) Is it possible to see the contract between the University, ICH and WebMD in terms of what they pay and what they are doing?
- 4) How much the health premium will increase for people who had a family history or previously sick?
- 5) In the WebMD questionnaire, the share of questions on mental health such as depression and alcohol is large. What may be the reason? A participant answers that webMd is driven by pharma companies.
- 6) No informed consent is provided for questionnaires.
- 7) Issue of lack of shared governance. A comment “Listening to VP Basso read President Erickson’s letter – they seem to think that they have consulted faculty. The only way for change is for faculty to organize under AAUP, the Teamsters, and forms an organization

that has the strength and finances to fight this.” Unionization was also discussed. It was suggested that AAUP can be called.

Summary of File name: “Highmark Medical Cost Savings Study.pdf”

Summary by Jeremy Blum

Abstract: The file describes a study done by two Highmark researchers which examine 643 employer-based wellness programs in Pennsylvania. The abstract states that study concludes that “**may** decrease health care costs and encourage preventative service utilization” (emphasis added). The conclusion is more emphatic in stating that the wellness programs studied did reduce medical costs and increase consumption of preventative services.

Important Points

The study points to four previous studies that have found that when implemented correctly wellness programs can improve health outcomes and lower costs while increasing worker productivity.

This study (which was done by Highmark) examined the effectiveness of Highmark wellness programs by comparing 47 employers with high rates of participation in the web-based programs with 596 employers with a large number of nonparticipants. Of the 47 “engaged wellness employers”, five used only Web-based programs while others included some mix of on-site individual activities, group activities, and/or biometric screenings. The participation in these voluntary programs ranged from a median rate of 11.4% at the beginning of the study to a median rate of 43.2% three years later.

The findings of the study include:

- 1) The participating employee group had significantly more employees with a chronic condition
- 2) There was a lower rate of per member total spending increase in the participant group (\$859 vs. \$1191 over the four-year study period). Most of this difference appears to be attributable to “professional service expenditures.” There were no differences found in pharmacy costs, rate of inpatient admission, or emergency room visit frequency.

COMMENT: While the rate of increase was more, the baseline for the nonparticipant group was significantly lower. At the end of the study, the total cost per member in the non-participant group was \$3798 vs \$3599 for the participant group.

- 3) The number of preventive services consumed increased more in the participant group (16%) than in the non-participant group (7%).

COMMENT: The difference in the number of preventive services consumed seems very small. At the end of the study this was 1.22 for the participant group vs. 1.04 for the non-participant group.

The study notes that following limitations:

- 1) There was no return-on-investment analysis included.

COMMENT: This seems to indicate that the total medical expenditures reported in the study is incomplete, at least in the sense that it did not include the cost of these wellness programs. This would reduce the savings that is reported here.

- 2) The study is unable to assess which of the range of programs is responsible for the observed outcomes (for example, is the improvement due to on-site programs or to the Web-based components?)
- 3) The participant group included employers with a greater concentration of women.

Summary of File name: “Highmark ROI Study.pdf”

Summary by Jeremy Blum

Abstract: The file describes a study funded by Highmark to investigate the return on investment (ROI) of a Highmark Wellness Program. The study concludes that health care expenses for participants were \$176 lower than nonparticipants. Given the program expenses and estimated expenses, the study suggests that these programs had an ROI of \$1.65 (i.e. for every \$1 spent, \$1.65 was saved). Note that the authors note that actual estimated ROI could be as low as \$1.19.

Important Points

The study used the program that Highmark offers to its employees. Almost all of participated in a wellness program, with 82% participating in biometric screening, and many participating in condition management services, as appropriate.

The study excluded four individuals who participated in the wellness program because of a claim level in excess of \$100,000. COMMENT: The exclusion of these participants seems likely to affect the results.

The non-participants were selected from Highmark client companies. Non-participants were matched with participants using the following attributes: gender; age within 2 years; medical expenditures for year at start of the study within \$500; and predictors of heart disease, diabetes, stroke, mortality, length of hospital stay, and 19 other health conditions.

The wellness program included access to fitness center and on-line programs. Average costs ranged between \$130-\$150 per year per participant. The cost savings due to the programs were estimated at \$176 per year per person. COMMENT: Due to the potential errors in estimation of these costs, this paper does not seem to me to make a definitive case of the benefit of these programs.

One of the conclusions of the study is that participation only in the Health Risk Assessment (HRA) can produce \$173 per year in savings (although the sample size was too small to find statistical significance in this difference) and increased preventive screening rates from 56% to 60%.

The study notes the following limitations:

- 1) Selection bias: those who participate in these programs may be more proactive in general in managing their health, and thus would have lower health care costs than the control group.
- 2) Measurement bias: those who took the HRA may be more likely to be healthy, which may overstate the role of the HRA in producing positive outcomes.
- 3) Inaccuracies in both expenses and benefits: The study notes that there were difficulties in obtaining accurate cost information.

COMMENT: The study also, for some reason, omitted the cost of the ½ day off that was given to some employees. Including this cost would have reduced the ROI to \$1.48.

The authors go on to state that they believe that due to the study limitations the ROI could lie between \$1.19 and \$2.52.

File name: “webmd_Terms of Use.pdf”

Summary by Jeremy Blum

Abstract: The file contains the terms that users must agree to in order to use the services on the WebMD website.

Important Points in File

The terms of use serve mainly to limit the liability of WebMD for claims that might arise from the use of the site. For example:

- The agreement states that “the site does not provide medical advice,” but is “provided for informational use only,” and
- That the use of WebMD is at user’s risk only.

The WebMD agreement notes that if a user accesses the site “through a sponsoring organization,” (which may be the case for PSU), the sponsoring organization may have a different policy regarding “the collection and use of [user’s] personal data.”

One important potential liability that a user takes on by creating an account is that the user is required to maintain “the security of [their] identification, password, and other confidential information,” and is responsible for ... charges resulting from use of [their] WebMD account.”

Additional restrictions cover information liability limits, links to third party sites, rules governing user submissions, trademarks, and so on.

File name : WebMD wellness survey-00002.pdf

By Dr. Margaret Rose Jaster

Introduction:

- ~Profile inquires about health interests of responder; offers 57 possible topics
- ~Wellness Rewards can be earned if the responder completes 3 tasks: Biometric test, Wellness Profile and Preventative exam w/ healthcare Professional
- ~Responder is assured of privacy; link to Privacy Policy provided

11-page Wellness Profile Includes:

~Requested info:

- ~~height, weight, waist measurement, blood pressure, blood sugar, cholesterol and triglycerides,
- ~~recent preventive screenings and exams with approximate dates of same (if available),
- ~~responder's general nutritional information,
- ~~tobacco usage,
- ~~alcohol usage,
- ~~fitness information,
- ~~emotional health,
- ~~commitment to making healthy changes,
- ~~responder's assessment of her/his overall health

File name: webmd_Privacy Policy.pdf

By Dr. Margaret Rose Jaster

10-page Privacy Policy Includes:

I. Introduction

II. WebMD's Commitment to Privacy Protection

III. What Personal Information WebMD Collects From You

IV. "Cookies" and "Web Beacons" and How They Are Used

V. How WebMD Uses Your Personal Information

A. WebMD Tools

B. Concept Unique Identifiers

C. Aggregate Data

D. Data Warehouse Analysis

E. Disclosure to the Plan, Your Employer and Third Parties

F. Personalized Emails/Messages

G. Disclosure to WebMD Contractors

H. Third-Party Web Sites

I. Obtaining a Copy of Your Personal Information

VI. Your Privacy Choices as a User of the WebMD Tools

A. Changing Information

B. Account Deletion and Removal of Your Personal Information

C. Limitations on Removing or Changing Personal Information

D. Amendments Under the HIPAA Privacy Rule

VII. How WebMD Protects Your Personal Information

VIII. Changes to the WebMD Privacy Policy

IX. The WebMD Tools Are Intended for Adults

X. Questions

XI. Glossary

APPENDIX

The following article is shared with the members of the HR&BSC by Dr. Jeremy Blum. His email message below explains the importance of the article.

Email message of Dr. Blum:

The following may be an interesting thing to discuss at [tomorrow's](#) meeting. Consumer reports released ratings of Health Insurance Plans that was compiled by National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA), a nonprofit health care quality measurement group. Highmark's PPO ranks last (by a large margin) for Pennsylvania Health Plans, including a ranking of 2 out of 5 for Preventive Services. A link to the report is:

<http://www.consumerreports.org/cro/magazine/2013/11/find-a-best-value-health-plan/index.htm>

The PA Private PPO rankings are available at:

<http://www.consumerreports.org/health/insurance/NCQA-rankings.htm?state=PA&planCategory=privatePPO>

This was brought to my attention by Bob Gray, who had some interesting insights into the current cost containment approaches.

Article:

10/29/13

Health Insurance Coverage in 2014 | Health Plan Rankings - Consumer Reports

ConsumerReports.org

Find a 'Best Value' health plan

New rankings of 987 health insurance plans nationwide can help you choose the best one for you and your family

Published: September 2013

Some health plans excel at helping you get high quality medical care. Some excel at helping you avoid costly care. And some plans do both. For the first time in the four years, we've published rankings of health insurance plans we've identified Best Value plans—those that give the biggest bang for your health care dollar.

The Best Value designation is based on how well plans help people with diabetes manage their condition. We are focusing on diabetes for several reasons.

First, the disease has reached epidemic proportions, affecting about 26 million Americans and projected to reach a third of U.S. adults by 2050. So even if you don't have diabetes now, you might want a plan that manages it effectively in case you or someone in your family develops it later.

In addition, managing diabetes requires good, basic care—for things such as high blood pressure, cholesterol, and blood glucose levels—and coordination among providers. That means plans that get diabetes right are likely to do a lot of things well.

Finally, treating diabetes is expensive, especially if basic care is neglected, so plans that provide good diabetes care for less money should have more resources available to cover other conditions or to reduce premiums. And that's important for everyone. (See our [advice on how to prevent and manage diabetes](#).)



What your money buys

The data for the rankings and the Best Value designation come from the [National Committee for Quality Assurance \(NCQA\)](#), a nonprofit health care quality measurement group. It is financed mainly by fees from health plans for accreditation, by government research contracts, and by sales of other products and services. Overall, we have some information on 997 private and Medicare plans, and full data on quality and cost for diabetes care for 472 of them. (See a list of [NCQAs rankings of Medicaid plans](#).)

The information is part of an effort to better track and control health care spending, and to make the data available to consumers. "Many people assume that the more money that's spent on health care, the better health care will be," said John Santa, M.D., medical director of Consumer Reports Health. "But as these rankings show, that is not always the case."

In fact, our analysis of the data found no connection between cost and quality. Plans that avoided costly care were just as likely to provide high quality care as those that spent more lavishly.

Plans that avoid costly care often also provide high quality care.

Better care for less

NCQA identified Best Value plans by studying how well they performed on several key diabetes measures and how often and how long diabetic patients were hospitalized. Then NCQA compared similar plans covering the same region.

The quality measures include how well plan members have their [glucose](#), [blood pressure](#), and [cholesterol](#) measured and controlled, how well their kidney function is monitored, and whether they get regular screenings for eye disease.

NCQA focused on hospitalization to identify plans that avoid costly diabetes care. Hospitalization is by far the most expensive kind of care. And with a disease such as diabetes, it's often avoidable.

Plans that do well in managing diabetes tend to do a good job of helping members stay out of the hospital. Keeping you out of the hospital helps keep your medical bills down—and it can help insurance companies control their costs, too. After all, it costs more to hospitalize a diabetic patient for a heart attack than it does to provide the care that can prevent heart attacks in the first place.

Top-performing plans

Our analysis shows that 114 plans got a Best Value designation, earning check marks for providing high quality care and avoiding costly care. Many more—402 plans—got a check mark for one but not both of those measures. And 481 plans didn't get a check mark for either. That could be because they had poor results for those measures or they did not report the data needed for this analysis.

Doing poorly on either measure is obviously worrisome, but not sharing results publicly can be just as bad.

"If plans don't measure and disclose information about quality and resource use, it's hard for consumers to have all the information they need," said the NCQA president, Margaret E. O'Kane. "And without that information, it's also hard for plans to know where they need to improve."

Not surprising, plans with a Best Value designation also tended to do better in other measures that are included in our rankings. Specifically, Medicare plans with a Best Value check mark did better in consumer satisfaction, and private plans with a Best Value check mark had higher average overall scores.

Click on the links below to download PDFs showing the Best Value rankings for private and Medicare plans.

[Best Value Health Insurance Plans - Private](#) (245kb)

[Best Value Health Insurance Plans - Medicare](#) (224kb)

And use the complete [health insurance rankings](#) to get additional information on those plans and on Medicaid plans.

How big plans fared

We looked at large insurers that offer multiple health plans to see how they compare when it comes to making sure that their members with diabetes get higher quality care and avoid costly care. The table shows the number of plans for each insurer, and the percentage that earned a Best Value check mark. Note that 20 percent of unaffiliated plans also got a Best Value check mark.

Insurer	% of plans that are a Best Value*
Kaiser Permanente	25% (5 of 20 plans)
Health Net	25% (2 of 8 plans)
Coventry Health Care	20% (6 of 30 plans)
Blue Cross and Blue Shield	13% (11 of 84 plans)
Humana	10% (11 of 111 plans)
UnitedHealthcare	5% (10 of 188 plans)
CIGNA HealthCare	5% (5 of 99 plans)
Aetna	4% (5 of 118 plans)
Wellpoint	0% (0 of 39 plans)

*Includes plans that do not report Best Value data.



Table

Private health plan rankings from NCQA

Ranked plans, in rank order within states.



National rank	Plan name	Overall	Care factors (diabetes)				
		Overall score	Consumer satisfaction	Getting higher quality of care	Avoiding costly care	Best Value	
PENNSYLVANIA							
11	UPMC Health Plan (HMO)	89	5	✓			
12	UPMC Benefit Management Services (HMO)	89	5				
22	Geisinger Health Plan (HMO/POS)	88	3	✓	✓	✓	✓
35	HealthAmerica Pennsylvania (HMO)	86	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
42	Keystone Health Plan West (HMO)	86	5				
48	UPMC Benefit Management Services (PPO)	86	5				
48	UPMC Health Network (PPO)	86	5	✓	✓	✓	✓
54	Geisinger Quality Options (PPO)	85	4	✓			
86	Capital Advantage Insurance (POS)	84	4				
86	Keystone Health Plan Central (HMO)	84	4	✓			
94	QCC Insurance (Personal Choice) (PPO)	84	5				
99	Aetna Life Insurance (PPO)	83	3	✓			
102	Keystone Health Plan East (HMO/POS)	83	3	✓			
129	AmeriHealth HMO (HMO/POS)	83	3				
169	First Priority Health (HMO)	82	4				
201	Cigna Health and Life Insurance (PPO)	82	3				
201	Connecticut General Life Insurance (Cigna) (PPO)	82	3	✓			
231	Aetna Health (HMO/POS)	81	2				
299	UnitedHealthcare Insurance (PPO)	80	2				
299	UnitedHealthcare Services (PPO)	80	2				
301	Connecticut General Life Insurance (Cigna) (HMO/POS)	80	2				
451	Martin's Point US Family Health Plan (HMO) ³	71	5				
471	Highmark Health Services (PPO) ¹	65	4		✓		

**TECHNOLOGY AND LIBRARY COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT
MONDAY, MAY 05, 2014
PREPARED BY ZINA TARAN**

Committee Members:

Marie Blouin
Sukmoon Chang
Gloria Clark (Sabbatical)
Omar El Ariss
Philip Kavanaugh
Margaret Lohman
Zina Taran (Chair)
Sam Winch

Ex Officio:

Greg Crawford
Eric Delozier
John Hoh
Kate Tompkins
Christopher Weaver

Committee Charge:

- Meet with the Physical Plant Committee to prepare a statement for the Strategic Planning Committee that addresses Physical Plant and ISTL’s mutual needs
- Examine the ways in which the Horizon Report can guide campus technology planning in the next strategic planning cycle.
- Gather best practices in the use of the new technology on campus

Committee Meetings:

The committee met 4 times:

Date	Agenda
October 25, 2013	1. Introduction of Committee Members. 2. Review the committee charge. 3. Highlight Resources available to the committee
December 2, 2013	1. Joint meeting with the Physical Plant Committee. A walking tour of library facilities
February 14, 2014	1. Discuss 2013 Horizon report and its impact on our strategic plan. 2. Review strategic plan given to committee in the Fall
April 23, 2014	1. Further consideration of main themes of the IT Strategic Plan 2. Review summer projects

Charge Implementation:

A. Meet with the Physical Plant Committee to prepare a statement for the Strategic Planning Committee that addresses Physical Plant and ISTL’s mutual needs

The ISTL Committee met with the Physical Plant Committee on December 2, 2013. ITS has been implementing some useful developments, such as creating collaborative studying spaces for the students, facilities for students making and editing of videos, the Skittles room with its moveable flip boards and other innovations.

This is a great start, and more of this sort of collaboration between the two committees will be needed, especially, as facilities and classrooms keep being renovated and new learning spaces built, in particular, with the new EAB building with more integration of technology and learning spaces. ISTL committee recommends to continue the collaboration between the ISTL and the Physical Plant committees.

B. Examine the ways in which the Horizon Report can guide campus technology planning in the next strategic planning cycle.

The Horizon Report offers an overview of best practices and the outlook on important trends in technology and how it will impact higher education. As such, it provides a useful set of benchmarks and generally useful guide to where efforts should be concentrated. The 2013 report highlights the following trends:

A. Short-term (we are doing many of these at PSH):

- MOOCs
- Tablet computing
- Social media

B. Middle and long term (implementation is starting on these)

- Games and gamification
- Learning Analytics
- 3D printing
- Wearable technology

Being that these are the major trends having high impact on education, they have to be used extensively in campus technology planning.

C. Gather best practices in the use of the new technology on campus

The committee started discussions regarding best practices, but more effort is needed in that direction and it would be an important task for the committee in the next Academic year.

Currently, some of practices worth mentioning:

1. Collaborative Classrooms (we need more of those!)
2. One button studio
3. Feedback gathering mechanism at the point of use: a laminated card on each podium with instructions on how to send feedback via computer, or mobile device
4. Student Collaborative spaces
5. 3D printer and scanner
6. Treadmill in the library
7. Skype setup in some rooms
8. Box.com cloud storage
9. Apps for using tablets in the classroom; currently only available for iOS

It appears that instructional approaches to using technology currently are extremely diverse, ranging from emphasizing blackboards and chalk to mobile apps.

As new buildings are built and new best practices continue to emerge, it is important to make sure they are catalogued and known to the PSU Community.

Additionally, with so much being implemented to facilitate learning, it is important to take stock of whether the changes that are implemented are useful (and appreciated) by the community and in particular, students.

Finally, the Committee wishes to express its endorsement of the efforts of the ITS in developing technology on campus.

Committee suggestions for 2014/2015 charge:

- Continue working with the Physical Plant Committee and coordinate assessment of progress in moving toward providing of better learning and research technology and space to the community
- Evaluate progress relative to the Horizon Report
- Evaluate student perceptions of technology implementation
- Continue gathering best practices

International and Intercultural Affairs Committee
End-of-the-Year Report
2013-2014
Submitted by Robin Redmon Wright, Chair

Summary:

Over the academic year, the International and Intercultural Affairs Committee (IIAC) met 6 times and participated in two campus events on International/Intercultural issues. I appreciate the members' willingness to meet to discuss our charges, other issues as they arose, and to participate in campus wide forums. The first half of the year was devoted primarily to the strategic planning initiative and compiling our recommendations for Dr. Kulkarni's consideration. The second half focused on international students as the number of international students at Capital College continues to increase, and concern over the growing number of anti-gay laws being passed in countries where we make study abroad available.

Charges:

The Senate has confirmed this year's charges for the International and Intercultural Affairs Committee as follows:

1. Hold focus sessions with international students to determine their specific needs and desires for programs. Of special concern is how the college can help improve the experience of international students at PSH.
 2. Serve as a body for guiding the strategic planning and curricular integration of international programming for the College.
 3. Assist faculty in infusing internationalization into their courses and programs.
- **The first charge** coincided with the Carol McQuiggan and the Faculty Center efforts to gather information from faculty and international students on improving teaching and learning for international students. Rather than duplicating those efforts, the committee decided to be active in those activities: A Faculty Forum, An International Student Forum, and a faculty survey on international students.
1. Faculty Forum on International Students: Robin Redmon Wright, Chair of IIAC, was facilitator for this event and Donna Howard and Lewis Boahene were both panelists. The forum was well attended by both faculty and students. Donna gave an informative presentation on the international student application process, international student orientation, and services available for international students, including student activity groups. Lots of ideas were exchanged as regards cultural adaptations to teaching methods and advantages of having international students in classrooms.
 2. International Student Forum: The chair and five committee members attended the student forum and took notes. We discussed the student's stories and ideas at our next meeting.
 3. We participated in the survey and Carol shared the results with us. We incorporated the responses in our discussions about Charge #3.

- **The second charge** was the main focus of our first four meetings. Dr. Kulkarni attended the meeting on October 31st to explain the types of recommendations he expected, and how he wanted them presented, as well as give us a timeline. On January 28th, we presented the following recommendations to Dr. Kulkarni:

The International and Intercultural Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate have researched, discussed, and come to a consensus on a number of appropriate additions to the Capital College Strategic Planning Initiative that we feel will increase and enhance intercultural and international experiences for students. The following list is in no particular order as we feel each item is equally important:

Suggestions for International and Intercultural components to the Strategic Plan:

- College-wide development of educational programs focused on a single country or region, across all disciplines and at all academic levels. (Possibilities include having an array of core courses, celebrations, and informational speakers that focus on a single country or culture per semester. This will enable students and faculty to gain greater understanding of a particular country, as well as the impact that US and multinational corporations have on that country. Course content can include how individual choices may impact the people and environment of that country.)
- International trip funding for faculty.
- Visiting scholar resources. (For example: visiting scholar office suite, assistance with housing and transportation, etc.)
- Hire an intercultural training organization for everyone across the institution, including faculty, staff, and student employees. All staff, from administrative assistants to janitorial staff, need training on issues related working with international students.
 - Intercultural issues
 - Intercultural pedagogy
 - (Ideally, this type of training should be ongoing and not a one-time session.)
 - An example of one such group is the Intercultural Management Institute at American University: <http://www.american.edu/sis/imi/>
- Seed grants that focus specifically on encouraging teaching, course development, and/or research projects in collaboration with colleagues in other countries.
- Promotion and training of the use of video conferencing technologies in international teaching collaborations.
- Education for the faculty on existing MOUs with institutions abroad and ways that these can be utilized in teaching and research.
- Promotion of interdisciplinary collaboration, curriculum, and programming in teaching on cultural issues.
- Development of international and intercultural experiences that can be integrated into most, if not all, program curriculum.

- Graduate admissions assistance in assessing international candidates. There is a significant need for someone with appropriate expertise to evaluate international transcripts.
- Expand international student orientation and make the sessions enjoyable, social occasions to increase participation. Recruit student facilitators to assist with these sessions.
- Integration of intentionally curated programs of digital stories from the World Wide Narratives program into various curriculum, orientations, and trainings across the campus.

The IIAC feels that integrating these measures into the Strategic Plan will be a pro-active approach to increasing our international appeal, international student retention, and the quality and breadth of education received by all of our students.

- **The third charge** clearly overlaps with both of the above charges. In addition to the activities above, I asked Shivaani Selvaraj to give a presentation on the World Wide Narratives project to our committee on Feb. 19th.

World Wide Narratives creates intentional spaces in which members of the Penn State community tell their own stories of lived experience and listen to those told by others. The project explores who we are as a community, giving voice to what is often unheard and unnoticed with the aim of shifting awareness of difference, and provoking new approaches to addressing it. The process is grounded in the assumption that meaningful human interaction involves risk, care, and openness. Access to these video stories could be valuable to any effort to internationalize the educational experience of PSU Harrisburg students and would work for a variety of topics and disciplines.

Brief Synopses of the Meetings (full minutes are available):

The 1st meeting, held on September 25th, was spend discussing charges and generating ideas. We received reports on enrollment of and services provided to international students. Donna Howard outlined the International Student Orientation and Pathways to Success programs to the committee and we discussed ways it might be enhanced and *better attended*.

Dr. Kulkarni attended the first half of the 2nd meeting, on October 31st to explain his expectations for our recommendations for the strategic plan as explained above. He reminded us that:

- A. Strategic Planning Context:
 - International activities are not restricted to one area but concentrate certain regions of the world to focus attention and efforts (for example: upcoming Spring 2014 trip to India)
- B. Campus Context:
 - Student body represents 36 countries

- Penn State Harrisburg has the most enrollment of international students of all Commonwealth campuses
 - Couple of dozen of languages represented by faculty; 360 international students
- C. Strategic Partners are:
- a. India
 - b. Brazil
 - c. South Africa
 - d. China
 - e. Korea

This information was kept forefront in our minds as we proceeded with discussions for the rest of the year.

Our 3rd meeting on December 9th was a discussion of recommendations for the Strategic Plan. A list of priorities was hashed out at that lengthy meeting, and Robin Redmon Wright, chair, took these to refine, collapse, and develop into a list to send electronically to the rest of the committee for comment. Those comments were incorporated and a final list developed by the chair and submitted to Dr. Kulkarni.

The 4th meeting, held on February, 19th was devoted to understanding the World Wide Narratives project and discussing ways it could assist faculty in facilitating learning among and between international and US students. Ms. Selvaraj showed us 5 short videos dealing with experiences with an international component. The World Wide Narratives Project fits well with the focus on diversity in the strategic planning process that is currently taking place and encouraging faculty to include them in class activities was added to our suggestions for the strategic plan. Since the program began in 2011, project staff have recorded more than 250 stories, which are currently used in training and professional development and climate assessment research. The program team is interested in engaging with faculty to help them integrate the video narratives, as well as other parts of the program, into teaching and/or other programming.

During the meeting, we discussed:

- the importance of staff and faculty telling their own stories
- the assumptions exhibited in the stories (the recorders, tellers, and us as listeners)
- the usefulness of hearing from people with different positionalities for facilitating discussions around issues of international and intercultural differences and likenesses
- the learning taking place for the story recorders—the importance of listening critically. The stories are not meant to be “truth” or “authority” on some topic, but are reflections of experiences.

The 5th meeting on March 26th was focused primarily on discussing the International Student Forum, held on March 18th, and the upcoming Faculty Forum. There was a consensus among the members who attended that it would be beneficial for more faculty to be made aware of international student stories (as could be facilitated by the World Wide Narrative project). Some discussion on the issue of international students and culturally influenced class participation practices/credit led, again, to a discussion of faculty awareness (or, rather, the lack thereof) and ways to involve

more faculty who teach international students. Robin pointed out that adjunct faculty and FT1s are often the people who teach the general courses with larger numbers in incoming international students, and they often don't have time to attend forums and the many international activities that Donna's office facilitates. Perhaps there could be some incentive for faculty to participate? It was also suggested that school directors be encouraged to attend these activities to model behaviors encouraged for faculty.

Finally, the committee members who attended unanimously agreed that more such forums should be arranged and more strenuously promoted to faculty who have the most interactions with international students. AND that there needs to be more time for the audience to ask questions of the international student panelists.

After this discussion Robin Redmon Wright brought up a new business item, noting that both Russia and India have recently passed severe anti-gay laws and showing the committee a website: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-25927595> where each country's laws concerning LGBTQ people could be explored. This turned into a very animated discussion and was eventually tabled until the next meeting.

The 6th meeting was held on May 1st and consisted primarily of a discussion of the former topic. This second lively discussion about the universities possible responses to the growing number of countries passing anti-gay laws (see website above) and university sponsored student study abroad programs. While we all realize that Marie Louise and the staff here do a terrific job telling students about possible dangers and issues may arise in whatever country they plan to travel, it is certainly a concern that the recent passing and enforcement of anti-gay legislation in several countries may not be adequately addressed across the university. Nor is there any guarantee that awareness will be enough to protect students. Moreover, the university's policies on such matters remains unclear, at least to this group. The issues here are myriad:

- What message does university travel to these countries send to our LGBTQ community (in light of the university and college's stated vision and values)? What message are we sending to the community at large?
- What are the legal liabilities and possible ramifications if one of our students, traveling on a university trip, is imprisoned or sentenced to death because of who he or she is? Should we be proactive in this matter since countries like Russia and India have recently passed such harsh laws.
- Does the university have a moral responsibility to take a stand against such laws and, if so, what might that look like?

among many others.

Therefore, it was agreed that

1. The committee request that all university policies regarding study abroad made available to them.
2. The committee would like to facilitate a faculty forum on this issue as a means to learn from one another, exchange ideas on the issue, and show support for our LGBTQ community.

Finally, the Chair called for volunteers to chair this committee next year.
Anthony Buccitelli volunteered to serve in that capacity.

Suggestions for Further Charges:

1. Hold more international student forums and faculty forums on international students.
2. Review all university policies regarding study abroad made available to them.
3. Facilitate a faculty forum on this issue as a means to learn from one another, exchange ideas on the issue, and show support for our LGBTQ community.
4. See the list for Strategic Planning above for more suggestions!

Attendance Record:

September 25

Members present:

Robin Redmon Wright (Chair), Yuefeng Xie, Anthony Buccitelli, Indrit Hoxha, Karen Buhr, Marie Louise Abram, Michael Becker, Donna Howard, Martha Strickland

Members absent:

Lewis Asimeng-Boahene, Michael Barton, Richard Young

October 31

Members present:

Robin Redmon Wright (Chair), Lewis Asimeng-Boahene, Michael Barton, Anthony Buccitelli, Karen Buhr, Marie Louise Abram, Michael Becker, Martha Strickland

Members absent:

Donna Howard, Yuefeng Xie, Indrit Hoxha, Richard Young

Guests present:

Invited Guest: Dr. Kulkarni

December 1

Members present:

Robin Redmon Wright (Chair), Anthony Buccitelli, Karen Buhr, Marie Louise Abram, Michael Becker, Donna Howard, Yuefeng Xie, Indrit Hoxha, Martha Strickland

Members absent:

Michael Barton, Lewis Asimeng-Boahene, Richard Young

February 19th

Members Present:

Robin Redmon Wright, Chair, Marie Louise Abram, Lewis Boahene, Anthony Buccitelli, Karen Buhr, Donna Howard, Indrit Hoxha, Martha Strickland, Xie Yuefeng

Members Absent:

Michael Barton, Michael Becker, Richard Young

Invited Guest:

Shivaani Selvaraj

March 26

Members present:

Robin Redmon Wright (Chair), Michael Becker, Lewis Asimeng-Boahene, Donna Howard, Yuefeng Xie, Indrit Hoxha

Members absent:

Michael Barton, Anthony Buccitelli, Karen Buhr, Marie Louise Abram, Martha Strickland, Richard Young

May 1

Members Present:

Robin Redmon Wright, Chair, Michael Becker, Anthony Buccitelli, Martha Strickland, Xie Yuefeng, Marie Louise Abram

Members Absent:

Michael Barton, Lewis Boahene, Karen Buhr, Donna Howard, Indrit Hoxha, Richard Young

Final Report of the Physical Plant Committee

The Physical Plant Committee met three times during the 2013-2014 academic year. A number of activities were conducted online obviating the need for additional meetings. The attendance and minutes can be found in Angle sub-folder titled “Agenda and Minutes” under 2013-2014 folder. Following are the original list of activities provided by the Senate and responses from the Committee.

Meet with the ISTL Committee to prepare a statement for the Strategic Planning Committee that addresses Physical Plant and ISTL’s mutual needs.

As more space is added around the campus, Physical Plant Committee requests faculty and staff cooperation and support for new projects such as new Amtrack Station, Olmstead building walkway and new EAB building extension. Library will be rearranging shelves to create more study space and periodical collections, which may require additional cooperation from faculty, staff and students.

Work with Ed Dankanich, John Hoh, and their offices, to carry out the process of planning available space on campus. Have each school’s committee representative serve as a conduit for that school’s faculty to express ideas and needs.

The Committee regularly met with Ed and John to learn latest developments on the campus and IT. An electronic document on learning spaces guide was studied by the members of the Physical Plant Committee. Members provided inputs on variety of issues related to physical space management on campus.

Evaluate the campus-center smoking ban and issues of enforcement.

The Plant Committee discussed this issue in detail both online and in the meetings. The Physical Plant Committee has prepared following joint statement on this issue:
The Physical Plant Committee recognizes that the current Penn State Harrisburg (PSH) smoking policy is not working well and is poorly enforced. Many students smoke around the entrance areas of the Olmstead building and the Library, as well as on walkways. Other people are exposed to second-hand smoke when they enter, exit, or pass through these spaces. Further, smoke enters Olmsted via the heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) system intake vents and open windows. It is well known that smoking leads to health problems. The Physical Plant Committee strongly recommends smoking only in parking lots and stronger dissemination of the smoking ban policy to the students.

A variety of smoking policy enforcement and enhancement issues were identified and are available in the document titled “SmokingBanComments1.docx” under 2013-2014 folder.

**Strategic Planning Committee
Penn State Harrisburg Faculty Senate
2013-2014 Academic Year**

Committee Members: Heidi Abbey (Library); Thomas Bowers (BSED); Shashi Marikunte (SET); Dinesh Pai (SBA); Bing Ran (SPA, Chair); Sairam Rudrabhatla (SET); Robert Russell (SBA); Aaron Wachhaus (SPA); Sam Winch (HUM); Chiara Sabina (BSED, Senate Liaison); Mukund Kulkarni (Admin, Ex Officio), Omid Ansary (Admin, Ex Officio), Catherine Rios (President, Ex Officio)

Major Activities:

The Senate Strategic Planning Committee was charged by the Senate to “Begin working in the planning process for the college strategic plan during the 2013-14 AY. Seek assistance from the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor in this endeavor”. We are glad to report that the committee has successfully fulfilled the charge by actively participating in the college strategic planning for the 2014 – 2019 AY as members in the College Strategic Planning Steering Committee.

The committee members made significant contributions to the success of this round of 5-year strategic planning for the college. All the committee members participated in weekly Friday meetings from January to May; conducted environmental scanning; gathered inputs from various internal and external stakeholders; reviewed, re-defined and articulated many versions of college’s vision, mission, and value statements; reviewed inputs from all units and examined / critiqued their analyses and strategic initiatives; identified key strategic initiatives for the college; participated in the presentations of the units’ plans and gave feedbacks; continuously solicited feedbacks from the college community through feedback sessions (such as college strategic Town Hall meetings), electronic communications, and one-to-one dialogues; and is continuing to work on college strategic initiatives throughout the May and June 2014 period.

The major product of these activities is the drafts for the college vision, mission, and value statements (attached), and the college strategic initiatives (finalizing).

The committee suggests that the new charges for the next year’s strategic planning committee is to conduct an annual progress review of the strategic initiatives, and continuously brainstorm new initiatives that contribute to the strategic themes defined by the college and the University.

Respectfully submitted,

Bing Ran

Vision Statement (Draft)

Penn State Harrisburg will be distinguished by educational excellence, innovative research, commitment to diversity, and strategic partnerships that support community building and increased access to education. These strengths will enable us to prepare our students to lead positive and sustainable change as ethical citizens.

Mission Statement (Draft)

The mission of Penn State Harrisburg is to provide an integrated and responsive approach to education that benefits society.

- Our comprehensive offerings of rigorous undergraduate, master's, doctoral and continuing education programs broaden accessibility and produce knowledgeable and skilled graduates.
- Our dynamic array of extra and co-curricular activities enhances learning beyond the classroom, engages students in our community, and facilitates inclusiveness and diversity.
- Our world-class intellectual and creative pursuits broaden our knowledge, enhance the value of teaching and learning, and promote academic excellence.
- Our collective dedication to innovation, applied problem solving, and critical thinking drives our mission of education, research, and service.

As the largest and most comprehensive of the University's Commonwealth Campuses, we strive to achieve national and international standing in academic quality and impact upon the progress of society.

Statement of Values and Principles (Draft)

The vision and mission statements of Penn State Harrisburg are informed by the sustaining values of integrity, diversity, and excellence in all our endeavors. Our purpose is to promote life-long learning by creating and sharing knowledge, enriching the lives and well-being of individuals, communities, and our global society, and educating our students to become knowledgeable, skilled, and ethically engaged citizens. Therefore, our core values include:

I. Academic Excellence. We value:

- Outstanding teaching and research in a community that promotes lifelong learning;
- Learning-centered education that develops socially and globally competent leaders;
- Scholarship that changes lives and deepens understanding;
- Discovery, creativity and innovation that have a positive impact on society.

II. Respect, Cooperation, and Diversity. We value:

- Civility and free exchange of ideas;

- Community and international engagement;
- Commitment to diversity and an appreciation for the perspectives and talents of each individual;
- Treating others with openness and professionalism in all interactions;
- Teamwork, citizenship, and a learning environment conducive to interdisciplinary collaboration.

III. Integrity, Transparency, and Accountability. We value:

- Academic freedom, responsibility, and shared governance;
- Creating a culture of trust;
- Promoting honesty, fairness, and courageous ethical behavior;
- Promoting good stewardship and prudent management of resources;
- Promoting environmental and organizational sustainability;
- Continually improving our organizations and ourselves.

APPENDIX “L”

To: Richard Young, Faculty Senate President
From: Glenn McGuigan, Chair Student Affairs Committee
Re: Annual Report of the Student Affairs Committee
Date: 5/2/14

- Roster
- Charges
- Meeting Summaries
- Recommendations

Roster

Members:

Refik Culpan	Denise Meister
Sai Kakutura	Amy Sauertieg
Hengameh Hosseini	Kimberly Schreck
Glenn McGuigan, Chair	Siddharth Dahiya, Student Rep

Non-voting / Ex-officio

Joe Cecere
Felicia Brown-Haywood
Robert Gray, Faculty Senate Liaison
Richard Young

Student Member

Siddharth Dahiya

Charges

In addition to our work in the spring to assign financial aid awards, here is our agenda this year as related by the Faculty Senate President.

- Explore topics that could be addressed during the first-year seminars to benefit the students.
- Explore ways to adjust common hour scheduling to enable SGA members to participate in other clubs and prevent faculty and students from missing concurrently scheduled meetings.
- Explore the possibility of inviting student members to serve on the Student Affairs Committee rather than appointing them in an effort to improve student attendance.

Meetings summaries

Meetings held:

- Monday, Sept 20, 2013, 12:30 pm -1:30 pm
- Wednesday, Dec 4, 2013, 12:30 pm -1:30 pm
- Thursday, March 27, 2014, 10:00 am to 1:00 pm (Financial aid review)
- Friday, April 25, 2014, 10 am -- 4 pm (Long meeting – financial aid review)

- Regarding the **first charge**, we had Janice Smith present on the structure of the FYS and to solicit input.

Presentation by Janice Smith, Coordinator Learning Center

- There are 32 sessions of FYS spread throughout different first-year courses. They attend a slate of co-curricular courses, including an advisory mandatory event, and then they choose two events to attend. She distributed materials relating to the FYS options. The FYS experience has been integrated into the regular courses, designated with S. The options change over time, often based upon the popularity of previous events. Faculty in the classes have a lot of opportunity for feedback to get the student input. Janice welcomes comments for proposed ideas.

Additional comment after discussion:

- Refik mentioned that we have an increasing number of Asian students who are experiencing language and communication problems. Since in many courses, we assign grades for participation, this is an issue that we need to address. We need to address this issue since it is a student problem. What can be done and how to do it should be on the agenda. Glenn will talk to Catherine to see if other committees are addressing this. Based upon this discussion, in collaboration with Carol McQuiggan, Shivaani Selvaraj, and Anna Marshall, and as Chair of the Committee, Glenn participated in the International Student Panel session as the moderator on March 18, 2014. See appendix below for notes taken by Anna Marshall on the panel discussions.

- Regarding **charge number two**, with the implementation of the new scheduling template to take place in fall, 2014, the committee voted to table this issue.
- Regarding **charge number three**, while this remains a problem with many other committees, we are happy to note that we now have a reliable student representative on the committee.
- Regarding financial aid review, the Committee awarded 250 recipients a total of \$369,242.

Respectfully submitted
Glenn S. McGugian

Appendix A

Notes from Student Panelists on March 18, 2014

Prepared by Anna Marshall, International Student Adviser

Student Panelists:

- Nana Annan (a graduate student from Ghana)
- Meng Li (an undergraduate student from China)
- Amir Sodeifi (a graduate student from Iran)
- Nipun Sher (an undergraduate student from India)
- Sang Yeop Kim (an undergraduate student from Korea)
- Zhili Huang (an undergraduate student from China)
- In Haeong Lee (an undergraduate student from Korea)

Moderator: Glenn McGuigan

Discussion areas:

- Differences of being a student here vs. being a student in their home countries
 - Participation is not a class norm in the students' home countries
 - Students are not supposed to ask questions as it may be perceived as being disrespectful
- Classroom experiences
 - Smaller classes here
 - Classrooms and classmates are the same for the whole semester. Professors of various courses come to the class room to instruct. So students connect with their classmates quite well in their home countries; Classmates and classes are not the same for the program, so it is hard for students to connect/bond in the classroom
 - Class pace is fast, and international students may need to have longer time to formulate answers in English as English is their second language
- Relationship between professors and students
 - Professors are more authoritative in their home countries
 - Professors are friendly here as they sometime even bring food to share in the class.

- Professors are quite approachable in and outside class, and students can ask questions
- Social Life
 - More clubs and organization here
 - Enjoy the various cultural events and feel motivated to share their home culture
 - Global Lion Mentor program is very helpful to new international students
- Concerns
 - It will be good for new students to have an option to purchase the insurance before coming to avoid encountering medical problems right after they arrive
 - Confusion on ordering food in Stack's, or what to bring for the airport check-in

“To Do List” for the office of International Student Support Services (ISSS):

- Update the website with
 - Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) for potential and current students (see attached)
 - Current Programs and events (see attached)
- More International Student Panel discussion in the future
- Global Lion Ambassador Program (Student leadership program)
- Global Lion Connection Program (To involve community support, both on campus and off campus)