



101 Kern Graduate Building
 University Park, PA 16802
 Phone: 814-863-0221

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

THE SENATE RECORD

Volume 55-----September 14, 2021-----Number 4

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

The publication is issued by the Senate Office, 101 Kern Graduate Building, University Park, PA 16802 (telephone 814-863-0221). The Senate Record is on file in the University Archives and is posted online at <http://www.Senate.psu.edu/Senators> under “Publications.”

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

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

Reports that have appeared in the Agenda for the meeting are not included in The Senate Record unless they have been changed substantially during the meeting, or are considered to be of major importance. Remarks and discussions are abbreviated in most instances. Every Senate meeting is recorded via Zoom and recordings are posted on the [Senate website](#). For older Senate Records, please contact the [Senate Office](#) or view recordings on [Mediasite](#).

Individuals with questions may contact Dr. Dawn Blasko, Executive Director, Office of the University Faculty Senate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Final Agenda for September 14, 2021	Pages i-iv
II.	Minutes and Summaries of Remarks	Pages 1-64
III.	Appendices	
	a. Attendance	Appendix N

FINAL AGENDA SEPTEMBER 14, 2021

- A. [MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING](#) Page 2
Minutes of the April 27, 2021 Meeting in [The Senate Record](#) 54:6
- B. [COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE](#) Page 3
Senate Curriculum Report of August 31, 2021
<http://Senate.psu.edu/curriculum/Senate-curriculum-reports/>
- C. [REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL](#) Meeting of August 31, 2021 Page 3
- D. [ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR](#) Pages 3-7
- E. [COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY](#) Pages 7-17
- F. [COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST](#) Page 17-27
- G. [FORENSIC BUSINESS](#) - NONE Page 27
- H. [UNFINISHED BUSINESS](#) Page 27-29

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules

[Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article II – Senate Council, Section 1\(e\) and Article IV – Committees, Section 6\(a\)](#) Page 28-29
(Introduced at the April 27, 2021, Senate Meeting)

- I. [LEGISLATIVE REPORTS](#) Page 29-51

Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid and Education

[49-60 Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory – Baccalaureate and Associate Degree Candidates](#) Page 29-36

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules

[Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure Section 6\(a\) Committee on Committees and Rules](#) Page 36-40

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules and Faculty Benefits

[Revision to Standing Rules Article II – Senate Committee Structure Section 6\(g\), Committee on Faculty Benefits](#) Page 40-43

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules and Senate Self-Study Committee

[Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article II – Senate Council, Section 1\(c\), Addition of the Category of Positional Reports](#) Page 43-47

[Revisions to Senate Standing Rules, Article I – Rules of Procedure, Section 2, Addition of the Category of Positional Reports](#) Page 47

REPORT POSTPONED UNTIL OCTOBER 19, 2021, SENATE MEETING

Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs and Education

[Senate Policies and Rules on Instruction and Curriculum; Creation of Senate Policy 100-00](#) Page 47-51

J. [ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS](#) Page 51-62**Senate Committee on Education**

[Discussion on Policies that Pose Obstacles to Equity for At Risk Populations](#) Page 51-53

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

[Changes to AC21 “Definition of Academic Ranks” Clarification of Contract Lengths](#) Page 53-54

Senate Committees on Faculty Affairs, Educational Equity and Campus Environment, and Intra-University Relations

[Faculty Teaching Assessment Framework](#) Page 54-62

K. [INFORMATIONAL REPORTS](#) Page 62**Senate Committee on Education**

[Summary of Petitions by College, Campus, and Unit 2018-2019 and 2019-2020*](#) Page 62

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

[Earning Tenure During COVID](#) Page 62-63

Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics

[Name Image Likeness Policy](#) Page 63

*No presentation of reports marked with an asterisk.

L. [NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS - NONE](#) Page 63

M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Page 63-64

N. Adjournment

Page 64

The next Regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, October 19, 2021, 1:30 p.m., via ZOOM.

The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, September 14, 2021, at 1:30 p.m. via Zoom Webinar with Bonj Szczygiel, Chair, presiding.

Chair Szczygiel, College of Arts and Architecture: All right. Good afternoon, everyone. It's 1:30 PM Tuesday, September 14, 2021, and the University Faculty Senate is now in session. Today, we're meeting in a Zoom format. So let me once again start by going through some of the instructions.

First off, who can speak in a Senate meeting? This is important to listen to. So only those who are elected or appointed student, faculty, administrator, or retired senators or past Chairs have the privilege of the floor.

The meetings are public, and others can join and listen, but please do not try to ask a question, if you are not a senator. You'll know if you're a senator or not. You can email Executive Director Dawn Blasko or me, if you would like to request to speak at a future meeting at least five days in advance of that meeting. Our Zoom capacity is 500 people. I see we are at something like 220 something right now. So, I think we're fine. If we happen to reach capacity, people may not be able to join.

We do create a complete record of the meeting that will be available within three weeks and often much sooner than that, and that would be available on the Senate website. This meeting, like all Senate plenary meetings, is being recorded, and we've brought you in with your microphones muted and your cameras off. You can turn on your camera, but please stay muted, unless you are recognized to speak. When you are finished, mute your microphone, so we don't have the background noise, et cetera.

If you're presenting a report, when it is time for your report, we will call on you. Please, wait to speak, until you are introduced by the Chair. When you are finished, please, mute.

Chat, as you can see, will be on for you to informally communicate with each other, but we are not going to be closely monitoring it. You can use it to post a comment, as you would texting a friend, or to report a technical problem, but please do not use it to ask a question or to be recognized to speak. If you have a question or an emergency about any of this, please email Kadi Corter, and perhaps we could have Kadi's email address. She is KKW2@psu.edu. Just toss it in there. So, this is Kadi, and she'll be there to help you with technical problems.

If you have a question-- this is important. We're going to use only the Raised Hand function again for this particular plenary. We did it before at the last special plenary and it worked well. So, raise your hand. Use that function down at the bottom of your Zoom screen. Wait until I recognize you, and then begin by stating your last name and academic unit, so for example, Szczygiel, Arts and Architecture. Please, speak clearly and slowly, as the audio is not always clear on Zoom calls.

This is a function from us being able to see each other, and one of the advantages to my mind is just that, that we are able to see, should you want to be seen. You can make some contact with other people and take a look at those around you. It also replicates what a plenary session would be like in person. So, there was no Q&A line up at our face-to-face meetings. For some who are new to this, we're trying to give you as much of a real time experience of what plenary sessions had been in the past, and I'm hoping will be soon in the future.

How do you vote? In order to get an accurate vote, we are using Tally Space. You've got the link. The link is posted in chat along with the directions. The first thing you need to do though right away is to grab your nine-digit Penn State ID now. Have it handy.

You may want to hold off logging into Tally Space, as it has a two-hour session limit. We will be doing a test vote, casting your vote to tell us that you are present. You'll just need to have your Penn State ID and be able to log into the system at that point in time.

We regrettably don't have the ability to look your ID up for you. So, if you do not have it, please, don't contact the Senate office or any of us. You can find it by logging into Workday.

And a final note, just a reminder as always, please be patient. Running a meeting like this has a lot of moving parts, people coming in and going out. We try to make it as smooth as possible. So, I know you will give us your patience.

I want to welcome everyone and thank you for being here. Your commitment to the Senate is more important than ever. I know that each of us is probably a little exhausted right now, and that staying focused and committed to shared governance is harder than ever. We've been facing some challenges.

I want you to know that I see you and value your time and commitment and efforts. I am also here to support you. So please, don't hesitate to reach out to me. I also want to thank our resource people and guests for attending and engaging in the work of the Senate, and I want to thank the Senate Office for their hard work as well. Without their support, the Senate could not get its work accomplished.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Szczygiel: So, let's move to the Agenda. Agenda Item A, Minutes of the Preceding Meeting. Minutes of the April 27, 2021, Senate Record, providing a full transcription of the proceedings of the meeting was sent to the University archives and is posted on the Faculty Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions to these minutes? Please, raise your hand, if you have any. Seeing no hands being raised, may I hear a motion to accept? You can just say aye, please.

Ira Saltz, Penn State Shenango: Aye.

Chair Szczygiel: OK. We got it. We got it, and I think I'm pretty sure we had a second in there too. So, all in favor of accepting the minutes, please, unmute and say aye.

Benjamin Taylor, Penn State Berks: Aye.

Chair Szczygiel: Opposed, please, say nay. The aye's have it. The motion is carried. The minutes of the meeting have been approved, and now please, mute your microphones.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report of August 31, 2021 – Appendix A

Chair Szczygiel: Next item, Item B, Communications to the Senate. The Senate curriculum report of August 31 of 2021 is posted on the Senate website and listed on the Agenda as Appendix A.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Meeting of August 31, 2021

Chair Szczygiel: Agenda Item C, Report of Senate Council. Minutes from the August 31st Senate Council meeting can be found in the link within your Agenda. Included within those minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, also held on that day, August 31.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Szczygiel: Moving quickly onto Item D, Announcements by the Chair. I do have a few things I want to share with you, and first again, welcome to our first regularly scheduled Senate plenary of the 21-22 academic year. If you are new to the Senate, a special welcome to you all. I know there's quite a few number of you out there, and congratulations.

You were elected as a reflection of the trust and confidence your faculty colleagues have in you. That's a vote that is very meaningful. I hope everyone also had a successful committee meeting today. They are without a doubt the engine that makes this large Senate machine operate.

In fact, some committees, such as Intercollegiate Athletics and Senate Curricular Affairs, continue to work throughout the summer on a fairly regular basis. And you know what, we've had a lot of activity during the summer on other fronts as well. Just as a reminder, since April, I felt the imperative to call two special plenaries and have held three informational forms. Your support throughout has been gratifying and so appreciated.

Also, the Senate self-study group did not take a summer hiatus but kept true to its mission and course, and I want to sincerely thank all of those members. You will be hearing from this group soon. Additionally, I want to thank those serving on the Joint Task Force on Racial and Social Justice and the Special Committee on Elections Reform, as they pursued their important work throughout the summer, and forgive me if I've left anyone off. This summer has just gone by very quickly through all of this activity.

I want now to make a special announcement regarding recent and upcoming events. You may recall, there was a survey sent out during the first week of classes. We were seeking a more in-depth snapshot of how the faculty were faring given the recent events, including the faculty Senate's August 13th vote of no confidence in the University's fall plans.

The survey had a fairly quick turnaround, basically from Thursday to Monday, as I was aiming to have results ready to be presented at a September 3rd meeting with the Board of Trustees. You may be interested to know that at these meetings they usually ask how things are going with the faculty and students. This is a smaller group of board leadership and Senate leadership. We get together before the large public board meeting, and I wanted to give as much detailed information as possible when asked that question.

As we found, the results were absolutely impressive with over 1,500 faculty responding. This obviously went beyond just two faculty senators but was attempted to disperse it to a wide variety of faculty within the University. Not surprisingly, the vast majority expressed serious concerns about issues surrounding their health, the classroom, campus conditions, and I want to let you know that we are now processing this information with, thank goodness, the help of a tremendous service that's being provided from the Data and Policy Committee within Abington's local faculty Senate. This is a group located in Abington and provide policy analysis and data analysis available to their local Senate.

I twisted their arm. It didn't take too much. They were very happy to help, and we now have them engaged in this process. It is with their help that we will take this raw data and turn it into a report that we'll be able to share with you all, a report about the trends and findings in more detail.

But I wanted to take a moment, while this was going on in the background, to share with you today just a quick first look at the survey observations. They indeed provided a rich view of the faculty's teaching concerns after their first week of classes. There were specific and personal concerns raised, and there were themes. None I think will surprise you. Most common themes were highlighted fear of health risks, concerns about and for unvaccinated persons, a variety of mask-related issues, many concerns about classroom environment, many concerns about unwieldy logistics and inconsistent support for course management, concerns about flexibility and choice in instructional modes, and certainly concerns about COVID testing processes at the various campuses and colleges.

I sincerely want to take a moment to thank everyone who spent the time to respond to this survey. We know that was an incredibly busy week for you, high stress, but know that we are taking time now to better evaluate those findings, that data's significance in the form of this report. We anticipate that information will be available by the November Senate meeting, if not earlier. So please, give a shout-out when you see Senator Judy Ozment or her colleague David Hudson and his crew at the Abington Data and Policy Committee for their willingness to tackle this very important project and for providing the Senate with a valuable service.

The findings of the survey were such that they also led to the planning of yet another special event, and I will announce it now. On September 21st, that is next Tuesday, at 6:30 PM, the University Faculty Senate will host a faculty town hall meeting with the Provost Jones. It will be in a different format than the previous town halls we've seen coming from administration, and we hope that you and all of your non-Senate colleague's neighbors and friends will join us in this public gathering.

Some of you are familiar with this already, because we just a few days ago sent out a request for faculty nominations to serve as the audience, if you will. We're anticipating anywhere from 20 to 30 people in the audience. The audience would be receptive in providing questions to the provost who would join them in the webinar room, if you will.

The questions presented to the Provost will be vetted, but only so as not to repeat issues. We hope the questions will lead and promote dialogue between the Provost and the selected faculty audience, and just to clarify why this decision was made, the audience participation has intentionally been opened to senators and non-senators alike. We value a diversity of thought and a diversity of experiences. We saw this as a way of reaching out to the larger faculty body, and to that end, we continue to accept nominations for senators or non-senators alike who you think would be willing and interested in participating in this webinar.

If you'd be so kind to please send a note of your interest to Kim Blockett by the end of the day, and I think Kim has posted her-- or will be posting. There she is-- posting her address in the chat. So please, bookmark that date, a week from now, Tuesday, September 21st, at 6:30 PM, and we will get information out very soon.

Now, I take time to talk about this, because this notion of reaching out to a larger faculty audience is not an accident or a happenstance. It is representative of the current need to improve Senate communication strategies. We're pretty good at talking to each other, either in this setting or through committees, but one of my ambitions for this year is to find better ways to be more facile in connecting with the larger Penn State community, both within and outside of our senatorial sphere. Frankly, we all need to improve on this. Recognizing some senators are more engaged already with their constituents than others and recognizing that certainly doing such requires time and energy on your parts.

Please, understand that the price of not doing this or of not valuing these efforts, these communication efforts, is high. Think back to the number of times you've been asked by a colleague or friend, so what is it that Senate actually does? I'm going to suggest that in order for us to remain relevant going into the future to the rest of our community, they must understand the good, the important work that is being done by this group.

I'll give you some examples of some of the ways that we're attempting to address this need right now. I and Senate leadership have been working with the Provost and President on creating University committee structures that are not dependent on the goodwill of its leaders to include Senate representation, but rather representation that is built into their committee structures, much like if you reflect upon our own Senate committees which have administrative roles built into their fabric. Together, we're working to find better ways to ensure that this happens.

As well, at the beginning of the summer, I charged a special communication working group who has worked very hard from that day forward meeting on a weekly basis to devise an overarching Senate communication strategy, one that will be continued into the future. You may have already noticed some improvements of late, because one of the overarching themes has been addressing the critical roles of communication of senators with their constituency and to the Senate body to the larger public, and this brings it home to all of us in this meeting.

I must ask all senators, you individually, to increase your efforts to communicate relevant Senate news to your home units, news that you feel would be important to share with your colleagues, and this is the good part. Toward that end, in an effort to aid you in that process, it is my pleasure to ask the Chair of the Communication Working Group, Immediate Past Chair Beth Seymour, to explain how we are going to attempt to aid you in this process. Beth?

Beth Seymour, Penn State Altoona: Thank you, Bonj. It's nice to see everybody. The first thing I wanted to do is to just give a shout-out to my colleagues on the Communications Working Group. So, from the Senate Office, that's Destiny Anderson and Erin Eckley, as well as Wendy Coduti, Andy Freiberg, Maureen Jones, Judy Ozment, Julio Palma, Brandy Robinson, me, Shelli Stein, and Josh Wede. We've been working all summer on thinking through ways to help support the Chair and the Senate Office with communications. So, I'm just going to briefly go over some of the framework and then a few of the items we've been working on.

We decided that some of our goals were transparency and clarity, efficiency, responsiveness, information gathering, accessibility, and consistency, and that we would focus our communications strategies on orientations of various sorts, general and routine business, gathering input for Senate work, feedback on decisions to help close some of that loop that we know we need to close, urgent business, which we have a lot of that these days, communications between committees and out of committee, and thinking of both internal and external constituents. Our first main recommendation is, at least for the time being long term goal, we'd like to build more support for this in the Senate Office but short term to have a group like the Communications Working Group helping to facilitate these communications for the Chair and also across the committees, across our constituents. When I mean our constituents, I mean you were elected by a group of full-time faculty in your unit. That's who your constituents are directly.

This team should be managing or helping to manage some of the communication process and recommendations to the Chair and the Senate Office, to help handle survey creation and analysis, to handle newsletters and other communications that may become more formalized, and to facilitate the work with the unit communications contacts. Some of you have already heard about the unit communications contacts, because you are that. What we've asked is that each voting unit have a contact person to help with these communications, and rather than that person generate all the communications, the Communications Working Group is hoping to help facilitate that by providing the support for that. For some of these units, it's going to be your Senate councilor. For others, it has to be others, because Senate council doesn't align perfectly with the needs of all the units.

The projects that we've started are we've been working on orientations for new senators, for officers, and standing committee Chairs. We've also been working to help support and build up the unit communications contacts, help them communicate with their constituents if they need that help. And they will have access to the portal, and the portal is where we have all of our constituent information for each unit that helps with our elections and the census.

I don't want to get into the weeds, but that's a very important structure that Erin and the Senate Office have helped to build up over the last couple of years. Generating guidelines for how to communicate and develop communication plans and to help standing committee Chairs create-- and you might have heard about this in your committees today-- top three items that can be shared out. So shareable items of the progress of the work going on in committees that can be shared out not just across committees but also to constituents. We've been providing support for the Chair and her needs to communicate.

We've also been discussing possible intern support in the Senate Office. We did provide some support for the faculty survey that Chair Szczygiel just mentioned, and in fact, Judy Ozment as you heard is one of our members. And we are currently working on helping to rework some of the bring the concerns to the Faculty Senate and other information about faculty rights and responsibilities and Ombudsperson just to help get that information more available to more faculty across the University. So those are just some of

the highlights of what we've done since June and what we're working on now. Thank you, Chair Szczygiel, for the opportunity to speak to the Senate.

Chair Szczygiel: Oh, thank you, Beth, and thank you to everyone on the committee, and I hope you all caught that a good bit of the work is going to be in supporting you in your communications to your constituents. That's critical, and we recognize that there should be a centralized bank of information that you can cull from and patch together your own communications, but that you don't have to create it from scratch every single time. We all know that takes a lot of work.

All right. Well, thank you, Beth, again, and now, let's get on to the business at hand and have ourselves a good Senate meeting. We've got a lot of ground to cover.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Szczygiel: The next Agenda item, Comments by the President of the University, it is my pleasure to now recognize President Barron for his comments.

Eric Barron, President, Penn State University: Well, thank you very much. I appreciate that. A few good things to think about here. We've begun a process of groundbreaking and cutting ribbons that have been absent for a little while.

We had groundbreaking on the Palmer Museum at the Arboretum at University Park, entirely funded by Big Ten Media Money and philanthropy, the fastest goal reached in a construction project in our history.

A second new Engineering building which is funded by \$230 million from the Commonwealth, this was part of my discussion with the governor on the importance of Engineering at Penn State and the need to invest and replace an aging infrastructure. And last week, we cut the ribbon for a remarkable renovation at Greater Allegheny and the Ostermeyer Building, a STEM building, beautiful laboratories for the students to have their classes and labs in.

If we look back over the year, we had more than 6,000 employees and students who participated in different panels on diversity, equity, and inclusion at an enterprise scale. That's a remarkable amount of participation. We have slowly worked through the commission--select commission's recommendations, but I do want to announce that earlier yesterday, the President's Council approved the formation of a new center for racial justice to be housed within our institute structure. This I think is an opportunity to attract many scholars to Penn State who are looking at racial bias and racism and for us to be a leader nationally and to help develop policies that this University and others can implement. You will see an announcement of a description of the center very soon, and we have found the funds to begin the process of building that, including the search for a national leader.

You may have noticed that Penn State ranked 4th in the US and 32nd in the world out of 1,115 international institutions in terms of the Times Higher Education University impact rankings. We had no change in the US News and World Report. We remain a top 25 public. Although, it is clear that among the Big Ten, we have less support for scholarships for our students and support from the state than do other institutions.

I was pleased to see that Forbes reported that Penn State graduated more STEM students than any other University in the country. That's a rather remarkable statement about our impact. I was also pleased to be

part of the celebration of naming the College of Nursing the Ross and Carol Nese College of Nursing with a landmark \$27.125 million gift, part of which was matched by the University. It's the second largest single commitment to an academic unit in our history.

I'm sorry. Could you hear that last part of it? For some reason, it said the host muted me.

Chair Szczygiel: No. That appears to have been an accident. Sorry, Eric.

President Barron: No, no worries. So, at any rate, third largest gift in Penn State history, and we are the only Big Ten institution that has a named college of nursing. So, this is really going to be enabling excellence in nursing. Obviously, fundraising, when you can't go visit donors, is difficult, and our development officers were sidelined. We still had the sixth highest total in new gifts in the history of the University.

We've passed \$1.82 billion in five years. That is a record setting pace on the way to a \$2.1 billion goal. We have 10 months to go. I wanted to congratulate the units that have already exceeded, reached or exceeded their goal, Abington, Ag Sciences, Arts and Architecture, Behrend, DuBois, Earth and Mineral Sciences, Education, Ed Equity, Hazelton, Liberal Arts, New Kensington, Nursing, Schreyer, Undergraduate Education, and Student Affairs went over the limit yesterday. So that's a remarkable statement of real success in raising dollars, even though we're in a pandemic.

I did want to point out to everyone, we will do our best to do more advertising, something called One Big Week. As you know, this University worked very hard to maintain full employment despite the fact that we had a pandemic and went remote. We had many, many people who were unable to complete their jobs, but this institution stepped up anyway. We took a hit of about \$440 million. We're far from having the feds recover all of that, but I can't think of anything more important than protecting the financial viability of our Penn State community.

A lot of our students' families were not so lucky, and so we have the chance to do something big. Beginning Sunday, September 12, and running until midnight on Saturday, September 18, One Big Week challenges all Big Ten University communities to channel their school pride into student support, to do as much support as possible by the end of the week. For the Penn State community, the objective is to support the Student Emergency funds across the Commonwealth. The gifts can be made either to Student Care and Advocacy Emergency Fund or to one of 42 featured emergency funds benefiting specific colleges or campus student communities. This is a central resource that assists students who are facing financial hardship.

Since March 2020, more than 1,400 students have received support from the fund. Over \$1 million in emergency grants were awarded. Currently, just over \$5,000 remains in this fund. A national estimate suggests that nearly 43% of college students across the country struggle to afford food, and they have various levels of housing insecurity. So, I just wanted to call that to everybody's attention, because the One Big Week in competition with other Big Ten schools is focused on those emergency funds for our students. It's at [OneBigWeek.com/Penn State](https://OneBigWeek.com/PennState), and you can watch the funds grow, if you want on that.

I wanted to turn to COVID. We were going to have two separate types of information, one on testing and one on vaccination status. To make this easier and more visible, they are now together as part of our dashboard. That will be posted later on today. It now will be posted based on campus rates.

I saw the mock-up before it was posted, and so University Park was listed there, and so that you have an idea there. Residential students at University Park is now at 89.9%, just about ready to cross over to 90% vaccinated. Non-residential students are 83%, administrators almost 98%, academic 94.4%, non-union staff 83% 0.3, union is 25.9%. You can see the exact same numbers for each commonwealth campus. I could neither go through them all and in this context, nor were they quite available, but they will be posted so that you can look at them.

I will say that across the commonwealth campuses were double digit increases in vaccination rate for both student and faculty populations. Those numbers are minimums. Those numbers are essentially residential students at 90%, 10% unknown.

We have some students still who haven't put up their data. We have some students that have reasons why they would rather be tested than vaccinated. We have some students that are partially vaccinated, and we're only including fully vaccinated to give you an idea.

We also have a system of testing. If your vaccination data is not present, then you are currently being tested at once a week. We're doing it about 2,000 a day at this particular point, and we have a structure which is basically three strikes for students, for faculty, and for non-union staff. We have students that are currently getting letters that they're at the third strike.

It's not a particularly large number. It's too large, but not a particularly large number, but they're getting letters. And if you reach a third strike and do not respond-- we're going to be very careful to make sure there's not some blip in that, but if you do not respond, that student will be suspended with notification to the faculty that the student has been suspended. Faculty and staff, same category.

These are staged at different times to managing the testing and the working through the data, but I'll give you an example of why both our numbers are minimums and why it is we're working carefully through the numbers. So, for example, in that testing non-compliance is over 500 students that appear to be no-shows on campus. Every year, we count our denominator as the number of students who are paid accepts, and then as we go through the semester, we realize that not all of them arrived. So that's just one example of how the percentages will go up, because we have students that are not actually here. We have another set that may be elsewhere in the system.

I would also like since much is presented about how other schools have mandates, and we do not. So, we know that that word mandate appears to be another word that has become politically motivated, and this institution has not described our testing-- our vaccinate or be tested. Do neither, and you must leave the University, until that is rectified. So, we need to take a lot of care in comparing Penn State to other schools with mandates.

So many of them have exceptions for religion, for health, or for ethical reasons, and many of the schools report their vaccination rates for those students without exceptions. So, for example, Vermont is reporting 100% vaccination, but that does not include anyone who has said for religious reason, a health reason, or an ethical reason, I am not going to be vaccinated. Many are only reporting those numbers without the exceptions included in there to give you a vaccination base.

Many of them do not have mandates for faculty and staff, only for students. Rutgers is in that category, reporting a very high rate, but it applies only to students. The rest of their population is only encouraged.

Vermont, very high reporting rate, but the faculty and staff are only encouraged. Many trust but do not verify. So, all you have to do is say I am vaccinated, as opposed to uploading your data.

Some include partial vaccinations in totals. So, Indiana much, much talked about has sets of exceptions. Michigan has sets of exceptions that are very similar to what I've already described, but for example, Indiana reports in their numbers, which are a few percentage points higher than ours, partially vaccinated individuals are included in their number. For Penn State, only fully vaccinated individuals are included in that number. Some lack significant teeth, if you are in non-compliance for testing, if you're not vaccinated.

So, I just want to point out that we have teeth. Faculty or staff will be put on leave. Students on the third strike are suspended from the University. We only report the known full vaccination that has been verified. So, in reality, our numbers are higher than what we're reporting. Those not reporting are considered to be unknown at this stage, partially vaccinated, whatever. We only report the fully vaccinated.

We verify the student information, and with the exception of a union, all are required to be vaccinated or to be tested with consequences for non-compliance. So, I think this gives some context for what our increasingly high numbers of vaccination rates for the University as a whole. We are now targeting those areas specifically for which we do not have evidence of very high vaccination rates.

We are going to continue to put pressure. We have other knobs to turn, if our vaccination rate does not get to where it should be, but these are very promising numbers in terms of the safety and security of our community. I see no reason why the reporting levels at other institutions, given how they're reporting, if we report it the same way, that we would look comparable to institutions that have described this as a mandate.

And I will say that I am proud that so many people are recognizing the importance of the vaccination and testing strategies for the healthy success of the University. So, I just wanted to let you know that now vaccines data will be fully transparent for all campuses and posted with the dashboard, give you an idea of the growth and vaccination rate that's occurring and will continue to occur, and making sure you understood consequences for non-compliance. And finally, to put into context our vaccination rates compared to those who have described their rates as being mandates, because the reporting is substantially different, and the rules are substantially different even between all of the different schools that are in that category. So, I will stop there at that point, Bonj, and thank you for your attention, and I will stand for questions.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, President Barron. For everyone, to ask questions, please, use the Raise Hand function, which you can see at the bottom of your screen. On my screen, it's under the Reactions icon, and a reminder, I'm very gratified to see we have such a healthy attendance at this point in time. A reminder that the floor is only open to senators. Please, begin your questions with your last name and academic unit for the record. Chris, go ahead. Chris, are you there?

Chris Byrne, Eberly College of Science: Yes, I'm sorry I was muted. Chris Byrne, College of Science. And I want to ask about there was both a physical and racial assault reported in Willard building on September 1st. It was in the Center Daily Times, The Collegiate. And there's been a lot of talk of faculty across campus. Everyone's very upset about it. The NAACP has criticized Penn State very harshly for, essentially, sweeping it under the rug, basically. And the fact that you did not mention it in your remarks

this morning contributes to a perception that the administration is really trying to downplay this, when I would think an attack of that sort should really be a big deal. And can you comment on that?

President Barron: I can. And Chris also, thank you for raising it, because I should have said something. A lot of the reporting wasn't the full story. In two incidents on this campus-- one during a protest in front of Old Main and the other in the restroom, individuals have been charged. And then the faculty process of examining this takes a different route. So that was a police matter. We refer those cases to make sure that they're adjudicated within the University, but it's also a police matter.

And although it was stated that nothing was going to happen and this was swept under the rug, two individuals have been charged by the police. I am sorry that I didn't address that immediately. I thought this was public information. Thank you for helping me say it.

There are two questions in the chat, if you don't mind. One is any consequence of non-compliance testing for the Union. In the case of the Union, we have negotiated uploading vaccination data when asked. But testing and vaccination are not a part of OSHA requirements, and therefore they have to be negotiated. Of course, you've seen President Biden announced that it would be an OSHA requirement. And that will change the requirement to negotiate that, and switch to a requirement to negotiate what the penalties are for not going forward. Just to give you an idea on that one. Lewis asked what the universal vaccination rate threshold needs to be to drop the indoor mask mandate.

This depends more on the County than what our vaccination rate is, and the state of Pennsylvania and guidance we get from the federal government. So right now, if you move to a particular level, it becomes policy. Bonj I thought, very wisely said, why wait until it turns orange? Let's do it now, let's be more preventative. And we agreed with her, so we instituted it.

Right now, while caseloads are high in the County-- obviously the County is far less, and in this particular County and maybe every County-- is far less than the vaccination rates within the University. There is risk there, and part of the reason why we'd like to get to a full vaccination rate for those who do not have exceptions. There are no plans to change masking based on vaccination rate.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Eric. We've got quite a few other hands that are raised right now. Do you have time to sit—

President Barron: Yep.

Chair Szczygiel: --through these? I would ask the presenters or the questioners to please be brief. Julio, you have the floor right now.

Julio Palma, Penn State Fayette: Julio Palma. Penn State, Fayette. You mentioned a little bit about the context between what is happening in Penn State and other universities, but I want to put it in the context of our own University. The Commonwealth campuses are definitely not in the same situation than the University Park. Among Commonwealth campuses, we mostly serve underrepresented rural communities.

You mentioned in the beginning how in the Nation, we are suffering. People are suffering insecurities-- boarding insecurities, housing insecurities. Fayette County, and many other counties where we have Penn

State campuses, are in that situation. And the context of the COVID situation in our University, I think, it requires an immediate attention that there is a disparity among campuses.

There is a disparity of what is happening in University Park. There is a disparity of what is happening in other campuses. We have very low rates of vaccination. Even if we are trying to be very optimistic and saying that is the minimum, some campuses in the Commonwealth are worse than last Spring. They are worse than last Summer.

How is that? We don't have social distance. And we are fully in person. So, what we have is just for example, a faculty in University Park has a very good chance to walk into a classroom with having most of the classroom, if not even in some cases 100%, of people vaccinated in that classroom. That doesn't happen in Fayette campuses. That doesn't happen in other countries.

The chances of faculty walking into a classroom with a high percentage of vaccination in that classroom is pretty much none. The same happened with exposure of staff members. The ones that are in the counties. The ones that are attending people, interacting with people. And even with students, even if they don't want to get vaccinated for some reason, we still have to take care of them. There is a disparity and I think this is an equity issue.

I'm on the policy, because the policy does not improve equality within our community and within our University. Even the testing-- and I'm going to be one more thing-- even the testing. We were testing six students a day last year because it was 1%. Now there is one person a unit trying to go through 300 testings a week. Because there is a lot of people on vaccinated, the workload of some staff and faculty has increased. So, my question is two issues.

Can we at least acknowledge that this policy is putting a disparity within our campuses? And second how do you plan to address these disparities within our units?

President Barron: This is what I meant by where we're switching from this sort of universal numbers to tackling what we view are the biggest disparities and lowest vaccination rates. We know we have different challenges in the type of testing that we can do at every location, that are, in some cases, rules that make it difficult for us, and sometimes it's supply issues. So those are there, absolutely, especially for testing.

We are systematically starting to look at where we have issues. One of the biggest one of the biggest issues is commuter students living at home, particularly in more rural areas, have a lower vaccination rate. There may be a lot of reasons for that. Especially with the testing strategies, we are working hard to whittle that down.

It does take a little bit more time, but we absolutely recognize that there are differences between campuses right now. The availability of vaccines is really, really easy. I mean, you just walk into a drugstore these days and you can get a free vaccine. But we still have differences, perhaps in family situations. We may have differences in terms of politics. We may have other differences that are in there. But we have moved to this mode of trying to tackle those areas that have the lowest vaccination rates and get them up. We really do believe that in the next couple of weeks if we send students home, it will have a profound impact on their willingness to get vaccinated. We have to do that carefully. We have to make sure that the students truly deserve the three strikes.

Many of the student populations say that will be the difference between moving it to where it's 80 or 82, or in some cases in the 70s, to something that's a much higher number. But this has not gone unnoticed to us, and we're going to work at it.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you President Barron. Again, a reminder, we have a long Agenda. I want to recognize as many people as I can. Please keep it brief. Ira, you have the floor next.

Ira Saltz: Thank you. Saltz, Shenango. Dr. Barron, can you give us an estimate on how much you think Penn State will spend this academic year on testing?

President Barron: It seems to me—

Ira Saltz: Faculty, staff, and students. Sorry.

President Barron: It seemed to me last year in terms of PPE and testing, that it was tens of millions of dollars. We are actually keeping a running total of that. I don't know how fast I can look up that number, but I suspect that it's still up in that range.

Ira Saltz: And then, could you tell me how much would it cost to give every full-time faculty and staff member a 1% raise at the University?

President Barron: A 1% raise is something on the order of \$12, \$13 million.

Ira Saltz: So, several percentages of our raise is going to COVID testing?

President Barron: Well. I don't know whether you could say that. Because we've had an attitude that raises are extraordinarily important. The actual costs of testing have been funded by the HEERF funds from the federal government and that will continue. So that part is covered. In the losses that I described, those were not having some students that were here, and the fact that we kept people employed even though, in many cases, they were in units that were not generating any resources.

So, I would say that in terms of not having raises, a more significant is the population of students and keeping people employed who were in jobs that were held back because they couldn't participate in COVID. But the actual testing cost was covered by HEERF and I believe will continue to be so, unless the number gets very large.

Ira Saltz: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, and thank you Ira. Rose? You have the floor

Rose Jolly, College of the Liberal Arts: Rose Jolly. Liberal Arts, senator. I have two related questions; I will be brief. The first is I do not understand COVID vaccine exceptionalism. That is to say that we have students that quite happily do mumps measles, rubella. And so, I'm not sure that I understand now that we have formal approval of the vaccine, why it is so contentious?

And this is related to my second question, which is for those of us who may be regarded, like myself, to be a little bit on the outside of the workings of the relationships between Old Main and Pennsylvania

State. It looks a little bit like we are being highly influenced by state forces-- because we need a 2/3 majority in state governance to get our budget-- in terms of our rhetoric around COVID.

And my problem with that is if I'm a potential incoming president-- which I have to absolutely say I am not, but nevertheless I hope my point stands-- I'd be very concerned at taking over an institution that appears to be bowing to the state in something of this importance because it will have a lasting legacy. One-- of the idea that the state can demand what kinds of science we throw our weight behind. Never a good idea for the academic freedom of a University.

And two-- it tends to leave a residue of, well to be honest, poor morale amongst those of us like myself, who do not really understand the vaccine's exceptionalist response by some members of our community who may not be into vaccines. But there has never been this kind of furor over MMR.

President Barron: A lot of states actually have laws on the books that you can have exceptions for health and religion. And this University, despite that being a requirement, we estimate for the student population from MMR is between 92 and 95% acceptance rate. So, we're actually approaching and the number that it fits with all other vaccinations.

I don't know of a public University that doesn't pay attention to public funding. I will just give you an example. Let's take our state funding, what order \$5,500 per in-state student and Penn State amplifies that. For the campuses that's typically on the order of \$8,000 that we decrease the tuition compared to that's what an out-of-state student does.

For University Park that number is even substantially greater. So, like it or not-- and there's a reason why if you crisscross this nation and look at who has mandates and who doesn't, it's often associated with other political characteristics of a state. Like that or not, Penn State's model of having campuses and 73% in-state students and having campuses that are competitive in terms of their cost.

To be able to get a world class education at here at that percentage of students, quite simply the Penn State model fails. It is not possible to support the campus structure without the state appropriation. It is simply not possible. And so, I would say that in every state that I have been employed in as an administrator, we do have to pay attention to the fact that we have individuals that hold a purse that has significant impact for the University.

Now you can then take it to the level, Rose, that I think you were, which is that this University was bending to that political pressure. But simply, we are going to achieve a vaccination rate that is equivalent to those universities that I just cited with mandates. I believe we're very close to Indiana, because they're reporting partial vaccinations and we're not, and they have a mandate.

I don't understand why it is that if this institution can achieve the same vaccination rate without using politically loaded words, why that wouldn't be something that we would support? I am trying to get us to the goal line, get us to that point, where we have a lot of confidence in the safety of our institution. You know, right now we know it is much less safe to go through K through 12 school up to the age of 12, because that is a vector that goes back to the community.

It is safer on this campus with vaccination rates at what they are, than it is compared to much of the places in our community, which people seem to happily go to without masks. And so, I am trying to get

us to the finish line. I'm not sitting there trying to say, "I have to bend to the will." I'm trying to get us to the same place without adding additional risk to this community.

The campus structure is extraordinarily important to our model, to our outreach to in-state students, to AG extension to all that we do in economic development our communities. And it is extremely important to me not to put it at risk if I can get to the vaccination levels that is comparative with schools with mandates.

Rose Jolly: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, President Barron. Again, an issue-- we'll be able to spend maybe another 10 minutes or so with the president. You know I'm going to say. Michelle, go ahead.

John Champagne, Penn State Erie: Sorry. Sorry Bonj, I was actually next in the queue. I lowered my hands in anticipation.

Chair Szczygiel: Oh, John, excuse me.

John Champagne: That's OK. Sorry Michelle, I will make it brief. John Champagne, Penn State Erie. Dr. Barron, my concern is about contact tracing.

President Barron: Yeah.

John Champagne: I believe that we are not conducting contact tracing as we say we are. As you know, the CDC is saying 15 minutes, six feet regardless of masks status. There is nothing in the CDC policy about only in case of people not masked. I can tell you from my own experience, at Behrend. I had a student in a small room, we were there for an hour and 15 minutes. Clearly closer than six feet. Those other students were not contact traced. Thank you.

President Barron: OK well, I would have to get Kelly to help me with how our contact tracing is going because I can't answer that specific question. I don't know whether you want to do it separately Bonj or right now.

Chair Szczygiel: I think I would like to just continue down our lines right now.

President Barron: Yep.

Chair Szczygiel: And I'm going to make an executive decision. I see some senior senators who have raised their hands, but I also see some younger senators who have not had much of any floor time in the past. So, I would like to go now, and if we have time, we'll come back to you Cynthia and Michelle. But Noah, you have the floor.

Noah Robertson, College of the Liberal Arts: Thank you. Noah Robertson, College of Liberal Arts Student Senator. Hi, President Barron. Thank you for the information that you shared in your report. So, my question is not pertaining to COVID specifically. But as you all know, there have been numerous instances of sexual assault that have occurred since the beginning of the fall semester. And they report that with the right to know emails we sadly get spammed in our inbox quite frequently.

Recently at the Schreyer Gender Equity Coalition released an open letter to your administration, asking you to release the results of the 2018 sexual misconduct climate survey and empower a diverse group of students to prepare for future survey administrations. And this open letter as of today has been signed by 513 current students, alumni, parents, staff, and faculty, and other Penn State community members.

So just to keep it brief, my question is have you read this open letter? And would you be willing to commit to releasing the 2018 survey results so the community can better understand students' experiences with sexual misconduct.

President Barron: I think there was between COVID and a lot of other things, it got to the point that it didn't seem like it fit with the circumstances of the University. But frankly, I absolutely think we need transparency on this, and the students should have transparency on it. We're going to work hard to make sure that everybody has this data.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you Noah. Is there anyone else that would have a question about the topic that we've not already discussed? If so, please do leave your hand up. All right. Ben, you've got the floor. And we'll give this another, maybe, 12, 13 minutes.

Benjamin Taylor: Thank you very much. Benjamin Taylor, faculty senator for Penn State Berks A lot of my students have come up to me asking in April if more vaccines get approved, if you would mandate it. I was just wondering if that's something you're looking at, or if it's not. Thank you very much, President Barron.

President Barron: Thank you. It is that word, "mandate," and the objective of getting to the finish line. Certainly, having it be approved not on an emergency basis, I think, will mean that another population yet unvaccinated that had this as a reason for not being vaccinated, no longer has that as a basis for that disagreement.

This is an opportunity to increase our numbers. Obviously, that's not been enough time yet to have them appear on the charts, because it's a two dose and we only report fully vaccinated. But again, why use politically charged language when we're getting to the goalpost anyway? Like I said, even last week the campuses went up by double digits and every single category at University Park went up. Residential students are about to cross 90%. Faculty and administrators are already in the high 90s or mid-90s. So, I think we're going to get there, and I'm going to do everything I can to get there without having an argument about it.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you very much. And folks, a reminder please-- only those who are elected senators should be raising their hands right now. I'll take two more questions. Kofi, over to you.

Kofi Adu, Penn State Altoona: Kofi Adu, Penn State Altoona. Mine is related to the masking in the buildings. Most of the time in corridors, you might find students not wearing their masks properly. And even though we're supposed to cover both the nose and the mouth, you see that it will be hanging down either under the chin or only on their mouth. Now my question is-- what are the guidelines as to how that is going to be wearing the mask fully to be reinforced in the buildings? And who is doing that?

President Barron: Certainly, anyone can actually report this, if there are so inclined. You know, I perhaps have a different level of authority, but I would think faculty in a classroom would have extreme authority. And most people are telling me that when they say "Please, wear your mask properly," that

action is taken. But we also have a number of people that are resisting. We had an anti-masking campaign, and even a part of that suggesting that they should storm my residence to make sure that I understood that masking should not be a requirement. So, I'm really counting on peers and everybody that works at this University to remind people. If they're not paying attention, I think they should be reported and can go through the student conduct process.

Bonj Szczygiel: OK. And our last voice on the floor for President Barron is going to be Edward. Edward, you've got the floor.

Edward Fuller, College of Education: Yeah, thank you Bonj. And thank you for the opportunity, President Barron. I just wanted to ask or suggest looking into the cases of faculty who are single parents especially with young kids, even younger than five, who are school are closed. And they have to teach in-person, and maybe making some exceptions on an individual basis for those faculty. I've heard a number of people who are in that situation, thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: I take it there's no response to that?

President Barron: Well, we need to do everything we can. I'm looking forward to Pfizer being approved now down to age five. It will make a huge difference. I do believe that the campus is becoming safer and safer. We do not see signs of transmission on campus, or students to community. We don't see it yet, maybe we will. So, we're working hard to keep safe, but there is no doubt different populations have different levels of risk.

My own son is autoimmune. I wear a mask constantly, even a lot of the times when I am with him. And I take that step because that's how to keep safe. So, it's very difficult to manage every part of this without any risk. I'm very sympathetic to what Edward has said.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you very much, President Barron. And I'm sorry for anyone else whose questions cannot be entertained given the interest of time and our Agenda. Thank you for joining us today.

President Barron: Happy to do so at any time.

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Szczygiel: And it is now my pleasure to recognize Provost Jones. Provost Jones, the President has warmed the crowd up for you, but you now have the floor to share some comments.

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: All right, thank you. Thanks very much, Bonj. At the end, happy to take any additional questions they may be about COVID. But let me focus on some other topics. Chris, just so you know, the issue of the faculty being involved in the assaults was one of my talking points. I always try to make sure that my discussion points complement those of Eric's, so I did have that on my list.

Number one, let me just talk about budget. We're, of course, into the fiscal 2022 budget year with an approved budget that provides for a modest tuition increase and a general salary increase. In case any of

you missed the messaging on this, salary increases retroactive to July 1 but will be paid beginning in your September paycheck.

So, beginning two weeks from now, you will be getting your salary increases. We're in a challenging budget year. COVID is, of course, having impacts on our operations. I'll talk a little bit about HEERF in a moment in a bit more detail. But we are feeling the impacts. Probably the thing that we are most focused on now, we've seen some good developments relative to enrollments across the University.

Particularly with this incoming freshman class. However, the impacts of COVID are not just on freshmen enrollments, they are on our enrollment's writ large. So, we're monitoring very closely to see what the impacts are. And of course, this has a potential impact on our projected revenues, which were predicted back before the July board of trustees meeting.

We may need to make some mid-year adjustments to reflect these changes. Next year's budget is certainly going to be challenging for the institution. While again, we're headed in a positive direction with enrollment-- seeing a bit of a bounce for our freshmen-- the negative bubble impact of COVID still will take a couple of years to work through the system.

We will be submitting to the Board of Trustees this Friday for their approval our appropriation request for next year. I can't really talk about the details of that until the board has had an opportunity to review and approve it. But we're already looking at what is likely to be a challenging budget year ahead. More to come on that as we move forward.

And then finally, I would just mention that this was the first year where we worked with our budget units to implement the new five-year budget modeling. So, budget requests for next year are made in the context of a five-year budget forecast that allows budget executives, deans, chancellors, other unit leaders to be more strategic in their view. And perhaps most importantly, to align their budget thinking over the next five years with their strategic plan.

So, it's an opportunity for them to really link those two critically important components together. I'd like to tell you it has been wonderfully straightforward and easy. It's been challenging, because it's a different way of thinking for the institution as we move out of considering things like permanent and temporary fund requests, and incremental budgeting thinking one year ahead.

So, it's a big change, but all of the units I think have really stepped up and done a great job to think this through. So, we're looking forward to getting better at that in future years. Let me just say a little bit about HEERF-- that's the Higher Education Emergency Relief funds. Each of the HEERF allocations had a different name.

To keep it simple, I'll call it HEERF one, two, and three. So, the first tranche of HEERF funding. Each one had an amount that was apportioned for student aid, and in all three cases it's pretty simple. It's going to student aid and support. We've had a good team of dedicated people figuring out the best way to allocate those funds, and make sure it gets in the hands of students where it can do the most good. The balance was institutional relief funds.

HEERF one, there was \$27.5 million of institutional funds. That went in its entirety to support our auxiliaries-- operation, housing, and food services in particular. I think as you know, they were heavily

impacted by the flip from residential to remote that took place in the spring 2020 semester with the refunds, incurred quite heavy losses. And so, the \$27.5 million went to salaries to offset those losses. For HEERF two, total of \$58 million. About \$26 million of that went, to Eric's point from before, to defray the cost of testing and other actions taken by the University to manage through the pandemic. Of the balance, which I guess is \$32 million, that was split 50-50 between the education and general funds budget, and the auxiliary's budget, again, to offset lost revenues in both of those categories.

The HEERF three funds, about \$75 million. The final numbers haven't been determined yet but, but about 2/3 of that will be supporting the impacts on auxiliaries again. And one third of it will support education and general funds losses. So that's where those dollars are going. As the president said, it's a total of \$251 million.

That's great support from the federal government for Penn State and our students. But it doesn't come close to addressing all the gaps that we have as a result of COVID, hence the budget challenges that we're going to have for the next couple of years as we work through all of this. I want to mention to Senate, Middle States.

And this is not Middle States in the context that we've been discussing recently, but Middle States in the context of our eight-year accreditation cycle which is ahead of us. So, we've begun planning. The self-study will be completed in 2024 and submitted to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. The self-study is co-Chaired by Lance Kennedy Phillips, vice provost for planning assessment and institutional research, and David Callejo Perez, associate vice president and senior associate dean for academic programs in the Office of the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses. The self-study is a very comprehensive document. It is designed as a reflective process to evaluate educational quality and the University's success in meeting our mission.

We have to demonstrate compliance with Middle State's seven standards. Which are mission and goals, ethics and integrity, design and delivery of the student learning experience, support of the student experience, educational effectiveness assessment, planning resources and institutional improvement, and number seven, governance leadership and administration.

The process also involves identification of institutional priorities and opportunities for improvement and innovation. Much of that exists already, of course, in our strategic plan. Part of my reason for mentioning it here is that the Senate support and active involvement is essential to the success of the study. In coming months, we will be asking faculty and members of the Senate to serve on steering committees structured around those seven standards.

There's a lot of work to be done, a lot of heavy lifting. And we're going to count on you all for your support in this process au pair. - Lance's shop will provide the administrative support and coordination. And the timing is that prep work is currently underway, putting the teams together and charge documents as well as an evidence repository.

Tentative dates are set. Committee work will begin an early '22. Final draft of the self-study due at the end of 2023. And the evaluation site visit is to be scheduled for early 2024. With the final report from Middle States expected early to mid-2024. Again, critical role for the Senate to play in assisting us to do all the work that is required.

For those of you who've been through this process before, you know that the document is truly a tome. It is a very, very comprehensive piece of work to make the case for an institution like Penn State. Next thing I want to mention, Eric touched on it briefly, and if I may, I'm just going to share my screen just for a moment. That's on US News World Report can you see that? Bonj, I'm looking at you for a nod. You see my screen? Yeah.

This is the five-year summary of US News rankings. You know, we don't live and die on US News and World Report, but they are important. We do pay attention to them. Row 5 here shows the overall ranking over the last five years. No change from '21 to '22 overall or in terms of our ranking among the AAU publics or our ranking within the big ten publics.

And then in some of those other areas-- Business, Engineering, Computer Science-- we were ahead a big jump in the category of most innovative schools. So that was a nice pat on the back, and nice to see that we moved up a little bit in terms of best college for veterans. I draw your attention very briefly to those four footnotes, A, B, C, and D.

We're frequently asked why do the rankings keep changing? And in particular, why have we trended down from 52 to 63? There's a lot of reasons for that, but one of the reasons is there's a methodology change with US News and World Report just about every year. And unfortunately for us, certainly over the course of the past four years, those changes and methodology have not been particularly helpful to Penn State leading to the change that you see.

The other thing that I would point out is, as you know, there's a bit of an insensitivity in the numbers. Your overall score could change by one point and your position will change by five in the rankings because there's a bunch of other schools that are ranked equally with you or just above you.

Lance Kennedy Phillips and Roger Brindley, Vice Provost for Global Programs, have put together a very, very good presentation explaining how the rankings work-- not just US News and World Report but other global rankings as well. I think it's something that I have suggested to Senate leadership that this be presented at a future plenary meeting of the Senate when there is time to do so, because I think it gives a very, very useful and interesting insights into how this process works.

And how sometimes, by doing the right thing we get penalized. And a good example of that is actually a result of the collaborative effort that Senate administration undertook several years ago putting in promotion standards and criteria for our fixed term faculty, which got us National recognition for those efforts.

And we can point to the year that they went into place, it led to a drop in our rankings because US News and World Report forced us to combine all faculty ranks together and there was an impact as a result of that. But, you know, I would like to say that we don't care, because we did the right thing. But I'd rather say we do care, but we still did the right thing by addressing that issue in the way that it need to be addressed.

So Bonj, let me stop there. I'm sure there's much more I could say, but I know time is of the essence.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Provost Jones. Remember. If you have a question for the Provost, please raise your hand. Remember to begin with your last name and academic unit. And yes, we are running a little tight on time, so brevity is appreciated. Cindy, you have the floor.

Cynthia Simmons, College of Communications: Cynthia Simmons, Bellisario College of Communications, UP. One of my colleagues made a list of questions and would like to remain anonymous. And in reading as many of these as I will be allowed to get through, I want to emphasize that even tenured professors feel wary about asking questions. That's the climate we're in.

People are afraid to elicit information that will allow them to make decisions that will affect their own health. So, I'm just going to go through these. Don't expect you to have long answers to most of them. When is the University going to include vaccination rate data on the dashboard?

Provost Jones: Today. 1:00.

Cynthia Simmons: Great. Does the University believe that the 50% to 60% vaccination rates among students at some Commonwealth campuses is acceptable and reflects an effective COVID strategy?

Provost Jones: We're working very hard to get students at the campuses to upload their data. As president indicated, just in the course of the last week we've been working on a communication strategy with individual chancellors reflecting the uniqueness of each campus. And saw in many cases double digit increases in the reporting. So those numbers have improved substantially. We are going to keep working with the chancellors to improve those numbers further.

Cynthia Simmons: Why does the dashboard indicate that only a few Commonwealth campus students were tested at places like Behrend, Harrisburg and Altoona, when the vaccination rate suggests thousands of students should be subject to weekly tests?

Provost Jones: I don't know the answer to that question offhand without looking at the dashboard data.

Cynthia Simmons: OK. How many union employees does the University have who are not included in the count of unvaccinated individuals and in the weekly testing program?

Provost Jones: I think we're accounting for all of our union employees, so the total number and the percentage that we provide is a percentage of all known union employees.

Cynthia Simmons: OK.

Chair Szczygiel: Cindy, I appreciate the brevity that you're proceeding, but we've got to-- I don't know how long your list is but how about one more question?

Cynthia Simmons: Two more questions. What additional steps is the University planning to increase vaccination rates? Are there suggestions that optional events like football games might be limited to vaccinated students?

Provost Jones: We haven't talked about that. We're certainly planning to offer vaccine clinics at future football games. There is some consideration being given to increasing testing frequency for students and employees who have not uploaded vaccine data yet. We haven't taken that step yet. We're just getting through the first few weeks with the testing frequency of once per week.

There's a smorgasbord of options being considered by the coronavirus management team, really on a weekly basis. Anything and everything, and, actually, we welcome suggestions for people as to how we might improve that.

Cynthia Simmons: Last question-- would the University be in compliance with the proposed federal rules regarding vaccination mandates and testing? So, are we already in compliance with what's coming from the feds?

Provost Jones: Are you referring to what came out of the White House last week?

Cynthia Simmons: Mm-hm.

Provost Jones: Yeah, so that's a great question. In some areas we are pretty much in compliance. The requirements around employers of 100 or more people, that vaccines are required or mandatory weekly testing. That is currently our expectation, and so we clearly have met that one. We don't have the details of all of those yet, they've been described at a very high level. I can't be definitive until we see the actual specific guidance.

In other areas like OSHA-- the OSHA requirements-- that will give us actually a little bit more wind in our sails in terms of being able to press a little bit harder on the vaccine requirement. So that one we're actually looking forward to, because we think it'll be very helpful for us to push our numbers up even further.

Cynthia Simmons: Thank you.

Provost Jones: We're monitoring them all, Cynthia, right now. And the CMT task groups are engaged looking at the requirements and the guidance as it comes out so that we'll be ready to respond quickly and implement.

Cynthia Simmons: Thank you.

Bonj Szczygiel: OK, thank you very much. Michelle, you have the floor.

Michele Duffey, College of Health and Human Development: Thank you Bonj and thank you Provost Jones. Michele Duffey, Health and Human Development. Provost Jones, is there an update on presidential search and when might the faculty expect to have an opportunity to hear from the candidates?

Provost Jones: I can't answer that question, Michele. I'm not I'm not involved in the process and Eric-- I see camera on Eric. Eric may have more.

President Barron: I was just going to say briefly, obviously there are faculty representatives there. We know from a great deal of experience out there that the more privacy there is in this process, the more likely that high caliber candidates working in other universities will be a part of the search.

I know they're going through their process, and they're counting on the fact that the faculty that are on that selection committee will work hard to make sure that nothing objectionable is occurring in that particular process. But I can tell you that all the search firms, and many other campuses, are

recommending strongly that a high level of confidentiality be included at all of these different stages in order to attract the best candidate.

I am not part of it either. I just happen to know that is the guidance that they're receiving, and the evidence from across the nation of different searches.

Benjamin Taylor: Thank you both.

Bonj Szczygiel: And Diane. State your name and your—

Diane Berish, College of Nursing: This is Diane Berish. I am from the Northeast College of Nursing at University Park. And Provost Jones, you had mentioned that there might need to be some mid-year adjustments to the budgeting. I wondered if you could just please elaborate on what that might be?

Provost Jones: First of all, it's nice to hear you introduce yourself as being from the Northeast College of Nursing. That always sounds terrific. It means a potential rescission. Don't know exactly how much yet, but if it is necessary to make the budget balance for this fiscal year, a rescission may be necessary.

Bonj Szczygiel: OK great thank you very much. Julio, since you've had the floor once and I'm going to skip over you. If we have time, we'll come back. Margaret?

Margaret Hu, Penn State Law: Hello, thank you. I realize this is anecdotal, but I've heard from many undergraduate students that they don't feel well, but they're afraid to go get tested because they will be quarantined and not able to go to classes. So what measures are there for to encourage these students to get tested?

Provost Jones: I don't know if Kelly is still on. She probably has ear closer to the ground to some of that than I do. I certainly can't refute what you're saying. I mean, if that's what you're hearing. What we're seeing is actually a strong willingness of students. Obviously, the students who are required to test-- most of them, not all of them, most of them are showing up.

But we're also seeing a lot of students-- well, obviously primarily vaccinated students, who are still showing up for walk up. And I think we shared this with you at the end of last year, particularly last fall, that the willingness of our students to come to walk up testing-- even though they knew there was a possible consequence of needing to quarantine or isolate-- we were really gratified by the large numbers who did that.

And we're seeing indications, Margaret, that is happening again this year as well, which is very positive. Kelly, I don't know if you want to add more color, but we certainly understand that students are concerned about that. But we just encourage them to do the right thing and come and test anyway. They'll know in 20 minutes, and, you know, it's just it's just the sensible thing to do.

Bonj Szczygiel: All right. Thank you very much. Ray?

Ray Najjar, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Hi, I just want to report—

Bonj Szczygiel: Ray, could you identify yourself and your unit?

Ray Najjar: Oh, yes, I'm sorry. Ray Najjar, Earth and Mineral Sciences. I just want to report what some of my constituents are telling me. When I hear from my constituents that they're Universally in favor of a vaccine mandate. And I have emails from them-- I won't read them I'm just summarizing the sense from them.

I did get one suggestion email from a sort of exasperated faculty member who realizes that a vaccine mandate is not coming despite overwhelming support. And he says, it got me wondering whether there's been any discussion as an alternative of having Penn State charge unvaccinated workers more for health insurance. He says that Delta Airlines has done it to the tune of \$200 per month or more, and it seems to be working.

And he and he provide me with a link, which I'm happy to forward. I'll go on, he has, Penn State has plenty of time. The increase probably couldn't happen until January 1. You could tell employees now, and they have plenty of time to do it. I guess I'll add that the president's report sounds very favorable regarding University Park vaccination rates, but I'm really glad Julio brought up the points about the Commonwealth campuses and how low the vaccination rates are there.

If we had a vaccine mandate, I think we would have very high vaccination rates. And the point isn't to eventually get to 100%, or a very high percentage, it is to get there now to prevent the spread of the variants. So, thank you for allowing me to make my comment.

Provost Jones: Thanks, Ray. Appreciate that feedback. I will say that Eric and I had a very constructive conversation yesterday evening with some faculty members from the Center for Infectious Disease Dynamics. If we're flexible on timeframe, the necessity to use the word mandate becomes lower. Because if we're talking about trying to get to much closer to 100% vaccination rate within a year before next fall, then that is something that is much easier to attain.

Ray Najjar: We're not flexible on timeframe. I mean, these things evolve. We've seen what Delta turned. One month this summer just seemed like we had come out of it. I was back in my office permanently. And I was thrilled to be back in my office. And I can tell you, I'm back at home now full time. I go in. I teach my classes. I come right--

Provost Jones: Sorry, I missed that.

Ray Najjar: Looks like the host has muted me. Is that to limit my enthusiastic response or can I go on?

Bonj Szczygiel: No one muted you, Ray.

Ray Najjar: Oh, OK. The sign came up saying that the host had muted me. You know, which sometimes happens at home, as it turns out. You know, there was such promise this summer. June and July I was doing an undergraduate research program here. We had this window where we could actually bring undergraduates from across the country to work on research projects together.

We were so fortunate to be given that window, and then it just went away like that. So, time is of the essence, Provost Jones. This is not something that we can take out of the equation.

Bonj Szczygiel: OK.

Provost Jones: I'm not suggesting that there is not urgency, Ray. That is not what I am what I am saying. It's just getting to 100%, or something close to 100%, is a particular challenge. And it's a challenge with the meningitis vaccine and with MMR as well. Those are other vaccines where we have mandates. We don't get to 100% with those either for a variety of reasons. We have to take fairly austere actions with students in those cases as well.

Ray, I can just assure you that we've got we have a large number of people doing a full court press every day to do everything we can do to encourage vaccination and drive people in the direction that we need to go. We think the new federal guidance is going to be helpful. As I said before, give us a little bit more wind in our sails. We are going to just keep driving this issue, whereas you see from, certainly at University Park, the numbers are positive.

Getting up and around 90%. In the low 90%, high 90% in some cohorts. But we certainly have a lot of work to do at the campuses, and we know that. We're working with chancellors individually to help drive those numbers up.

Bonj Szczygiel: Thank you. Thank you, Provost Jones.

Provost Jones: I will say, Ray, in terms of the time thing-- If I may, Bonj, just one more thing. Until students came back, we had the survey data from earlier in the summer. But that was just survey data. We didn't know what we really had until students came back and we began that upload process. We've only had a few weeks to gather all of these data.

Last week was a good example where, based on the data that we now have available to us, we can really start to tailor our vaccination strategies and communications to really try to improve those numbers.

Ray Najjar: I brought up the summer because cases were basically zero. They were basically at zero in Centre County. It seemed like it was over.

Provost Jones: Yeah

Ray Najjar: And it's just it's just unbelievable that COVID-19 is a preventable disease. It is absolutely preventable. I'm sorry.

Bonj Szczygiel: Thank you, Ray. I know emotions are running high. Many people are sharing your sentiments, but we've got to move on. And Amit, you're going to be the last question for today for President Jones—President. Sorry. That was unintentional, Provost Jones. I just gave him a promotion unintentionally.

Provost Jones: You did, yes. It didn't last very long, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: Amit, go ahead.

Amit Sharma, College of Health and Human Development: Thank you, Bonj. Sharma, Health and Human Development Provisions. Good afternoon. This is a follow up question to Michele Duffey's. I know you are not involved in the process, but if there is a way for you to deflect it to President Barron, that will be fine too. What's the level of involvement of faculty in the process of the search? For instance, even given the confidentiality, is there access to confidential documents anonymously shared in terms of what the process is?

If not, is there any consideration to the fact that even given the confidentiality, there can be an attempt to keep that transparency of the process. And if not-- sorry, I've got three loaded questions-- is there any way that we can request that this be a serious consideration that confidentiality can be maintained and still there is some transparency of the process? Thank you.

President Barron: I don't believe there's any difference in the rules for the committee members. I think they have full access to all of the information that is there. I've not heard anything otherwise. And believe me, I think we would hear if we had members of the committee that were being excluded based on information or anything else. So, I will take that one up with a board to make sure. But I certainly have not heard anything like that at all.

Amit Sharma: OK. Thank you, President Barron.

Bonj Szczygiel: Thank you, Amit. And Josh, can you promise me you will be extraordinarily brief?

Josh Wede, College of the Liberal Arts: I will try. Wede, Liberal Arts. Faculty are extremely frustrated right now with everything that's going on. They're completely demoralized. You know, the contact tracing is essentially nonexistent in the classroom. There still has been no response to the faculty Senate resolution from, I think, over almost a month ago now where we asked for basic things.

So, I do have specific questions about contact tracing, that maybe Kelly can answer. What is the average time to contact when someone has a positive case? What is the goal and what is the actual? And these are metrics that were given last year-- what is the average number of close contacts per positive case? And then if there could be some comment on the number of resources that are devoted to contact tracing this year versus last year. Maybe a number of person hours per week.

Provost Jones: Kelly, do you have do you have any of those data at your fingertips?

Kelly Wolgast, Director, COVID-19 Operations Control Center: Let's see. I'll start with the pledge. The pledge is 24 hours from time that we know of the test result to contact the case. Contact tracing is doing very well in that. It's under 19 hours, actually, that they're being able to do that. So that's great. And if a student tests on one of our campus sites, they're immediately in isolation anyway. If that test is positive, they're already shepherded over to the isolation or they're in isolation.

That's what we're doing, what we pledged to do there. You asked about contacts per case. I think that's running about two or three close contacts per case identification that students are sharing with us, or employees are sharing with us. So maybe 2:3:1 on that. Some are obviously more, and some are less. Many people are telling us they don't know where they've been exposed, or it's a family-related event, or where their residence is. That's the primary right there.

We have no evidence of any transmission in classroom or workplace environments right now. No evidence of that. I know some folks don't believe that, that I'm saying that right now. But I don't have any evidence of that to share with you today. The resources of contact tracing-- I don't know the actual FTEs right now for that, Josh. Certainly can find that out, but you know we have folks that are working very hard. They're clearly getting through all the cases that we've been identified in the appropriate time.

Josh Wede: There's no cases that have been transmitted in the classroom, because you're not doing contact tracing through the classroom. If you look at the number of students that are in isolation versus quarantine, you know there's 33 that are currently in isolation, and only four of that are in quarantine. So that suggests that you're getting far fewer close contacts than what students actually have.

And in a classroom setting, in large lecture halls, anywhere between 16 and 20 students are close contacts based on CDC definition. Clearly, you are missing a large number of close contacts. And if a student goes in five classrooms, you should have far more than two to three close contacts per positive case.

Provost Jones: Josh—

Kelly Wolgast: Well, again—

Provost Jones: Can I just jump in on that one, Kelly? Just with a couple of things. First, what you're seeing in quarantine and isolation is the students who are in on campus quarantine and isolation. Those are students who are in residence halls who have been relocated there. There are other students who are quarantined or isolated who are out in the community that you don't see in those numbers.

The other comment I wanted to make, Josh, is that last year what we found was a much more effective tool than contact tracing was what I used to call crowd-sourced contact tracing. Students themselves know-- they are smart-- they know when they have been exposed to people. And a lot of the exposures are not taking place in the classroom, they are taking place outside of the classroom where they are in much less managed and structured environments.

This is where the availability of walk-up testing is so important. And last year, walk up testing-- and the willingness of students to take advantage of it-- was a much, much more effective tool than contact tracing was. And I think we're going to see the same thing play out this year as well, I think. And Kelly I don't know if—

Kelly Wolgast: No, no. That's exactly right.

Bonj Szczygiel: All right. Well, thank you everyone for contributing to this vibrant conversation with the provost. Hey, just a reminder. Guess what? We have another opportunity to talk with the Provost coming up next Tuesday, the 21, at 6:30 PM. Will run hopefully until around 8:00. There will be lots of chances for the provost to respond to some of your questions.

All you need to do is to make sure you have a representative from your college or your campus present in the audience. And in order to make that happen, we need you to nominate them, or nominate yourself.

FORENSIC BUSINESS - NONE

Chair Szczygiel: OK? All right, thank you very much. Provost Jones, we're going to let you go now. And we're going to move on to Item G of the Agenda, which is Forensic Business. And we have none.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Szczygiel: OK, so this is where things get a little more interesting for activities related to the plenary. This is the section of the agenda where we will vote to approve legislation. We're going to first do an attempt to simply vote your presence. So, we will conduct a present vote. But first you should be logging into TallySpace right now. Thank you, Anna. You've got the information up on the screen now, that's great.

And we're going to pause for just a little bit to make sure that everyone has time to do this. Make sure everyone has access to TallySpace. Go ahead and log in now. And then in a bit, we will-- Kim, if you're looking at the notes-- or anyone else-- let me know if there's an issue with TallySpace. I'll give it a little bit more time, and then Anna will put up the present vote. And you will select "A" to record that you are present at today's meeting.

Then all you will need to do is click "save my vote."

Anna Butler, Senate Office Staff: The vote is already up, and there are votes coming in.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you Anna. And you will let me know when we get close to capacity?

Anna Butler: Yes.

Chair Szczygiel: And I know there was-- maybe you can clarify this, Anna or Erin. There was some communication that by simply logging into the meeting, that registered a person's attendance at this meeting. Is that correct?

Erin Eckley, Senate Office Staff: Yes, Bonj. We are tracking the participant box to track attendance, as well as doing screenshots. But this present vote will be part of that, so it's threefold.

Chair Szczygiel: Great, very thorough. Thank you, Erin. We want to make sure everyone gets credit for being here today.

Anna Butler: I already have 177 senators that are present, but I can keep this up.

Chair Szczygiel: That's a great idea, Anna. Please keep that up while senators are still-- Remember this is not the only opportunity to indicate that you were present today. Obviously, they've got this well under in hand.

Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article II – Senate Council, Section 1(e) and Article IV – Committees, Section 6(a) – Appendix N (Introduced at the April 27, 2021, Senate Meeting)

Chair Szczygiel: I would like for us to then continue on to the first piece of legislation, which comes from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules, entitled, "Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article II – Senate Council, Section 1(e) and Article IV – Committees, Section 6(a)." And this can be found in Appendix N. This report was presented at the April 27, 2021, meeting. Today it is simply back on the floor to be voted upon. CC&R Chair Taylor will present the report. Annie, if you're here you have the floor.

Annie Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Thanks, Bonj. Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences and Chair of CC&R As Bonj, says we introduced this in April. I'm sure you all spent

your summer reading it very carefully. Ha, ha. Basically, this is a fairly simple legislation. It would move the oversight of the existing unit constitution subcommittee from Senate Council to the Committee on Committees and Rules.

The Unit Constitution Subcommittee is the subcommittee that is Chaired by the Secretary that reviews all unit constitutions when they're changed, when they're created, when they're changed, and so forth. They're ultimately approved by Senate Council. But in reality, the work of the unit constitution subcommittee often has been with the leadership of CC&R.

CC&R is responsible, as you hopefully know, for proposing changes to the Senate's own governance documents, and has the authority to interpret those documents subject to review by the Senate. So, CC&R is really familiar with governance documents, the structure, and the intent. So that's why it is very common-- I know when I was Secretary for three years, I often went to CC&R to get advice consultation. It seems like having it be a subcommittee of CC&R makes more sense for that to just facilitate that purpose. A final vote of approval of all unit governance documents, however, would remain with Senate Council. So, we'd still have that very important check and balance. Voting for this legislation would simply move the oversight from Senate Council to the Committee on Committees and Rules.

It would keep the structure and the work of that subcommittee the same. And with that, if there are any questions, I can do my best to answer. And thank you Erin for driving.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Annie. And any questions from the floor, the same format. Just raise your hand and we'll recognize you. This has been sitting simmering all summer long, so it'll be good to dust it off and maybe put it in its proper place. I see no hands raised, so it is now time to vote. Anna, please start the poll.

Anna Butler: It started.

Chair Szczygiel: And I think while-- if you see the numbers going up, Anna, what I would like to do is to just hold the reporting back of the votes to the end of the meeting. If that's OK with you Annie? And that way we can just move straight ahead.

Anna Butler: OK the report is up for vote, and there are definitely many votes coming in. Bonj Szczygiel: And you'll be able to keep it up for a minute or two?

Anna Butler: Yes, I will.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Szczygiel: All right, onto item I and this starts our round of Legislative Reports. There are six legislative reports.

49-60 Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory – Baccalaureate and Associate Degree Candidates – Appendix B

Chair Szczygiel: The first of the six is from the Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid and Education, entitled, "49-60 Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory – Baccalaureate and

Associate Degree Candidates” and it can be found in your Appendix B on the Agenda. Committee Chair Kat Phillips is going to be assisted by David Smith, Jeff Adams and Doug Wolfe.

And they are all here to present the report together. Folks, the floor is yours.

Kat Phillips, University Libraries and Scholarly Communications: Thank you very much, Bonj. And thank you also Erin for sharing screen. Thank you, Doug, and David, and Jeff for assisting and answering questions, and talking about this report today. To provide a little bit of background, this update to the satisfactory and satisfactory grading schema has been come through PIE, the Policies Influencing Equity Task Force, which was initially the Alternative Grading Task Force.

A lot of the conversations surrounding these updates to 4960 did stem from the experience we had with alternative grading, and also with our experiences post alternative grading and some of the issues that we saw come through. We went through and we completely overhauled the satisfactory and unsatisfactory policy and have updated it to the pass/fail policy.

I'm happy to answer any questions as they come in. But essentially what we've done is taken a look at the policy and-- scrolling through my notes as well-- we overhauled the policy and turned the pass-fail system into a three-prong system. Similarly, to the alternative grading, students who have an A through a C are eligible to request a PS for pass satisfactory to fulfill any stipulated C or better grade requirements through the curriculum.

A grade of D will be posted in the final record as PD, if students opt to go for the PD versus the D. This will not fulfill any C or better requirements but will still count toward fulfilling curricular requirements where a C or better is not stipulated. When the grade f, a fail, will post in the final record as UNS. No credits will be earned, nor will this count towards any degree satisfaction requirements.

I am happy to take any questions. This has been posted in Appendix B. Thank you. I see we have a hand raised.

Chair Szczygiel: Go ahead, Jonathan. The floor is yours.

Jonathan Mathews, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Mathews, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences. I don't believe you define anywhere what PS and PD and UNS is.

Kat Phillips: I believe that we did that. I'm going back through my notes quickly, and David or Jeff or Doug if you have that in front of you.

David Smith, Administrative: PS is Pass Satisfactory indicating that you have that C or better in the course.

Jonathan Mathews: I understand your definition. It's not documented on the document. I think it got deleted accidentally. The new document defines what PS or PD or UNS.

Kat Phillips: I see what you're saying.

David Smith: OK.

Kat Phillips: The statement has been made that there is not the definition of what PS, PD and UNS stand for.

Bonj Szczygiel: So, Jonathan, is there a motion to amend this report?

Jonathan Mathews: If it's necessary. It's simple editorial omission.

Michele Stine, College of Health and Human Development: Bonj, can I interject here? It is defined in the document. If you look in points five. Where pass fail grading option has been selected, grades of A, A minus, B plus, B, B minus, C plus, C will be posted on the final record as PS. Then it goes down to explain, just as Kat did, D and F as well. So, they are in the document.

Chair Szczygiel: Great, thank you, Shelli.

Jonathan Mathews: PS is not specifically defined as standing for anything. So, if it requires a motion, I'd like to make a motion that we define PS as Passing Satisfactory. That we define PD as passing with the grade of D, and we define UNS as Unsatisfactory.

Kat Phillips: Thank you, Jonathan. I understand the motion that we need to designate what the acronyms stand for. That the definitions are included, but the acronyms for what PS, PD and UNS stand for. Is that correct?

Jonathan Mathews: Yes.

Kat Phillips: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: I'm wondering if we could clarify that for everyone. Jonathan, you were difficult to hear. Maybe your mic is not working as well. But if we could repeat what those definitions are. They're alluded to but not overtly in the document. I would suggest that this might be a minor amendment that could be made after the case. it may not change the intent of this document.

So, if we could get a clarification clearly of the definition of those three acronyms, and then let's see if there's still any concern about what to do with this motion or this report.

Josh Wede: If I can jump in-- Wede, Liberal Arts-- and make a quick suggestion. If on 0.5-- if Anna can scroll down-- can we just say the first sentence will be posted in the final record as pass satisfactory, in parentheses PS. then do the same thing for PD and-- whatever the other one was.

Kat Phillips: UNS. Unsatisfactory.

Chair Szczygiel: So, I don't know is who's driving this. But I see it's-- the motion is being explained out. You have pass satisfactory.

Kathleen Phillips: --again. I'm sorry.

Josh Wede: What was the pass-- what's the pass D? Or PD?

Kathleen Phillips: It's Pass-D.

Josh Wede: OK.

Kathleen Phillips: Yeah.

Chair Szczygiel: Jonathan, is this getting at the heart of what you were concerned?

Jonathan Mathews: Yes, that's correct. I mean, I am happy to withdraw the motion if this is not needed as a motion. It's a—

Chair Szczygiel: I'm willing to-- I would like to-- if people are feeling concerned about whether this satisfied the motion or not-- I understand you are withdrawing. Are there any other concerns? This would be a really good time to bring them up, but I think we've taken care of the matter in an editorial fashion. Any other concerns about this? And I'm going to ask my colleague, Keith, to-- there was a motion placed, but it was withdrawn. Are we OK with that, Keith?

Keith Shapiro, Parliamentarian: I think so. From my standpoint, this is what we would call a non-substantive change, simply a clarification, and our rules are clear that this doesn't have to be voted on if there are other mechanisms for this.

Chair Szczygiel: Great.

Keith Shapiro: It'll save a lot of time to do it this way, unless somebody has a problem with us defining those.

Chair Szczygiel: Well, I see Terry's hand is raised. Terry?

Terry Blakney, Penn State Erie: Yes, I just-- Terry Blakney, Penn State Erie. I just have a concern there, that it has-- this grade can be changed by 11:59 on the last day of class. But we also have-- this should be done with the advisors and everything else and that stipulation. And I'm just concerned about that timeline.

Because quite frankly, people aren't going to be available at 11 o'clock at night for this midnight change to pass/fail or whatever they want. I mean, I'm just concerned, pushing that timeline to 11:59 on the last day of class-- you know, who's going to really have consultation with their advisors and all that information? I mean, I just think it puts, you know-- I'm just not happy with that timeline of 11:59 on the last day of class.

David Smith, Executive Director, Division of Undergraduate Studies: I would-- Terry, I agree in certain ways, right? I mean, this is a challenge that we have with a number of our policies. It is what is the case, though, with drop-add, late drops, et cetera-- that the deadline is set for 11:59 PM for all of those processes. So, I mean, partly, it does create a challenge, but I think we have to get out ahead of that by communicating clearly with students frequently and often about the policies and the dates and times that they go into effect.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, David. Paul, did you have a comment to make?

Paul Frisch, Penn State Scranton: Yes. Frisch, Scranton. Going along with what Terry said, in point 10, the first sentence, I think, could be problematic, that students are strongly advised to research and

consider implementations of this, where they should really be talking to an advisor first instead of doing their own research in case they want to take one of these pass/fails with a grade that could be a C or better that they need for entrance to major and end up screwing up their entrance to major.

And they might not know that, because things could change. So, was there consideration of putting in "talk to advisor, not do your own research first"?

David Smith: I think it's both, right? At the end of the day, the way the advising does work at Penn State is that the student is responsible for the decisions that they make, right? So, we're not, as an advisor at the University, necessarily going to know all the rules and requirements outside of Penn State.

And I think this is a word of caution to students and others to make sure you're thinking through the broad implications. I think this is one of those policies where it's going to take time and acclimation to help students understand the pros and cons of why, where, and when you would use such an option in selecting it for your classes.

Paul Frisch: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Roger, you have the floor.

Roger Egolf, Penn State Lehigh Valley: Yes, am I understanding this right, that students will be able to select pass/fail right up to the last day of classes? And then, they can take their exams, their final exams. Depending on how they do it, they can reverse it through a petition, and then get the actual grade? This really seems like a recipe for grade inflation, and I can't support this.

It just does not seem like a very-- I could support extending designation of pass/fail up to, say, the end of the early drop, before the late drop starts or something like that. But also, if somebody takes it, they shouldn't be able to reverse it after they see how they do in the final.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Roger. Does anyone want to respond to that?

Jeff Adams, Associate Vice President and Senior Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education: I'll respond on the reversal. I think the conversation with the committee was around the students who made a-- basically made a poor decision at the time that they made that. That's really what that petition process is for, really not the intention where the petition would say, oh, I did better on the final I expected, so I want to recuperate by a letter grade, but rather, other situations where it's determined that the student made a poorly informed decision or somehow is going to be hurting of their academic progress. But I don't see this as trying to signal allowance for that kind of grade manipulation that was just suggested.

Chair Szczygiel: OK. Thank you. Thank you, Roger. And Joshua.

Joshua Graham, Penn State Beaver: Josh Graham, student senator. I just wanted to respond to that by saying that I think, as a student, it's incredibly important that this option be available. And the idea that somehow, this is-- we shouldn't move forward with an opportunity like this or an option like this because it'll game the system-- I don't feel is appropriate.

Because there's a petition system involved. So, if this petition system is what needs to be the point of discussion, then I think that is where we could shift that conversation to. But this opportunity seems like it makes good, reasonable sense.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Josh. Kevin.

Kevin Bowley, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Thanks. Bowley, Earth and Mineral Sciences. I was just curious. One thing that wasn't entirely clear to me with our proposed legislation here is, how does this fit within the new grade forgiveness policy? And do classes that get switched over from a letter grade to a pass/satisfactory, a PD, or a UNS-- do those still qualify for that same grade forgiveness policy? Or how do those two mechanisms fit together?

David Smith: I think in the implementation phase of this-- if this were passed, then it would go to an implementation stage, and we would have to look at that in relationship to other policies, you know, Kevin, such as the grade forgiveness you mentioned. Right now, as an example, we don't allow transferred credit to be used in grade forgiveness.

Because there's no rate attached to it. There is, at some level, some precedent for a limitation on not allowing a pass/fail grade to then replace another grade. But it would have to be further conversations at the implementation stage. It's a good question, though.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Kevin. And the next hand I see raised is Robert. Robert, you've got the floor.

Robert Melton, College of Engineering: Hi. Melton, Engineering. I have a question for the committee. What is the rationale for excluding these grades, a pass satisfactory grade, for entrance to major in a controlled major? Because a student would have to have earned the equivalent of a C or better as one of the criteria to enter the majors. So why not simply accept the PS grade? That seems illogical.

Kathleen Phillips: Sorry, everyone. Somehow, I was muted again. Thank you for that question. I believe-- and David, Doug, or Jeff can back me up on this-- that this has to-- this point was made, aligning with some of the discussions that happened around alternative grading and some of the decisions that were made when we implemented alternative grading, and specifically how alternative grading interacted with entrance to major. David, or Jeff, or Doug?

David Smith: Yeah, I think part of this to understand is, that PIE is looking at a number of things that influence equity or effectively are undermining equity at Penn State at the moment. Entrance to major is a process that we are actively talking about within that group. I think the overarching issue is around the use of a cumulative GPA, and how a cumulative GPA is used to determine entrance or access to a variety of things within higher education.

And so, at some level, trying to disentangle that or address that kind of an issue as to how we create more equity and who has access to a variety of programs at the University. But as Kat is referring or mentioning, I think the use of alternative or the use of pass/fail here, if it were part of the credit window, then that would enable students to have higher GPAs, effectively, based on a fewer set of classes for the entrance-to-major process.

So, there's an attempt to try to take that these grades out of that process, at some level. And I guess Jeff may be able to explain that a little bit better than I did.

Jeff Adams: No, I think you did well, David. Yeah, and the other piece is around recognizing the ability for these individual majors to set limits on the use of those, because then those GPAs are so critical to students meeting those thresholds. But it's also worth pointing out that PIE also has a subcommittee that's been working, really, since its inception on the whole issue of the entrance-to-major process and the equity issues involved there.

We don't certainly see this as-- we see this as highlighting the challenges associated with equity in that process. We don't think it makes it worse, but we certainly don't see this as addressing those issues either.

Chair Szczygiel: OK. Thank you. Joyce.

Joyce Furfaro, College of the Liberal Arts: Furfaro, Liberal Arts. As somebody on the petition committee who used to be Chair, I just wanted to speak to that briefly, that for a student to petition for a change, they would have to have very good extenuating circumstances. They should be able to explain it very thoroughly, have good documentation to back that up, and college support, advising support. It's not as easy as it sounds. We have been worried about an undue burden for something like this. But so far, we've been able to manage it rather well, I think.

Erin Eckley: Collegiate athletics report scheduled to be--

Chair Szczygiel: Any other comments or questions for the presenters? I see Kristin.

Kristin Purdy Drew, Eberly College of Science: Hi. Purdy Drew, science. I really just wanted to ask the presenters why-- what was the impetus for basically doubling the number of pass/fail courses that are allowed. Because I was looking at the old version, and it says 12. This one's 24 credits.

Kathleen Phillips: I see that Alan has his hand raised, and I was wondering if we could allow Alan to answer that question.

Chair Szczygiel: We can certainly try. Alan, do you have an answer for us?

Allen Larson, Penn State New Kensington: Can you hear me?

Chair Szczygiel: We can.

Allen Larson: OK. The old pass/fail system-- of those 12 credits, you'd also have to look at the fact that almost every other-- there were so many stipulations on what could count and what could be offered and taken as a pass/fail course under the old 49-60, that nobody would ever even get to 12 credits.

But that's not-- the point of this, the purpose, the spirit of this legislation was to come up with a wider safety net, really, for students, recognizing that there are all kinds of crises situations that students encounter over a four-year period. So, 24, a career limit of 24, a semester limit of 7-- this isn't giving, kind of, free reign for people to game the system, as I think someone said in the chat. I always, sort of, object to that.

I mean, we make up the game, and we give it to students to play. And I think the purpose here is to make that game more accommodating to a wider range of students who experience all types of hardships, above and beyond all the ones that were brought to the fore just by virtue of this particular pandemic. So, this seemed like an extremely reasonable compromise to open up a little bit without in any way compromising academic standards, which I do not believe it does if you look at it in the cumulative.

And it is, as Nathan just put it in the chat, right? I mean, that all goes back to the framework of equity under which the task force was working. So, I hope that that answered that question. There was one question about the entrance to majors, and I just have to add there that one complication there is not-- some majors don't just have a C-or-better requirement for certain courses. They have a B-or-better requirement for certain courses or things like that.

So, in order to allow for that, we had to make some other allowances there as well. And then, my phone is ringing, so I'm going to—

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Allen. Thank you, Allen. Kristin, it sounds-- looks like, in the chat, you were satisfied with that response.

Kristin Purdy Drew: Thanks very much.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you. And any other questions or concerns before we move to a vote? And while you're thinking about it, this would be a vote on the report, as you see being presented on the screen, with the minor edits having been applied to it.

And Anna, I've got a question for you. Do you have-- are we pretty sure that the last vote has been processed? We're good to go?

Anna Butler: Yes, it has.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, great. It is now time to vote on this particular report from ARSSA. This is 49-60, satisfactory-unsatisfactory, in baccalaureate and associate degree candidates. Anna, please start the poll. And senators-- thank you, Anna. Senators, you can cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B. And before we move on, I just want to make sure, Anna, that you're seeing some votes coming in, and that the process is going forward.

Anna Butler: Yes, I am seeing many votes come in.

Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure Section 6(a) Committee on Committees and Rules – Appendix C

Chair Szczygiel: Alright. Well, we'll return again, as we did with the previous one. We'll find the answers to the voting at the end of this meeting. Let's move on to the second legislative report. It comes from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules.

“Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure Section 6(a) Committee on Committees and Rules,” Appendix C. That is to say, you will find this report in Appendix C. That's not part of its title. So, Chair Annie Taylor will present this report. Annie, over to you.

Ann Taylor: Thank you. So, the first part is going to be a quote right from that first paragraph. But "diversity, equity, and inclusion are fundamental to the University's value and mission to support all members of our Commonwealth and beyond." And it's not, as this says, the responsibility of any one individual or any one unit or task force or committee.

So last year, I believe credit goes to Chair Seymour for beginning this process, and then to Bonj for continuing it. The idea that we really need to look at every single Standing Committee within the Senate and look at our Standing Rules and figure out how we can really embrace a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the work that we do in our committees.

So, each Senate Committee was asked by our Chair, beginning last year, to consider how their committee would address diversity, equity, and inclusion in their work. So, this means, with Chair Szczygiel supporting this this year, that every committee, all 15, will be presenting legislative reports this year, each addressing some aspect of their Standing Rules, with regard to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

This report is from the Committee on Committees and Rules. And every committee is going to take a different approach. We decided that we would do it in a very comprehensive way by adding this simple but significant statement to our duties, that in this role, the Committee will shall strive to enhance diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging in all its activities. So, by approving this, you are allowing us to make that an official part of our Standing Rules and a wonderful reminder to us to do exactly that in everything that our committee does.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Annie. This is great to have before everyone, just so, as the committees think about what their amendments might look like-- I would also say that this could be a good time, if there is a serious cause to reconsider other aspects of the Standing Rules, which describes the duties of each committee. I know of one such committee at least-- two-- that found this to be an opportunity to, sort of, update it and put these descriptions into the 21st century and to reflect the current concerns of the Senator.

So, thank you, Annie. This is a great example of this. And now, are there any questions about this recommendation? John.

John Champagne: Hi, I'm just wondering, was there any discussion about accountability? About putting some language about accountability into the statement?

Ann Taylor: There was. There was some. We started this work last year, so you're now challenging my memory. But I believe-- and so fellow previous members-- Victor Brunsden, I would invite in particular. He was the Chair last year and is raising his hand. Victor, do you want to address that?

Victor Brunsden, Penn State Altoona: Yeah, we did talk about this. It is exceedingly difficult to add language about accountability into this. So how should we be accountable, and to whom, right? I mean, so obviously, to ourselves-- and no, this is not-- I'm not trying to dodge the issue, but it is very difficult to put language into our Standing Rules that would do that.

The Senate has to hold itself accountable for this. And that's going to be something that we will have to judge our progress on, but it is a good point. We did talk about this a lot. Annie's right. And it's-- I'm not sure I know how to fix that. Anyway, thank you.

John Champagne: Well, what if you built into it that you have to-- the Committee has to evaluate its efforts every year?

Victor Brunsden: That would be great, but on what-- but the Committees already have a lot to do. And if you have some-- if you have a suggestion, you could always make an Amend-- You could always move to amend the document.

Chair Szczygiel: Julie. Do you have a comment? Question?

Julie Gallagher, Penn State Brandywine: I do. Thanks very much. The issue of accountability was one that came up for me as well as I listened to this conversation. And having worked on the Senate More Rivers to Cross Report, I'm glad to see we're moving in this direction, but I think accountability is essential.

And if we have to write some kind of narrative report about concrete steps, this can't be, kind of, good intentions. It has to be concrete actions. And it may be hard to identify, Victor. I get that.

But if we don't put accountability measures in these, if it's not explicitly quantifiable, then as part of our conversations, whether in our policies, where did we grapple with this? What kind of decisions did we make that were different? Because this is a priority.

And so, I think each one of our Standing Committees needs to be more concrete in defining what we're going to be doing to hold ourselves accountable, and that there should be a written report at the end of every year that documents a running list of ways that we have really not just made a good effort but made some serious change.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Julie. Beth?

Elizabeth Seymour: Hi, everyone. Can you hear me? Yes, I completely agree that the Senate needs to think seriously about accountability. I'm not sure putting it in the Standing Rules is the place where we need to think about accountability. There have been great suggestions by Julie and John.

This has also been a conversation that Educational Equity and Campus Environment has been very keenly engaged in. There's also been conversations about putting in an accountability structure into Senate Council as well. So, I think I welcome your comments.

I think we are starting down this road, sadly, and accountability is crucial. And we need to think about how to build that in. I would urge my colleagues not to edit these documents at this point, but to engage in a broader discussion of accountability.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Beth. Chris.

Chris Byrne, Eberly College of Science: Yes. I appreciate what Beth just said about taking one step at a time, so to speak. And I'm just wondering on this issue of accountability and, really, the whole issue of making diversity goals really ubiquitous throughout everything we do in the University and in the Senate, because that's our piece here.

And I just wonder-- and I had to step out of the room, so I hope I just didn't miss if somebody already said this. But how many examples are we drawing on from other universities, other institutions that have had success implementing diversity policies? I'm imagining that we're not the first people to ever try this, and there could be some really valuable lessons learned out there, from things that have worked, and also other things that have not worked. And is that part of that-- is that research part of the process as we design things here?

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Chris. Felecia, you have the floor.

Felecia Davis, College of Arts and Architecture: Hi. Felecia Davis, University Park, Department of Architecture. I just want to say, I'm part of the EECE Committee, and we've been discussing for the last couple of years a DEI dashboard that makes use of data that is available on our campuses to see how we're doing, to put a kind of quantitative measure on things. And the reports that are being discussed here could be a part of that DCI dashboard, so that all committees could tie into it.

I think that the EECE is not interested in being the kind of police of DEI, but it's good to see that these processes are also moving into all committees so that it's, kind of, equally shared, which is, I think, an important fact. But it seems that it might be possible or useful to include some of these reports in the DEI dashboard.

Provost Jones: And Beth?

Elizabeth Seymour: Yeah, I was just responding back-- and sorry-- Seymour, Altoona. I was just responding back to the point made by Chris about whether or not there was any thought in, sort of, best practices for DE&I work in this. Yes, actually, I asked, last year, Associate Vice Provost for Educational Equity Sonia DeLuca Fernandez to give us advice on steps.

And she, in fact, gave the first edits in these documents that then were presented to the Standing Committees. So, we are following a path of best practices. I just wanted to make sure people were aware that we did ask for professional diversity, equity, inclusion advice in this process.

Chair Szczygiel: Yeah, thanks for that bit of history, Beth. That was helpful. Nathan, I saw that you had dropped out, and you came back, so let's go to you.

Nathan Tallman, University Libraries and Scholarly Communications: Sure, and I can be brief. So last year, we passed an advisory consultative report on mandating a diversity, equity, inclusion annual report. I believe Felicity just, sort of, implied that this was an active thing, but we have passed this. We have said to the University, we want the dashboard, we want to work with OPAIR to do this.

We have not followed up on this to assign a committee who would take ownership of that, and it's clear the EECE does not want to be in that role. So just reminding that we do, sort of, have to-- the implementation and completion side of this report that was approved last year needs some follow-up and I think is relevant to this discussion. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Kofi.

Kofi Adu: Kofi, Penn State Altoona. What I just wanted to add is not only that we have this on paper, but it's very important that we have to make sure we have accountability. Because that is the only way we'll be able to evaluate ourselves and know that what we have on paper are being implemented. So, I think that as Beth said, we have to definitely come up, maybe a different committee, to be able to come up with guidelines on how we'll be able to develop-- come up with these accountability guidelines that will help us to be able to evaluate ourselves, that in all our committees and deliberations and decision making, these are taken into account. Thank you, Bonj.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Kofi. Nathan, is your hand back up again? Or is that just a remnant?

Nathan Tallman: Sorry. OK, any other thoughts or comments that you'd want to make on this? So, this is the-- well, any other comments from anyone else? Ann.

Ann Taylor: I would just say, this has been so good, so helpful. For what it's worth, if it's just one opinion, I do really like the idea of a more central way of accounting for the Senate. I'm picturing, for example, perhaps the Senate has an annual report that committee Chairs are asked to feed into, that would help us self-reflect on all the committees' work that year and how that committee work upheld these important principles.

I feel like that would have a lot more power and voice and accountability than if we add something to every single one of the five Standing Committees' Standing Rules saying that they have to do individual self-reflection reports. It's just a thought. Because I do agree that this accountability is so important.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Annie. Chris. Yeah, Chris, do you have anything you want to share?

Chris Byrne: Sorry, sorry. There I go with my mute button. Byrne, from College of Science. And this is just-- with the idea of accountability, self-accountability is valuable. We all do it every year in our evaluations, and so on, and it's important.

But we all have a tendency to sugarcoat ourselves. We beat up on the administration for doing it, but of course we all do it ourselves. Everybody does it. We need somehow trusted critics.

A friend of mine once came up with a slogan. If you want to know what your rights are, ask somebody you've wronged. And I think there was some real insight in that. And somehow, when we come to accountability, we should think about identifying trusted critics, you know.

Of course, trust is very important in this process. But it's also important to have somebody who's not entirely on your side, someone who wants you to succeed, but you know. So, I just want that idea in the mix. It's something to think about.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you, Chris. Very good. We've had some good conversation about this, and I think we may be ready to proceed to a vote. So, Anna, are we in a good spot to begin to start the poll on this issue?

Anna Butler: Yes, I've started it.

Chair Szczygiel: Great. Thank you. And again, this is the document, the report you'll find in Appendix C. The Committee on Committees and Rules, first lush at accommodating or addressing the new standards for DEI within our Standing Rules. So, to accept the motion, press A. To reject, B.

Anna Butler: I do have many votes coming in, and I will keep this poll up.

Revision to Standing Rules Article II – Senate Committee Structure Section 6(g), Committee on Faculty Benefits

Chair Szczygiel: OK. Thank you, Anna. All right, so let's move on to the third legislative report. This is a report from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules, and the Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits. It is titled, "Revision to Standing Rules Article II – Senate Committee Structure Section 6(g), Committee on Faculty Benefits," and can be found in Appendix D on your Agenda. Chair Taylor or Chair Costanzo, do either of you have any comments for the floor?

Denise Costanzo, College of Arts and Architecture: Yes, Bonj. This is Denise. I will-- so, Costanzo, Arts and Architecture, Chair of the Faculty Benefits Committee. So, building on the last revision and conversation, we in Faculty Benefits have revisited our Standing Rules in conversation with the Committee on Committees and Rules.

And we identified four specific opportunities to incorporate DEI consideration in our Standing Rules. One is a sort of aspirational statement, and then three in ways which we hope are concrete enough to support accountability, although the broader systems of accountability that are being discussed before are great. So, if we could scroll down just a little bit.

So, one of the concrete action items would be to add a resource person to our committee, which is relatively small. We would like to have someone who is-- their work is based in the field of diversity, equity, and inclusion, participate in our committee. That person could come from HR, Office of Educational Equity, or any other appropriate entity across the University. So have that person as a voice who's part of our conversations.

If you scroll on to the next page, we propose an addition, because we are asked to serve as the faculty's voice on the issues of whether or not our faculty benefits are serving our colleagues' needs. So, this is an addition which simply highlights the fact that this voice, our Committee's voice, should be inclusive, and address the very specific benefits needs of faculty in minoritized groups. Finally, in two of our mandated reports that come through our Committee each year, there's additional opportunity.

One, the faculty salary report-- we are adding, where possible, this data should be disaggregated by gender identity, race, ethnicity, and other categories of concern to help contribute to the data that permit a meaningful conversation about where and how progress needs to be made. The third point involves our oversight of the campus childcare centers. And we note that where possible, the report that we see should identify, evaluate how childcare provision at those centers supports the University's broader DEI initiatives.

We're pointing out that analysis should include a summary of the student population being served by the categories mentioned, a summary of their staffing, teaching, and support, so we have a sense of what that environment is like. And then, a review of how these centers support recruitment and retention of diverse

faculty, students, and staff at the University. So those are the revisions to the Standing Rules that have been proposed, and I am sure Annie, and I will both welcome any questions or conversation.

Ann Taylor: And I would just add-- Denise, that was perfect. But I would just add that this, to me-- when we received this, we had done the CC&R one already, and I thought this was such a fantastic example of how every committee is going to need to address this differently, based on the nature of their work.

CC&R deals a lot with governance documents in our duties and charges, so there weren't as many places to really insert into these mandated reports and so forth as Faculty Benefits has done. And so, I just really applaud their committee for paying such close attention to how they could really make a difference.

Denise Costanzo: Thank you, Annie. We had great guidance from your committee and from your consultants as well, who really helped pinpoint these opportunities for us. And thanks to the discussions from last year's committee, we've had some carryover, but not all of those folks are still on our committee.

Chair Szczygiel: Very good. Thank you both. And any questions or clarifications needed? Seeing none.

Chair Szczygiel: Oh, Denise. Double Denise.

Denise Potosky, Penn State Great Valley: Yeah, sorry about that. This is not a critique or a challenge-- meant to be a challenge in any way. But I was just wondering what the rationale was for including the diversity of the children in the childcare center, in the childcare report, given its purpose of reflecting the University's, how they're doing with initiatives.

Denise Costanzo: So, I think the rationale on that was recognizing that the demographics of the entire facility help convey its mission, and it is very important to members of our Committee that we see the centers demonstrating an ethos of inclusivity, not only in hiring, but also in the families that are there, and welcome. We know that there's a kind of tipping point that really communicates a different degree of welcome.

And so, we do see that operating at both the level of staffing and the level of families. We also know that children-- it's a very competitive environment to be able to have your kids in those two centers on campus. And within that context, we simply wanted to articulate that we see the value of making sure that the cause of serving diverse families is part of the picture that we're looking at.

Denise Potosky: I guess the reason I asked is because I wondered how information about or from children would be collected, because their parents would be asked to provide it, or the teachers would just decide? I mean, that's, kind of, a-- I don't know, I just thought it was, kind of, a delicate aspect to collect for a report of this nature.

Denise Costanzo: I get where you're coming from, and I think you raise an important point. To me, what would seem appropriate is families voluntarily self-identifying and always having the option to opt out. And as with any particular data point, it would be considered within the context of a larger framework, so I don't think it would be something that becomes-- the absence of a certain number of responses would not be all or nothing.

It's really about having an accurate picture of whether these centers are performing an important part of what we see as their mission-- or their contribution to the University's larger DEI mission. I hope that's helpful. It's certainly a question I can take back to the Committee, but I suspect there are ways to do it in a way that respects everyone's information.

Denise Potosky: Thank you for answering the question.

Chair Szczygiel: John, you have a question? And John, you just disappeared.

John Champagne: John Champagne, Penn State Erie. Hey, Denise. I understand that including information about sexual orientation is really complicated. But if people feel that their salary is lower because they are out as a lesbian, for example, if they feel that their children are not being treated equitably because they are gay or lesbian, I wonder if there is some way to include that language.

Denise Costanzo: Absolutely. We discussed gender and sexual identity as well as disability status. These are categories of immense interest, and we use those other categories of concern to cover this. Because depending on the situation, that may or may not be something that's easy to include in the conversation. There are cases where assessing disability status may come up against other kinds of confidentiality concerns. There are cases where, for some people, they want gender and sexual orientation identity to be on the table in the conversation, and others where they may not. So that was our attempt to tread carefully around situations that could vary. So that was where that language came from.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you, Denise, and for the good questions from everyone. I think we are ready to move on to a vote. Anna, how are we looking?

Anna Butler: I have opened the poll.

Chair Szczygiel: OK. Senators, you may cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept the motion, press A. To reject, press B.

Chair Szczygiel: And how's that looking, Anna?

Anna Butler: I am getting many votes, and I will keep this open for a little bit.

Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article II – Senate Council, Section 1(c), Addition of the Category of Positional Reports – Appendix E

Chair Szczygiel: All righty, thank you very much. Let's move on. Our next report is from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules, and the Senate Self-Study Committee, "Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article II – Senate Council, Section 1(c), Addition of the Category of Positional Reports." This report can be found in Appendix E for your Agenda. Chair Taylor, the floor is yours.

Ann Taylor: Thank you. Sorry, everybody, that you're having to hear from me again. But this is a very good one as well. Currently-- if you're a newer senator, this may be news to you, but we have four primary types of reports that are reflected in our Agenda structure.

We have forensic reports, legislative reports, advisory consultative reports, and informational reports. And each of these is defined in the document that Erin has on the screen now. And there are times when

the Senate is taking a formal position on an issue of importance to the University, but it was in the form of a resolution.

And we have many examples of this. The most recent that may be in your mind were the grade reports resolution that we made, that really was influential. Resolutions can be raised by individual senators from the floor of the Senate during new business. And then, we have to wait till the following session to-- we've got an extra sound there-- the following plenary to vote.

We don't, however, have a way to raise a formal resolution from one of our Standing Committees, given the fact that we only have forensic, legislative, advisory consultative, and informational report types. So this legislation would add a new report type to our arsenal, our toolkit-- the positional report. It would give Standing Committees a way to present a formal position on an issue that's of importance for the Senate body as a whole to vote on.

The legislation would basically just add it to the Senate's Agenda structure by inserting a new section where such reports can be voted on immediately after the presentation of the advisory and consultative reports. And then, on a very minor scale, kind of, a while-we-were-at-it, we noticed that in this part of our Bylaws, that Robert's Rules is referred to, and it says latest addition. Or-- excuse me, a specific addition, which we would rather use the language "latest addition."

That way, every time there's a new version of Robert's Rules, we don't have to go back to this in our Standing Rules and update that to the most recent addition. We just will always say, whatever the latest edition is of Robert's Rules, that's what we will be using. So, we snuck that in, hoping that that was relatively minor editorial change. And with that, if you have any questions.

Chair Szczygiel: Nathan.

Nathan Tallman: Thank you. I'm curious as to why we needed to create a new term called, positional report, as opposed to just giving committees the explicit authority to pass resolutions and to send them on to Council. It's, sort of, creating a structure that doesn't really have a parallel in other governance. Like, it's a resolution. Let's just call it a resolution.

I also have a comment that I think there's a risk about saying, latest edition of Robert's Rules, in that if no one is necessarily watching those rules and looking at all the changes, we could find ourselves in a situation where we're trying to resolve what the governing rules were at the time of making a decision without knowing what the latest approved was at that time.

Ann Taylor: Nathan, I can address the latter, and then Victor, I'm looking at you, if you want to perhaps help with the former. We have a Parliamentarian, and that's the job of the Parliamentarian. So the revised section with Robert's Rules is not Committee-- I mean, it's for the entire Senate, and that is the job of the Parliamentarian.

Poor Keith Shapiro is our current Parliamentarian. Beth has been it previously. They know well that they're called upon all the time if there's ever any changes that are made or any things being questioned. So, I'm not sure that would actually be a potential problem.

But Victor, I'm going to fall to you again, because again, this came out of last year's CC&R when I was the Vice Chair, and you were the Chair. Do you remember? I know we discussed the term quite a lot.

Victor Brunsten: Yeah, so the idea of a positional report came out of the idea-- technically, every report that we vote on is a resolution. So, the term, resolution, sort of, loses its meaning. The idea behind adopting a positional report is that the Senate can state its position on an issue, but this does not require a change in policy.

It may require that there is a written response from the administration or that this merits, but there may be times when it doesn't. So, there is a need for this kind of report. And simply calling it a resolution actually is somewhat incorrect. So there really is a need for this kind of report.

Ann Taylor: I'm going to correct myself, Nathan. I just looked through it again. We have two positional report-related legislations today. This one doesn't address the Robert's Rules things. So, let's just forget I ever said that, and we don't have to debate that now.

Nathan Tallman: In response to what you said, Victor, if everything we pass is already a resolution, why do we want to decrease our flexibility by pinning to a specific type of report, right? If we can pass any resolution, if we call it a resolution, it seems like we have a lot more flexibility in the type of document, and that we're not pigeonholing ourselves into a particular bureaucratic structure.

Victor Brunsten: We've already pigeonholed ourselves. We have certain categories of reports. And to be honest, I think it is more-- I don't see this as pigeonholing ourselves. This is actually being explicit about what we are doing.

So, the term, resolution, in some sense, doesn't have enough meaning, because all we do is vote on resolutions of one kind or another. So, our language is-- our current use of language is incredibly imprecise and muddies the issue. This does not, and it does not pigeonhole us.

So, I beg to differ. I'm sorry, Nathan, but I have to disagree. And Keith, I think, can weigh in on this better than I can, and I notice he has his hand up.

Keith Shapiro: Yeah, can you hear me?

Chair Szczygiel: We can, and please go ahead.

Keith Shapiro: Thank you. This report we're looking at right now, Appendix E, Revisions to the Senate Bylaw Article 2, is a legislative resolution. One of the things we need to be able to clarify is what happens to these reports after we're done voting on them. And some reports like this go into effect immediately. Some reports require a response from our administration.

There's some confusion, when we just have a report called a resolution, as to what we're supposed to do with it afterwards. This clarifies that we don't really, for this particular kind of report, require the president to write a response to us, as he would with an advisory and consultative report. The purpose of this is simply to state the position of the Senate, a consensus position of the Senate, in a clear and concise way.

And we've been doing this for the last year, and we've even seen some reports that say, positional, on them. One of the reasons we're doing this is because of the confusion that appeared on the floor when

Chair Rowland was presenting the great report, quite a long time ago now. Our provost said, this is a resolution. Does this mean we need to adopt it right now?

And the answer to that was, no, you don't. We're merely telling you what our position or our opinion is on this. We would like to avoid those confusions in the future, and this idea of a new kind of report that specifically gives the position of the Senate, which we just had in the last couple of weeks, I think, would clarify and simplify that problem. Thanks, Bonj.

Chair Szczygiel: Any other questions or comments from the floor? Seeing none, going slowly, seeing none. I think we are ready to proceed to the vote. Anna, could you start the poll, please?

Anna Butler: I'm sorry, could you tell me what we're voting on, Bonj? Is this a by-laws change?

Chair Szczygiel: This is the Senate Committee, Committees and Rules, and Self-Study, the category of positional reports. Its Appendix E.

Anna Butler: OK. I made—

Ann Taylor: Bylaws. Its Bylaws, Anna.

Anna Butler: I might be wrong, but aren't Bylaws voted on the next meeting?

Ann Taylor: Oh, she's so right. Bonj?

Chair Szczygiel: Did we get them flipped?

Ann Taylor: No, but she's right. So, we're introducing this today.

Anna Butler: Yes.

Ann Taylor: And you will vote next time. And that will become even more clear when we go to our next report.

Chair Szczygiel: I see what happened. I see. Thank you, Anna. You came in, you saved the day. Smart gal.

Anna Butler: You're welcome.

Michele Stine: Annie, it's still on.

Chair Szczygiel: So good discussion, and—

Dawn Blasko, Executive Director, Senate Office: Can you hear me?

Ann Taylor: Yes.

Dawn Blasko: OK. This report has already been on the April Agenda. This is the first one you're talking about. And so, this would be the—

Ann Taylor: I don't think-- Dawn, I don't remember that we presented the Bylaws that would add a category of positional report.

Dawn Blasko: Right. No, you're right. We're talking about the other report.

Chair Szczygiel: OK.

Dawn Blasko: Don't worry about that.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, everyone, for weighing in. Glad that we've got people on their toes catching these things. And that's great. We've had a good discussion about it, and you're going to see this thing come back probably at the October meeting-- is my guess.

**Revisions to Senate Standing Rules, Article I – Rules of Procedure, Section 2, Addition of the
Category of Positional Reports – Appendix F
REPORT POSTPONED UNTIL OCTOBER 19, 2021, SENATE MEETING**

Chair Szczygiel: Let's move on, if we might. Annie, this next report-- I believe it has-- you've requested that it be placed on hold for future—

Ann Taylor: Yes, CC&R would like to hold this legislative report for-- those who are new, as I was reminded today by Bonj, by Keith, and others, changes to the Constitution or Bylaws, as you just saw, have to be presented at one meeting, but then voted on at the following plenary. And that's because, as Keith put it, it's changing our rights, so we need to really think about those really fully.

Standing Rules do not. They can be presented and voted on in the same meeting. And since this report, Bonj, is so closely connected to the Bylaws, we'd like to wait, so they can be voted on at the same meeting that the bylaw proposal is being-- that we just talked about-- is being presented.

Chair Szczygiel: Right. I understand that. That's fine. Nathan, observation or—

Nathan Tallman: Tallman, Libraries. I'm still concerned about saying “latest version” of Robert's Rules. What if we don't like it? What if there's something in the new version that prevents us? So, if there's an opportunity for that to change before the next committee report comes out, and we vote on it, I just wanted to offer that feedback. I think there's risk for penny.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you. Your feedback has been received. Do you feel a need to respond, Keith, or shall we move—

Keith Shapiro: Yeah, I would like to say, just to mention, that the Self-Study Committee is considering making a recommendation to the Senate that we use a set of rules that are different than Robert's, and that are much more accessible and easier to use. So, in the end, this may end up being moot. But that, of course, would be a further discussion for our future.

**Senate Policies and Rules on Instruction and Curriculum; Creation of Senate Policy 100-00 –
Appendix G**

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you very much. I think we are safe to go onto our final legislative report. This can be found in Appendix G. It is sponsored by the Committee on Curricular Affairs, titled, “Senate Policies and Rules on Instruction and Curriculum; Creation of Senate Policy 100-00.” Curricular Affairs Chair Mary Beth Williams is here to present the report.

Mary Beth Williams, Eberly College of Science: Thank you, Bonj. And William Kenyon, one of our two co-Vice Chairs, is also joining me on the virtual floor. We are pleased to bring forward this legislative report from the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs, which has been charged to examine, clarify, and update the Guide to Curricular Procedures. With this report, we begin our work by proposing creation of a new section, separate from the policies for undergraduates, which are the numbered policies that we typically work with, to create a new section that enumerates the policies on curriculum and instruction.

The policies themselves are not changed. For example, faculty have always had primary role in responsibility over educational matters, including curriculum and instruction, which is stated in our Faculty Senate Constitution, in the Guide to Curricular Procedures, in the Governance Documents of the Board of Trustees, in the University Academic Policies, and in our reports to Middle States. This legislation is also not a change in—University-wide policies on curriculum or instruction.

For example, course and program curriculum is approved according to the University Faculty Senate Curricular Policies and Processes that are determined by this body on behalf of the faculty that we represent. So, with this legislative report, we are setting the stage to be able to do our work this year, to bring greater clarity to our curricular policies, and collect these in an easier-to-find location, index them more easily, so that they can be referenced. This has been in progress for more than two years, when it was discussed in the Curricular Process Reform Task Force, who presented an informational report to the Senate body in January 2020 and has been in discussion with the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs since then.

Organizing the guide to curricular procedures has been a committee charge for two or three years now, and it is made even more important to get this done with the impending rollout and transition to the new curriculum management system. So, we, in summary, are presenting this legislation as the enabling step to further our efforts and to get this project done this year. Thank you for your support for this legislative report.

Chair Szczygiel: Just a reminder, if you have any questions, please raise your hand, and we will recognize you. So, any questions or comments from the floor? Renata.

Renata Engel, Administrative, World Campus: Good afternoon. And I looked at—

Chair Szczygiel: Renata, could you identify yourself?

Renata Engel: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, thank you, thank you. Engel, World Campus. Thank you. I looked at the curricular procedures that you have already listed on the faculty Senate page, and so there are quite a few, so it does make good sense, I think, to pull these together. I'm going to just surface the question that came up in Senate Council, Mary Beth, and I think you heard it perhaps when we were there.

And it was really to get clarification on what is meant by the phrase in the statement there, the methods of instruction. So, if you could elaborate on that, I think that would be helpful. Thanks.

Mary Beth Williams: Sure, I'm happy to, Renata. Thank you for raising that question here. The phrase, methods of instruction, here is intended to refer to the pedagogical choices that faculty make in their courses for their students to promote student learning. The generality of the term, methods of instruction, is intentional, because it's meant to encompass the range of possible pedagogies, the methods, the approaches, that span all of our possible courses or disciplines or campuses.

And so, the policy has to encompass that entire range, including the innovations that faculty are now bringing to the classroom and in the future. So, it's not-- I don't think we can attempt to have an exhaustive list. I think your question is really about, what are the constraints on us? And clearly, there are constraints on all of us that are articulated both in Senate policies and in administrative policies.

For example, there are still administrative policies on academic freedom, on remote learning. 80-55 right now is under review by a committee. So, there are other constraints to this. This policy just is that top-level language that mirrors what we say in our report to Middle States that says that faculty have the primary role and responsibility for curriculum and instruction. So, I hope that I've explained why it's a general term here, Renata.

Renata Engel: Certainly, I understand, sort of, the general term, and I do think that the scope is quite large. I mean, it could be something as much as the difference between a lecture or laboratory or seminar, that kind of thing, or, as you said, more specifically, some of the innovations that are coming around-- things like flipped classrooms.

I agree with you. I don't think that there is perhaps an exhaustive way to, sort of, include all of that. I think I was just looking for some more clarity on what maybe that scope is. So, I think that there's an opportunity here to perhaps provide a little bit more clarity without providing a lot of the specificity.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Renata. And I see another hand. Marie.

Marie Hardin, Bellisario: Hi, everybody.

Chair Szczygiel: Could you identify yourself, please?

Marie Hardin, ALC Representative: I'm sorry. Yes, thank you. My name is Marie Hardin, and I am the ALC rep to the Senate. And I just had a quick question. I was reading this, and I guess my-- and I don't know about the background on the discussions.

Mary Beth, you talked about-- that this had been under discussion for a couple of years. I guess I just-- as I was reading it-- what is, sort of, the immediate-- what are the immediate implications, in your mind, of this change?

Mary Beth Williams: Yeah, that's a good question, Marie. Thank you for that. There's no change in policy. We're not changing any policies that don't already exist. This is merely creating what will be a new tab on the Senate website, and a new set of numbered policies.

What will happen next, Marie, is that the subcommittee of senators from the Committees on Education, Curricular Affairs, will get together to look at the Guide to Curricular Procedures and our current policies for students to identify which of those are actually curriculum policies.

And I have to tell you, there are a lot of them in the Guide to Curricular Procedures that is this entangled gamesh of policy and procedure. And we're going to pull policies out to make clear what the policies are and update the procedures. So, this is not a change in policy. It's an organizational structure.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Yvonne, you have your hand up? Or not?

Yvonne Gaudelius, Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education: Yes, maybe as a-- thank you. Gaudelius, Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education. This is a follow-up to that question and your response, Mary Beth. So, I understand, then, from your comments, this is merely an organizational policy about how our current procedures are organized within the Senate, and it represents no change in delivery and modes of courses.

Mary Beth Williams: There's no change in any of our existing policies with this. This creates a new section with which we can create numbered policies on curriculum and instruction, all of which would happen with Senate approval in a report, a legislative report. So, this doesn't change any existing policies or override anything. No.

Yvonne Gaudelius: So, this really is an organizational effort-- is what I'm hearing you say. And it's taking current-- I'm sorry to keep asking-- just a follow-up question. So, I'm really curious, I guess, then about the-- originally, one of the co-sponsors of this report was the Education Committee, and then Education was removed because there was no opportunity to discuss this report.

So given that this has been under discussion for more than a year, I'm really curious about the need to vote on this during this meeting and move this forward, if it's been under discussion for such a long time when a critical committee like Education is not included in the discussion.

Chair Szczygiel: To give some background to what transpired when this report was brought forward to the Senate Council, it was discovered that the voting members or what were thought to be the voting members were given access to the document for review. They weighed in and approved it going forward, unanimously, or I'm not sure of the actual numbers.

But that did omit some of the administrative senators from being included in that vote. So that's just some background for everyone to understand. Shelly, do you have any thoughts?

Michele Stine: Yes. So, thank you for giving that background on what transpired and why Education is not co-sponsoring this particular report. We felt it was really important for this report to come forward, because this report is what's going to provide the structure for us to be able to do what is going to be a lengthy task and trying to reorganize these policies.

The intent is really to make it easier for people to do what they need to do. We want faculty, we want students, we want administrators, we want senators, to all be able to find those policies and understand what the curricular and instructional policies are. In order to have a place, we need a home for those where they're all brought in the same place.

So, we really felt like it was important for this report to come forward, so that we have this structure, so that we could then move forward with restructuring those. And certainly, Education as an entire community would be part of those conversations about moving policies into the section and remembering policies if necessary.

But we felt like the structure of this was not-- I've lost the word that I wanted to use, but we thought that the structure was critical enough that it needed to move forward, and that the substantive conversation is going to come in when we're pulling those policies out of the Guide to Curriculum Procedures and out of other numbered Senate policies, and putting them into this singular place, if that makes sense.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Shelly, and again, ever mindful of the time. Yvonne, if you have something additional you want to add to the conversation?

Yvonne Gaudelius: I'm good. Thanks, Bonj. Sorry, I lowered my hand.

Chair Szczygiel: Oh, OK. Anyone else? Waiting, and I see no other hands emerge at this point in time.

So, Anna, I believe this time, we are ready to go, if you could please start the-- Anna, is it OK if we proceed to the vote on this one? I just feel better checking with you, my friend. I think she says, yes.
Anna Butler: Yes, it is.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, Anna. I'm just-- thank you very much. Here we are, our last vote of the day. We've got A to accept, or B to reject.

I'm sorry, it is not our last vote of the day. I didn't want to get any of your hopes up. We have some advisory and consultative reports. They will go quickly, maybe. So, let's just plug on through here, everyone. You are still on board. I see we still have a healthy number of people involved. And how is it looking, Anna? Shall we move on?

Anna Butler: You can move on.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Thank you. Thank you much. Let's move on to Agenda Item J. Advisory and Consultative reports-- we have three advisory-- well, actually, three advisory and consultative reports.

Discussion on Policies that Pose Obstacles to Equity for At Risk Populations – Appendix H

Chair Szczygiel: The first is from the Senate Committee on Education, titled, "Discussion on Policies that Pose Obstacles to Equity for At Risk Populations." It is found in Appendix H. David Smith; the Associate Dean for Advising and Executive Director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies will stand for questions. David, the floor is yours.

David Smith: Thank you, Chair Bonj. I can share my screen if we want to see the document—

Chair Szczygiel: Sure.

David Smith: --and have it. So, I can do that. So last year, the Senate Committee on Education had a subcommittee that was charged with looking at academic policies to review them, particularly with an eye towards identifying broad sets of things within the University policy structure that might lead to

inequitable outcomes for our students. We were very cognizant that there are multiple conversations going on presently around this topic of how we close the achievement gap, create better outcomes for all students. And so, we tried to, sort of, position this report in a way that would address some items that we thought weren't necessarily actively under discussion in other areas.

For the work that we did, we brought together leaders from Student Disability Resources, various student success offices across our campuses, the Center for Gender and Sexual Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Officers from colleges and campuses, as well as academic advisors, to really talk about where the barriers might exist for various subpopulations of students at Penn State. Much of that conversation ultimately led toward more discussion around, again, the kinds of things that are blocking students from making forward momentum.

And we saw this as something that was really affecting wide ranges of students and could be beneficial to all students if we really stop to try to think about it. We also recognize that these items aren't necessarily directly in the purview of the Faculty Senate, so that is why we've opted to go with an advisory and consultative report to try to bring greater attention within various functional offices at the University around some things that could be done perhaps differently to improve outcomes for students.

Holds are an important thing that the University uses to force action at some point in time for students who need to take various actions, but we also know that those holds on registration can have detrimental effects and often are disproportionately affecting marginalized student populations. So, we've made some recommendations around the use of registration hold, largely to gain more assessment of where and how they're used, recommending that they be pared back a bit.

So, for example, there are some holds that will prevent a student from actually dropping a course. And outside of academic misconduct issues, we were hard pressed to understand why, as an institution, we would want to prevent a student from actually dropping a course that they may not be doing well in. And then, that third recommendation there under the Hold section really also speaks to the larger goal of really trying to create a more proactive environment of outreach and support to students at Penn State, which I think really leads then into the degree-planning part of these recommendations.

Visibility and transparency around curricular requirements are often difficult for students to find. They're difficult for advisors sometimes to fully comprehend and be able to explain to students. So one of the things that we thought would be particularly useful would be for degree planning and greater attention to electronic tools that would help students plan out the eight semesters that they would need to complete a degree in, but to also really strongly urge that in the process of doing that, it create proactive tools or proactive ways for the advising community to be aware of students who are off plan, so that, again, the kind of proactive outreach that needs to happen to support students is more robust across the University.

And we also draw attention again to the consultative report on enhancing academic advising that was presented to Senate and passed by Senate in April of 2020. So, in a very brief way, that is this advisory and consultative report that the Committee on Education is advancing this afternoon.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, David. I see Martha has her hand raised.

Martha Strickland, Harrisburg: Yeah, thank you. Strickland, Penn State Harrisburg. David, thank you for your work, and we recognize the importance of advising across the University. I am interested in two pieces of your consultative report that I just have a comment about, probably more than a question.

But the holds-- my experience with the holds is not just if there's a hold and how that hold is, but also what when they click on it, what they're supposed to do. So, if it says, call the Bursar's Office, and no one's answering, we have a problem. So alongside that, when we're asking for additional help with advising or primary advisors-- and I don't think I'm speaking of anything that you don't already know, but I figure it needs to be on the record a little-- is we need more resources for advising.

So, when you have an advisor that's now up to 300 students, that primary advisement is going to be minimal, and limited at best. So somewhere in this, the direction of holds-- if they're first-generation, I find it's very misleading what that hold is and what to do with that. And secondly, again, we really do need, across the University, particularly at Commonwealth campuses, more resources. Not that they're not doing a good job, but we need more resources available for robust advising, particularly for marginalized students, which includes your first-generation students as well as others. So, thank you for your work, David.

David Smith: Thank you for your very supportive comments. I appreciate them greatly.

Chair Szczygiel: Any other comments for David on this report? Thank you, Martha. Seeing none. Anna, I think it's time to vote if the poll is ready. It is. We have A, again, to accept, B to reject.

Anna Butler: Poll is open.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Anna. And just waiting for confirmation that people have access to it.

Anna Butler: Yes, people were voting.

Changes to AC21 “Definition of Academic Ranks” Clarification of Contract Lengths – Appendix I

Chair Szczygiel: Great, thank you, Anna. And thank you, David. Our next report is from the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, Changes to AC21, Definition of Academic Ranks, Clarification of Contract Lengths. You will find this report in Appendix I. And we have Renee Bishop-Pierce, and Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs, Kathy Bieschke with us to present the report.

Renee Bishop-Pierce, Penn State Scranton: OK. Just when I had it-- thought I had it, now I can't find it. So that's the way it goes, isn't it?

Chair Szczygiel: Of course.

Renee Bishop-Pierce: And of course, it's at the end of the day when no one wants to hear that. For some reason, my screen keeps getting too small, and I can't reach the bottom of it.

Chair Szczygiel: OK.

Renee Bishop-Pierce: Yeah, I'm trying to share my screen, but I can't get to the bottom to share it for you.

Chair Szczygiel: Kathy has it. There she goes.

Renee Bishop-Pierce: Here we go. Thank you, Kathy! OK. This report is very simple. It's meant to address some concerns that were brought to us, where some faculty were receiving a shorter contract length than initially what they should have, simply because-- more than they previously had received-- because of interpretation of AC21. So, we simply wanted to clarify-- we simply wanted to clarify and make it very clear the intent of AC21.

And that's what this does. It talks about, contract lengths of faculty members vary both within and between ranks. And I'm sure you guys can all read that. So, I'll be happy to take questions-- or Kathy as well.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Renee. Any questions from the floor? Seeing none, going, going, gone. Seeing none, it is now time to vote. Anna, we're, sort of, rolling through these quickly, so I just want to make sure that we're ready to proceed with the vote on your end.

Anna Butler: Yes, I just closed the other one. So, we're good.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, all right, thank you. All right, folks you know the drill. A to accept this new definition of academic ranks, clarification of contract lengths, and B to reject. Thank you, Renee and Kathy. This is a great example of collaboration.

Renee Bishop-Pierce: Nice save.

Faculty Teaching Assessment Framework – Appendix J

Chair Szczygiel: Absolutely. All right. Our last advisory and consultative report is from the Senate Committees on Faculty Affairs, Educational Equity and Campus Environment, and the Inter-University Relations, titled, Faculty-- this is long-awaited, folks.

Renee Bishop-Pierce: Yes, it is, except I can't get my screen to share.

Chair Szczygiel: --titled-- someone will come to your rescue-- titled, "Faculty Teaching Assessment Framework." Just some background-- it can be found in Appendix J.

Renee Bishop-Pierce: There we go. I got it.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Great, Renee.

Renee Bishop-Pierce: Marvelous.

Chair Szczygiel: Renee Bishop-Pierce will present this report. Whenever you're ready, Renee.

Renee Bishop-Pierce: I'm working on it. I'm sorry. I've been sitting here all day, waiting for this moment, too. It's killing me.

Chair Szczygiel: Most of the faculty who were around last year will be very familiar with the yearlong-plus process that these three committees collaborating have gone through. There have been numerous listening sessions throughout the years. And there we go. Over to you, Renee.

Renee Bishop-Pierce: Thank you very much. Technology is a wonderful thing. As Bonj was saying, the work of this report has been the input of hundreds of faculty, senators, students, and administrators who attended our listening sessions, completed our many surveys, or sent us emails. Numerous faculty invested time reviewing questions, consulted on student surveys, or provided feedback on the framework and the report being presented today. We would like to thank everyone who contributed to this report.

This is just simply-- I'm gonna take a moment, and it's going to be very brief, to show you the process. As Bonj has alluded to, we've been working at this for quite some time. In the summer of 2020, Chair Seymour charged Educational Equity and Campus Environment, Chaired by Kim Blockett, University Relations, Chaired by Maureen Jones, and Faculty Affairs Committee, Chaired by myself, to review the teaching assessment at Penn State.

We formed a subcommittee consisting of two members of each of our committees and the Chairs of the committees. We immediately began exploring current practices of other institutions. We went well beyond benchmarking the Big Ten and looked at more than 30 different institutions and how they assessed faculty teaching.

We developed listening sessions for students, academic leaders, and Senate members. We sent out surveys. We then brought this all back. This is a very iterative process. We listened to what people had to say, and we modified our framework and brought it back out to the Senate, to other faculty, to students-- excuse me, and administrators.

Our goal was to be very transparent and open regarding feedback. In April, we received the full support of our three committees. We did present an informational report in the April plenary session, and you can link to that report in this report, so you can see the information we collected and some of the work we did to get here.

The objectives of teaching assessment are to provide faculty with feedback, student and peer, for course development and instruction. But we also realize that it's important for us to provide administrators with more robust and equitable tools to evaluate how faculty take that feedback and inform their pedagogy. We propose a very developmental assessment, and we also want to decrease the potential for bias.

We have to acknowledge that there's some serious challenges. We are more than-- we are 24 campuses, more than 440 academic programs, and 5,700 or more faculty. We also wanted to improve teaching assessment without excessively burdening students, faculty, or administrators. We propose a three-pillar framework, with student feedback, peer feedback, all informing faculty self-reflection.

For the first pillar, peer feedback, we heard some consistent concerns. There were questions regarding the value of peer reviews conducted by colleagues and small units. There were also questions regarding opportunity for bias or intimidation, either perceived or actual. Also, time and effort are substantial for fact that you do a really good job at this, because they're asked to do it more and more.

So, the recommendations of this committee are to provide very clear guidelines for implementation and compensation. The second is to provide faculty the choice of evaluators from within their unit, outside their unit, or by a consultant from the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence. We also recommend that they have a choice of the source of assessment.

What I mean by that is, there are many, many tools out there that are used for peer feedback. In fact, I'll give a shout-out to Annie. I love the one by Earth and Mineral Science. So, we want faculty to be able to have the choice in their career of who they want to evaluate them, whether within their unit, another person from their same program, or someone outside. And also, we want them to have the tool of choice for assessment.

However, the review process needs to be consistent and consist of a peer-review consultation, at least one classroom observation, whether it's in-person or virtual, and a post-visit conversation. The critique must be evidence-based, and recommendations must be action-oriented. Now, many units are already doing a really great job of this, but some units aren't evaluating faculty teaching. Peer reviews for many units stop once faculty members are promoted. So, we recommend that this take place no more frequently than once per year, but no less than once per five years.

The next pillar is student course feedback. Now, students may not know the finer aspects of pedagogy, but they definitely have valuable input about their experiences. So, the student surveys should consist of having students reflect about their activities in the course, the learning outcomes-- whether or not they're supported by course activities, learning outcomes supported by course materials-- focus on the general student experience.

We want to remove numbers. We would like to see the assessment a mix of Likert and open-ended questions. We heard in the listening sessions that faculty like to be able to get the responses from students of the open-ended questions, because it helps them understand more and how to make more changes. But we also heard from administrators that lots of these open-ended questions would be overwhelming for them.

We recommend that the University invest in software that could summarize the feedback by themes. We also recommend a mid-semester feedback, but not quite mid-semester-- week 6 for faculty only. This is an opportunity for faculty to collect information about how the class is going, maybe make a little correction, or initiate classroom conversations.

The end-of-the-semester evaluation would be actually not at the end, as it currently is, but in weeks 12 to 13. And these assessments or feedback would go to faculty and administrators. We chose the weeks 12 to 13, because the faculty would receive feedback from the majority of the course while reducing the negative impacts of surveying students at a very stressful time of the semester.

These were comments made by both the students who did not want to fill out the SRTEs at the end of the semester, and by faculty who were concerned about getting responses from stressed students. We did provide in the report recommended questions. So those are included. But we wanted to focus here today on the framework and the implementation.

There were some additional recommendations to attempt to mitigate bias by focusing on course development rather than individual instructors. Also, there were recommendations to remove responses by students who were sanctioned in the course for academic integrity violations. Students also need to be educated on the use and importance of the feedback, because the students at our listening sessions said they didn't really see the importance of completing the SRTEs. So, we want them to realize that we really are listening to what they have to say.

Faculty self-reflection is our third pillar, and this is an opportunity for faculty to have a voice in the review process. Faculty self-reflection was included in the faculty teaching assessment for 2020 at our committee's recommendation. We thank Kathy Bieschke for concluding that.

This is an opportunity to faculty have a voice in the review process. It's not meant to be onerous. It could be simply a conversation about student feedback or potentially comparing how one year progressed over another-- maybe some changes in the course, and how those course changes worked for them.

The recommendations we have is, again, if a unit is doing something, that it should continue if it's working. Units should have freedom to determine their own best practices. Self-reflection was included this year as the annual part of the review process and activity insight, and it could even be made easier for completion review if templates were developed for individual units.

This takes us to, I think, the most important part of this report, and that's the implementation of the teaching assessment framework. Our recommendations are that this be a partnership between the faculty and the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. We would like to see it as a permanent charge for the three committees and the Faculty Senate, with implementation on a three-year timeline, with year one being implementation, year two data collection, and year three evaluation and revisions.

I know I've put revisions on there, because there's no way we could possibly have thought of everything that would accommodate 5,700 faculty and more than 440 programs. I'm sure there's something that we didn't quite get perfect. So, I expect there to be revisions. We want this to be revised.

We do not want faculty assessment to be static and remain the same for 40 years. We also want the teaching assessment framework to be reviewed on a five-year cycle to assess consistent implementation across units, equitable practices, and anti-bias measures. Our pedagogy is dynamic, so assessments should be as well.

There were a couple of things that came up in the listening sessions, and we had recommendations for this. There are courses for which faculty do not control the design or content. So, student feedback for questions pertaining to course design or content really should not be directed to the faculty and be part of their evaluation if they're not responsible. Feedback should be directed to the unit responsible for design or content.

Also, student review of the questions should be included in the teaching assessment review cycle. What that means is that we should ask the students what they think the questions are asking them, because as we know, what we think the students are reading is not necessarily the same thing as what the students are interpreting. We think that students should be educated on this process, particularly in knowing that we are listening to them and the importance of their feedback. Faculty are going to need some assistance in preparing the self-assessment, and also peer reviews, and administrators are going to be need education and support as well.

I'd be seriously remiss if I didn't point out the members of the subcommittee who invested an enormous amount of time last year and had a great deal of patience with us as we worked our way through this. I also would like to acknowledge additional consultants Angela Linse, Executive Director of Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence, Eric Plutzer, Director of Graduate Certificate Program and Survey Methodology, and Joshua Rosenberger, Academic Director of Penn State Survey Research Center, all really helped to refine those questions and make sure we were asking what we thought we were.

Thank you very much for your time and your patience. I know it's been a long day. Kim Blockett, the co-Chair, has offered to respond to your questions.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Renee. This has been such a thorough and thoughtful report. I know the amount of time that all of you-- Maureen Jones, former Chairs, and Kim Blockett and yourself put into as well as your committees, and it was just an extraordinary effort on your part. So, thank you very much. I see Ira has his hand up. Ira.

Ira Saltz: Yes. Oh, turned my video off there, I see. First, yeah, let me say that this is a tremendous, tremendous report, lots of effort, great job. I still have some concerns about the peer review, and I guess you knew that was coming, Renee.

I mean, my first comment is, I see the recommendations are that the peer review be done a minimum of every year to a maximum of five years. I think five years is too long of a gap. My concern, one, is that many units won't have the resources to support peer reviewers, and so you know, I just cannot imagine, on my campus, anybody getting a course release to do peer reviews.

And so, you know, I'm afraid that this could become quite onerous. And here we are, trying to help faculty, but we may be placing a lot more burden on them. And I also question the value of peer reviews. I mean, I served on the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, and have done lots of P and T reviews, and I've never met a peer review that was not friendly.

You know, and for good reason. I mean, most of the times, these are our colleagues. These are people-- you know, and we don't want to be responsible for writing something negative that might end up in their being non-renewed or not getting tenure. So, I think the only valuable peer reviews I have ever seen are ones which are not seen by administration, but simply between the faculty member and the reviewer.

So, I support this as a pillar of that evaluation process. But I still think there's a lot of work to be done in the details on how to make it meaningful, how to prevent it from being a burden. So, I think we have a good start here, but I still think there's work to be done there.

And then, just the other thing, too, is, I'm also wondering whether or not students will take the time to answer so many open-ended questions. But OK, that's all I wanted to add. But again, great job.

Kim Blockett, Penn State Brandywine: Thank you, Ira. So, the first thing I'll say is that you nailed it when you said, the implementation and the details. So, this report doesn't take on implementation and the details, right? This is a report that lays out a framework that says, first and foremost, what we're looking for is formative assessment practices over the sort of hammer and whatever.

So, what we want to do is support faculty to be able to actually have valuable assessment, that is, in some ways, as much as can be, disaggregated from the oversight review process. But even that is tricky, because we know that administrators will, through no fault of their own, want to rely on this. And so that has to be worked out, and that's what happens this year. The beginning of this year begins the working out the logistics and the implementation.

So, I'll start with that. You asked about the five years. I would agree with you that five years is too long. However, if you look at the data, there are many units that don't do it at all.

Ira Saltz: Yeah.

Kim Blockett: And there are units where it might be every 20 years. So that we're trying to find a happy medium here, and find something that is sustainable, to your next point around sustainability. So, I'm a big believer, and we talked about this a lot and the fact that we don't let process guide what should happen, the larger scope of what we want this to look like, right? Process should not guide ideas. It should be the other way around.

And so, let's look at the structural problem. If there aren't structures in place to support valuable assessment, which includes valuable peer review, then that's what we need to deal with. We don't throw out the peer-review process. What we do is address the peer-review process and put structural support in place for that to happen.

So, in other words, we're saying the University needs to pony up. Put your money where your mouth is. If you want quality teaching, then you have to put some support behind the assessment of such. Again, that gets into the implementation piece.

So, we were aspirational in this report. We weren't trying to limit, based on what we know our resources to be right now. We're trying to say, improve them. And then, your last point was around the value of peer reviews.

There are many people who share your opinion, and there were many, many people who did not. I myself have been the recipient of really very useful peer reviews, but I think, to your point, again, this is why we're trying to disaggregate things if it is formative. That colleague can give their colleagues some really useful advice and suggestions and all of that if it's not burdened with the fear of, how will this be used. So yes. Did I hit all your points?

Ira Saltz: Yes, thank you.

Kim Blockett: OK.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Ira, and Kim, for that explanation. John, you have your hand raised.

John Champagne: First, I want to say that this is the most exciting thing about teaching that I have seen in 28 years at Penn State. And that's not to criticize anything Angela does, because Angela is terrific. But I am so impressed with the level of thoughtfulness of this report.

If peer reviews are going to work, then the institution has to develop a culture of reviewing. You can't just announce, now we're going to have peer reviews, and fend for yourself. My concern is that it will not be adopted enough.

And what I mean by that is, you all know that this phrase, unit, is really slippery, and can be defined in any number of ways. And at my campus, each of the four schools-- because the college is divided into schools-- has its own peer-review policies as part of the tenure documents. I would like to see all of that go away, and we have this policy. I don't know if we can do that, and I guess I want to be reassured that all of this really great work is going to find a home at all of our campuses.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, John.

John Champagne: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Raff. I'm going to skip over you, Chris, for a minute. Raff, we have not heard your voice yet.

Raff Donelson, Dickinson Law: Hello. Raff Donelson, Dickinson Law. I have a really small question, so maybe we're having the sort of larger structural questions. I had a question about the faculty self-reflections. And I noted that in the recommendation that the narrative sections be optional, but I was just, kind of, wondering, given that the point of them, from what-- self-description is for the faculty to have a voice, why aren't they completely optional?

And I just say this from the perspective of someone who filled out one of these things in the activity insight last year, and I, kind of, didn't think that this was actually helpful to me. Like, I didn't actually want to say anything else. And so, I was just wondering to myself, you know, is there a way, or was it considered already, to-- if this is supposed to be helpful to faculty, as opposed to a burden, that it be completely optional. Because otherwise, it really is just more work for faculty to do, especially if they feel like the numbers and other things speak for themselves and they don't want to say anything further.

Kim Blockett: Thank you for that. And I'll say that that was-- it was a huge discussion that went back and forth for a very long time. And there were so many good points on either side, and you just made a lot of good points about why it should be optional. But then, the other one point was, if it's not optional-- I mean, I'm sorry-- if it is optional, you've then, sort of, marginalized unintentionally those faculty members who choose to do it.

But that's not to say that that's-- we don't have an answer to that, is what I'm telling you, and that we were hoping that with more guidance and discussion with Kathy Bieschke's office, and with Angela Linse, and with all of our faculty senators, we might land somewhere during the implementation year of how this should actually work. But it's a big, thorny issue around whether or not it should be optional. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Beth, and Kim. Chris, go ahead. Chris, are you there?

Chris Byrne: I'm sorry. My mute. OK, Byrne, College of Science. I've found peer reviews very useful over the years. I have been teaching 25 years and gotten a lot of-- and actually, roughly equally useful with the open-ended questions on the SRTEs, which of course, students slam you and say you're horrible. There's always a few of those.

But there's also lots of valuable comments that are tangible, that really lead to actually actionable things. And with the peer reviews, I think there's usually-- my reviewers have always found a way to be very positive. As Ira's suggested, everyone would be positive. They always find a way to be positive and still make constructive criticisms that are actionable.

That's never seemed to be render the reviews useless. And maybe as far as the workload, if faculty are all reviewing each other, it's not like one person has to go review 20 teachers. If one person has to sit in on one other professor's lecture a semester or a year, that's not a big workload.

And I think professors can all learn from each other by watching each other teach. And I think that the reviewers can also be incentivized. You get brownie points for being a valuable reviewer. Maybe somebody even reviews the reviews. I don't know.

But I'm just saying, there can be incentives for people to actually find the time to do these reviews. There can be incentives to make them valuable. And I do think I'd like to see more of professors learning from each other by watching each other teach.

Kim Blockett: I agree, Chris. And one of the things that we learned very quickly in this process is that, as usual, the answers are here. Penn State is so large, that there are just a billion models of this, which is good and bad. So, we'd like to see a little more consistency.

So, we have a lot of, I guess, data, for lack of a better word, around different models that will help us out in the implementation mode. So, there are folks around the University who already have really good peer-review practices in place, and then others, not so much. So, we have models to use.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks, Kim. There is a question about what this group foresees as the process for implementation. Would you be willing to address that?

Kim Blockett: Yes. And we have that. We do lay that out in the report that year one would be implementation. So, we're looking at one year for that. And then, year two would be data collection, to see what happened, how did we do, where did we fall short. And then, year three would be the evaluation and the revision year.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Angela, I think your hand is going to be the last one, and then we're probably ready to move to a vote. So—

Angela Linse, Executive Director of Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence: OK. I was a little surprised to see the Schreyer Institute in there as a choice of reviewer, because we only do formative assessment. We do not evaluate faculty. The individual faculty are our client, so we can't be a peer reviewer like department reviewers are. And Kim did say that this is intended to be formative.

But if it is going to be used in an evaluative sense, then we're going to have to work very closely with the Implementation Committee, which I know is definitely on the table, to figure out what kind of role the Schreyer Institute can play. We're totally they're helping with the training. But whether we do peer reviews that go to anyone besides the faculty member, we're going to have to think long and hard about that, because you will not want to work with us if we are evaluating you, is the mantra in teaching and learning.

Kim Blockett: So yes, noted. We actually envisioned it as going to the faculty member, but again, this is aspirational. We understand that when it comes-- you know, there's work to be done with a variety of offices to see how this can be implemented.

Angela Linse: And we are totally there with you to try and figure that out.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, seeing no other hands raised, this is our last vote for the day, but not the end of our meeting. I've got good news, so hold on. But let's proceed with the vote on this.

Now, remember, this is a vote for the adoption of advisory and consultative report, it is entitled Faculty Teaching Assessment Framework. I can see Anna's ahead of us. And A to accept, B to reject.

And are we making any traction there?

Anna Butler: We are. Many people are voting.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Summary of Petitions by College, Campus, and Unit 2018-2019 and 2019-2020* – Appendix K

Chair Szczygiel: Great. OK, let's go on to Agenda Item K, Informational Reports. We were to have three informational reports. We now have two. I'll explain in a bit.

The first, though, comes from the Senate Committee on Education, titled, "Summary of Petitions by College, Campus, and Unit 2018-2019 and 2019-2020*." This is included in Appendix K, and it is available on the website, on the Senate website. And it will not be presented on the floor. So, thank you very much, Shelly, and all who were involved in that.

Earning Tenure During COVID – Appendix L

Chair Szczygiel: The second report that we were to have right now is-- sorry, is the report we're going to have right now. But let me just-- bear with me, because I want to-- so Josh is going to be presenting from the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, a report, Earning Tenure During COVID. And Josh, before you do that, I just want to let everyone know that our last report, which was to be from the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, is going to be postponed until October, November.

Our guest speakers were unable to wait until this moment to present. So, Josh, over to you, and you will be our last report of the day. You have our full attention.

Josh Wede: All right, well, I will keep this as short as I can. What the goal of this report is, is to outlay the plan for how the Faculty Senate in combination with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs is going to try to measure the impacts or the effects that COVID has had on the tenure process. So, the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs has data on the faculty who have taken the one-year extension in the probationary period. And we are going to help contextualize that with a survey.

This was generated by faculty and our committee along with Educational Equity and Campus Environment, Intra-University Relations, and Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity. That survey is almost ready to go. It will be out later this month, measuring both the impacts that COVID has had on the tenure process, and also asking about whether or not people took the one-year extension, and why they maybe did or did not.

The plan is, this year, to have a separate report that will coincide with the annual promotion and tenure report. Depending on what we find in the data, those reports may be combined in the future, or depending on what we find, we may continue to keep them separate. And so that's the plan going forward. Happy to answer any questions if anybody has any.

Name Image Likeness Policy – Appendix M

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Josh. Any questions from the floor? So, this is something that we'll be hoping to see come back to us in report form. Seeing no questions, and again, repeating that the report from IAC has been postponed.

Chair Szczygiel: Let's take a look at our earlier vote results. This is, sort of, the exciting moment here. Anna, whenever you're ready, please share your screen and read out each report's name and the results of the vote for the record. Yes. Drum roll, please.

So, Anna, we have-- would you like me to read them? We have the revisions to Senate Bylaws. This was the Section on Committees, Appendix N. It had a resounding passage, 164 Accept to 5 Reject.

The second report is the 49-70 report-- satisfactory-unsatisfactory that we had some discussion about, Appendix B. Another very healthy passage of 112 Accept, 43 Reject. It is passed.

Revision to the Senate Committee Structure on Committee on Committees and Rules-- again, a healthy 136 Accept, 18 Reject. Very similar response to the Senate Committee Structure, Committee on Faculty Benefits that Denise presented—129 Accept and 14 Reject. Congratulations.

This is the Senate Policies on Instruction and Curriculum, the creation of Senate Policy 100-00. And another resounding success. Congratulations, Mary Beth and everyone-- 131 Accept, 11 Reject.

We've had a discussion about the policies that pose obstacles to equity, at-risk populations. Again, we're really, really united, tied at the hips here, folks. 123 Accept, and 4 Reject.

Changes to the Definition of Academic Ranks, Clarification of Contract Lengths, 121 to 2 Reject. So, 121 Accept, 2 Reject. And then, finally, the Faculty Teaching Assessment Framework-- also very healthy acceptance level at-- we were losing people at this point in time-- at 99 Accept and 100 Reject. I thank you all for the excellent work that we have just seen. It's just so amazing to witness this at the end of a session like this.

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS - NONE

Chair Szczygiel: We have Agenda item L, New Legislative Business. I have none in front of me. I hope that doesn't disappoint.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Szczygiel: We have Agenda item M, Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the University. Are there any additional comments to be made for the good of the University? Nathan.

Nathan Tallman: Tallman, Libraries. Thank you. I'd like to recommend that the Committee on Committees and Rules explore a rule that Senate plenary Agenda are released no less than 48 business hours ahead of the plenary. I understand that this can be a difficult goal at times and that things move at a fast pace, but when the Agenda for the August special plenary was released after 5:00 PM on a Thursday, with the plenary being the following morning, there is no time to consult our constituents.

And in alignment with Bonj's opening comments about engaging constituents as an important part of our role, I think it's really important that we give senators appropriate time to engage constituents before we hold votes on actions that affect all faculty as well as other employees of the University. That's all. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Nathan. Julie, go ahead. You have a comment?

Julie Gallagher: I want to ask if you could just read the last vote again.

Chair Szczygiel: Julie, we're having a hard time hearing you.

Julie Gallagher: Sorry. Read out the last vote again. I was writing them all down, and I missed that last vote.

Chair Szczygiel: Oh, sure. This is the Faculty Teaching Assessment Framework. It was Appendix J. It passed 99 votes to pass, 11 reject.

Julie Gallagher: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: And if anyone has any questions about the actual numbers, I do have them documented. We can just send me an email. I'll let you know what those final numbers were if there is interest.

Anna Butler: Thank you, Bonj, for reading them I lost my tools whenever I shared my screen, so thank you for reading those votes.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Szczygiel: That's my pleasure. You saved our butts earlier. Absolutely my pleasure. I am feeling a motion to adjourn coming upon me. Does anyone else feel that? So yes.

Joshua Wede: So, moved. Second.

Chair Szczygiel: All in favor, raise your virtual or real hands, and we will dance our way out. I think--oh my god, it's beautiful. It's a beautiful sight, all those hands.

Thank you, everyone.

You're welcome. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held Tuesday, October 19, 2021, at 1:30 in the afternoon. Appreciate every one of you for sticking it out for this long. Have a good night.

The following Senators were noted as having participated in the September 14, 2021, Senate Meeting via Zoom.

- Abendroth, Catherine
- Acharya, Vinita
- Adu, Kofi
- Alexander, Chandran
- Amador Medina, Melba
- Anderson, Bryan
- Aurand, Harold
- Austin, Kelly
- Ax-Fultz, Laura
- Barron, Eric
- Bartolacci, Michael
- Berish, Diane
- Bieschke, Kathleen
- Bird, Douglas
- Birungi, Patricia
- Bishop-Pierce, Renee
- Blakney, Terry
- Blockett, Kimberly
- Blood, Ingrid
- Bolduc, Jasmin
- Borromeo, Renee
- Bowley, Kevin
- Braman, Valerie
- Brown, Nathaniel
- Browne, Stephen
- Brunsdon, Victor
- Byrne, Christopher
- Calore, Gary
- Chen, Wei-Fan
- Chetlen, Alison
- Coduti, Wendy
- Cohen, Stephen
- Costanzo, Denise
- Davis, Dwight

- Davis, Felecia
- Demirci, Ali
- Donelson, Raff
- Duffey, Michele
- Eckhardt, Caroline
- Egolf, Roger
- Engel, Renata
- Eppley, Karen
- Evans, Edward
- Fairbank, James
- Fanburg-Smith, Julie
- Farnan, Kaitlin
- Farrar, Katelyn
- Fausnight, Tracy
- Findley, Samuel
- Fox, Derek
- Frederick, Samuel
- Fredricks, Susan
- Freiberg, Andrew
- Frisch, Paul
- Fuller, Edward
- Furfaro, Joyce
- Gallagher, Julie
- Gaudelius, Yvonne
- Gayah, Vikash
- Gillespie, Marissa
- Goffe, Lorraine
- Goin, Campbell
- Graham, Joshua
- Griffin, Christopher
- Grimes, Galen
- Gross, Charlene
- Grozinger, Christina
- Guadagnino, Frank
- Han, David
- Hanses, Mathias

- Hardin, Marie
- Hardy, Melissa
- Hauck, Randy
- Hayford, Harold
- Higgins, Jeanmarie
- Holden, Lisa
- Huang, Tai-Yin
- Hufnagel, Pamela
- Iliev, Peter
- Impavido, Donald
- Iqbal, Zaryab
- Jett, Dennis
- Jolly, Rosemary
- Jones, Nicholas
- Jordan, Matthew
- Joseph, Rhoda
- Kadetsky, Elizabeth
- Karpa, Kelly
- Kass, Lawrence
- Kass, Rena
- Keleher, Peyton
- Kennedy-Phillips, Lance
- Kenyon, William
- Kim, Agnes
- King, Elizabeth
- Kitko, Lisa
- Klug, Rebecca
- Kramer, Lauren
- Kubat, Robert
- Kunes, Melissa
- Lang, Dena
- Le, Binh
- Lear, Matthew
- Ledford, Savanna
- Linch, Amy
- Linn, Suzanna

- Liu, Dajiang
- Mahoney, Joseph
- Malcos, Jennelle
- Malysz, Jozef
- Mangel, Lisa
- Marko, Frantisek
- Marshall, Megan
- Mason, John
- Masters, Katherine
- Mathews, Jonathan
- Maximova, Siela
- McCoy, Heather
- McKinney Marvasti, Karyn
- McKinney Marvasti, Karyn
- Melton, Robert
- Messner, John
- Michels, Margaret
- Mocioiu, Irina
- Mookerjee, Rajen
- Moore, Jacob
- Mulder, Kathleen
- Myers, Christian
- Najjar, Raymond
- Neely, Megan
- Nesbitt, Jennifer
- Noce, Kathleen
- Nousek, John
- Novotny, Eric
- Nurkhaidarov, Ermek
- Ofosu, Willie
- Ozment, Judith
- Page, B.Richard
- Palma, Julio
- Palmer, Timothy
- Parizek, Heather
- Pauley, Laura

- Perkins, Daniel
- Petricini, Tiffany
- Petrilla, Rosemarie
- Pfeifer Reitz, Dawn
- Phillips, Kathleen
- Pierce, Mari Beth
- Posey, Lisa
- Potosky, Denise
- Precht, Jay
- Purdy Drew, Kirstin
- Rhen, Linda
- Riccomini, Paul
- Richardson, Lewis
- Robertson, Noah
- Robicheaux, Timothy
- Robinson, Brandi
- Ruggiero, Francesca
- Rutherford Siegel, Susan
- Saltz, Ira
- Sanchez, Amy
- Sangwan, Raghu
- Saunders, Brian
- Scott, Geoffrey
- Seymour, Elizabeth
- Shannon, Robert
- Shapiro, Keith
- Sharma, Amit
- Shea, Maura
- Shearer, Gregory
- Shen, Wen
- Shurgalla, Richard
- Signorella, Margaret
- Sigurdsson, Steinn
- Simmons, Cynthia
- Sinha, Alok
- Sloboda, Noel

- Slot, Johanna
- Smith, David
- Snyder, Stephen
- Springall, Rob
- Sprow Forté, Karin
- Stine, Michele
- Strauss, James
- Strickland, Martha
- Strohacker, Emily
- Swallow, Nicole
- Swinarski, Matthew
- Tallman, Nathan
- Tavangarian, Fariborz
- Taylor, Ann
- Taylor, Benjamin
- Taylor, Jonté
- Thomas, Emily
- Tyworth, Michael
- Van Hook, Stephen
- Vasilatos-Younken, Regina
- Volk Chewning, Lisa
- Vrana, Kent
- Vujan Mcclosky, Andrea
- Wagner Lawlor, Jennifer
- Walker, Eric
- Wang, Ping
- Warner, Alfred
- Watts, Alison
- Wede, Joshua
- Weld, Jennifer
- Whitcomb, Tiffany
- Whitehurst, Marcus
- Williams, Mary Beth
- Williams, Nicole
- Wolfe, Douglas
- Wong, Jeffrey

- Wright, Suzanne
- Yagnik, Arpan
- Yamamoto, Namiko
- Yen, John
- Zhang, Qiming
- Zorn, Christopher

Elected	186
Students	17
Ex Officio	6
Appointed	11
Total	220