The University Faculty Senate met in special session on Tuesday, March 17, immediately following the Senate plenary meeting, 112 Kern Graduate Building, with Senate chair Nicholas Rowland presiding.

A special meeting of the University Faculty Senate was convened as a result of two resolutions that were brought to the floor of the March 17 plenary meeting under New Legislative Business. Under normal circumstances, these items would be sent to Senate Council, and if approved, would appear in the upcoming plenary agenda on April 28. However, Senate Chair Nicholas Rowland noted that April 28 would be too late to discuss the resolutions as the coronavirus is upon us.

In order to attend to the items, Chair Rowland invoked Senate Standing Rules Article 1, “Rules of Procedure,” Section 3, which reads, “The chair of the Senate may convene a special meeting of the Senate in addition to those specified in Article V or Article I, Section 2, of the bylaws, at such time and for such purposes as the chair deems necessary for the effective discharge of the business of the Senate.” The agenda of such a meeting is specified in Section 4 of the same article, which reads, “The order of business for any special meeting of the Senate shall be determined by the chair of the Senate.” Invoking Sections 3 and 4 of Standing Rules Article 1, “Rules of Procedure,” Chair Rowland asked for a motion to adjourn the plenary meeting and then immediately reconvene in a special meeting to consider the resolutions.

SENATE STANDING RULES

Article I – Rules of Procedure

Section 3

The Chair of the Senate may convene special meetings of the Senate, in addition to those specified in Article V or Article I, Section 2 of the Bylaws, at such times and for such purposes as the Chair deems necessary for the effective discharge of the business of the Senate.

Section 4

The order of business for any special meeting of the Senate shall be determined by the Chair of the Senate.

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

I. Final Agenda for March 17, 2020 Page i
II. Minutes and Summaries of Remarks Pages 1-12
III. Appendices Appendix I
   a. Attendance

FINAL AGENDA FOR MARCH 17, 2020

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR Page 1
B. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS Pages 1-12
   Resolution #1: COVID-19 Resolution: Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Grading Pages 1-9
   Resolution #2: COVID-19 Resolution: SRTE Pages 9-12

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, April 28, 2020, 1:00 p.m., via Zoom.
The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, March 17, 2020, at 1:00 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate building with Nicholas Rowland, Chair, presiding.

**Chair Rowland:** Senators joining us remotely. It is now. It looks like 3:23, Tuesday, March 17, that the Penn State University Faculty Senate is once again in session. Our first item of business is to-- could you please pull the two resolutions that we have?

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

**Chair Rowland:** I mentioned this before, but we can discuss it again. When an item of new business is brought up, it is not possible to discuss that item of new business in the same motion that it is raised for future consideration. In so far as that's true, in order to discuss the item, it does need to-- in order to discuss the item in the same meeting, we adjourn the previous meeting and open the special committee for a special meeting in order to view the item.

**DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS**

**Chair Rowland:** I'll read out for those of you that may or may not see the document.

**COVID-19 Resolution: Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Grading**

**Chair Rowland:** The first item is titled "Faculty Senate COVID-19 Resolutions, Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory, whereas due to the impact of COVID-19 on our communities, we live in a time of uncharted experiences and uncertainty for faculty, students, and the University as a whole, and whereas assessment of learning outcomes for improvised remote delivery presents challenges for both students and faculty while maintaining academic integrity and whereas respecting the students, respecting that students have made substantial efforts and financial investments to enroll in our courses and need to be courses, but that have legitimate concerns about the impact of remote learning on their grades and academic success, and whereas in this extraordinary situation, we need to provide students with additional flexibility and options that will allow them to make academic progress and adjust to new learning environments. And we resolve that students will be permitted to change the grading basis from a quality grade to satisfactory/unsatisfactory up until the last day of class of spring 2020 for any number of their classes. These changes should be made in consultation with the student's academic advisor or instructor to consider academic and financial implications."

Oh, I'm sorry. Just because my script is older, I apologize. I'll reread that passage. "Be it resolved that students will be permitted to change, if they opt to, the grading basis from a quality grade to satisfactory/unsatisfactory up until the last day of class of spring 2020 for any number of their classes, including general education courses. These changes should be made in consultation with the student's academic advisor or instructor to consider academic and financial implications. Be it resolved, no student will have their academic standing penalized, for example, placed on academic warning or suspension after the spring 2020 semester."

Oh, Dawn Blasko, executive director, has mentioned something very important that I neglected in the transition between meetings. Just as we all signed into the previous meeting in order to maintain that we have a quorum, please everyone go into the “Ask a Question” box in Mediasite and enter your name so
that you can be counted in attendance in the special meeting. So, give everybody a moment to discuss that or to enter their name.

Our parliamentarian, Keith Shapiro, just reminded me and this will impact how our discussion goes. In terms of our approach and the way that we deal with resolutions is that these items are not binding resolutions, so no one is bound to anything. They can be statements of, in this case, obviously resolved. They can be aspirational in nature.

OK. Senator Mary Beth Williams, who is coincidentally but I'm not sure it's related, chair of curricular affairs, is going to first speak, and then we'll take questions over Mediasite and discuss this matter. Mary Beth.

**Mary Beth Williams, Science-Eberly College:** Yep. Thank you, Nicholas. So, we bring forward this resolution to support the needs of our students, and I want to make two clarifications for the resolution for everyone to understand. We've been getting lots of feedback and first of all, this would be an opportunity for students to opt in. It would not be automatic for all students. Students would need to consult with their academic advisors and instructors on whether this is a course of action that they could pursue. And second of all, this resolution refers to a relaxation in Faculty Senate policies on grading. It would require that ACUE and the academic response teams of the task force take this up for implementation. For example, to consider the impacts or entrance to major and accreditation for a number of our programs. And so, we would have to rely on our colleagues elsewhere to take up those policies. This resolution refers to relaxing Faculty Senate policies to benefit our students.

**Chair Rowland:** OK. Thank you, Mary Beth. We can open up this resolution-- In that case, the resolution has been presented, and we can accept discussion on this item.

**Dawn Blasko, Executive Director:** David Han would like to point out that the last line of the resolution could imply that no student is put on warning after the spring 2020. That is, it's forever-- for example, infinitum.

**Chair Rowland:** OK, noted. Thank you, David.

**Diego Santos, Student Senator:** From the student caucus, there was a consensus about an opt in for satisfactory, unsatisfactory grades for certain classes that students pick and choose. This allows the students to decide which classes will impact their GPA. Some classes have been easier to transition online than others. This would also allow for students who have already been doing well in a class to receive a grade for their hard work. Students who may need a grade for certain entrance to major scholarship or further educational programs can still meet specific requirements.

The choice of unsatisfactory, satisfactory grades will benefit all students. This policy would help students who have struggled with transition to online due to a number of difficult circumstances, nature of the course, connectivity, taking care of family, the sick at home, having to work a job, et cetera. Advisors will need to be utilized to help students figure out which classes absolutely need a grade, instead of just getting credit if satisfactory needs are met. We also believe that a late drop deadline should be extended for two weeks so that students can have time to make an informed decision about their education during this remote learning period.
Chair Rowland: Is Mary Beth still on? Mary Beth, do you have any response to the comment? It appears not. Which is fine. And do we have additional questions or comments?

Anna Butler, Senate Office Staff: Yes, we do. From Ann Taylor, current policy includes subject to relations of the college, and the limits of the degree program in which the candidates--

Mary Beth Williams: Yeah, I'm sorry about the delay there. I can respond to the late drop deadline. We investigated a possible change in the late drop deadline because we understand it's important to students. However, that deadline is set by federal financial aid requirements, and we are unable to move that one.

Anna Butler: All right, so back to Ann Taylor.

Chair Rowland: Please, thank you.

Anna Butler: Current policy includes subject to relations of the college and the limits of the degree program in which the candidates enrolled. This is important for ABET programs, among others. I suggest we incorporate that language here.

Chair Rowland: OK, thank you, Anna.

Anna Butler: And next, David Smith. This will provide a good option for helping students complete this semester, and not face potential negative impact on their progress towards degree. That being said, it has many implications that need to be carefully considered. It will have direct impact on the academic advising community. As the details of this are sorted out, I would ask that the representatives of the advising community are at the table to sort out those details.

Chair Rowland: OK. Thank you, David.

Anna Butler: And for Mary Pierce. Is satisfactory a C or higher for major courses, and a D or higher for Gen Ed classes? Or is it the same, regardless? Some majors require a C or higher for major courses, but D is technically passing.

Chair Rowland: Should we wait for Mary Beth on this?

Anna Butler: Do you want me to read it again?

Mary Beth Williams: There's going to be a big delay again. Senate policy is that satisfactory is C or better.

Anna Butler: This one is from Nathan Allerheiligen. I don't agree with the soft language of made in consultation with. This doesn't provide a real check to students who might wish to switch up, and until the last moment, just see if they can get the grade they like. While I think there is some need for student choice, there is also a need for propriety among all of students. We should reward those students who take this as an opportunity to get a passing grade without a passing effort.

Chair Rowland: OK, noted.
Anna Butler: From Cindy Simmons. I ask those who teach in the College of Communications to email thoughts on teaching online, and pass/fail grading. Some of their comments included this from Shayam Sundar. I think switching to unsatisfactory-satisfactory grading option will immediately demotivate our students and undermine the learning objectives of the courses this semester. It would also be unfair to students who have been working hard to do well in their courses. It will send the wrong signal that we are going through the motions to finish out the semester, and not really giving our students a quality education for which they have paid, and to which they are entitled.

Chair Rowland: OK, very good. Thank you.

Paula Brown, Senate Office Staff: There are several comments from that same poster that told different people in their unit, if you want them all read.

Anna Butler: People that may not be senators.

Paula Brown: They're not senators.

Chair Rowland: Are there questions beyond that?

Anna Butler: For these people, yes. Do you want me to ask them?

Chair Rowland: No, I meant, questions that have been asked questions beyond.

Anna Butler: Oh, questions beyond that.

Chair Rowland: Cut and paste the questions that were there.

Anna Butler: There is one here from Chelsea Wood.

Chair Rowland: Let's hear it, please.

Anna Butler: This vote is being watched and followed by an unprecedented amount of students via Group Me and other systems, demonstrating the importance of supporting this resolution. I stand in full support on behalf of the students in the College of Education at UP.

Anna Butler: Not really a question.

Dawn Blasko: 32 more questions.

Anna Butler: I'm just trying to read through them to see if there's any duplicates.

Anna Butler: No, it's the same thing.

Dawn Blasko: Yeah.

Anna Butler: From Michael Bérubé. I think this is self-evidently the right thing to do, and vastly superior to the policies at other institutions that offer pass/fail options. Pass/fail includes D as passes, which would violate the policies that require students to earn a C or better in some classes. Satisfactory-
unsatisfactory, includes only A's, B's, and C's. That would clear the bar for Gen Ed classes and prerequisites.

**Anna Butler:** And from Steven Snyder at Berks, in the last paragraph, try as a result of the spring 2020 semester in the last paragraph for the previous comment.

**Chair Rowland:** Yeah, from David Han. Correct?

**Anna Butler:** Yes.

**Chair Rowland:** OK, thank you, Steve.

**Anna Butler:** Yes. From Jonathan Matthews. Is satisfactory equivalent to C or higher? I have not seen the language regarding the meaning of satisfactory. I think we covered that. And from David Smith. Warning is an important mechanism for prompting intervention to support students. It would be useful to consider this a bit further. I absolutely agree about not putting students into a suspension status as a result of this semester. And there's a minor text change from Nicholas Piatt. I would change the first "for" to "from" in the second whereas statement so it would become assessment of learning outcomes from.

**Chair Rowland:** OK, thank you, Nick.

**Anna Butler:** And from Martha Strickland, needs a clarification. If passed, will all campuses need to follow this? Or will campus administrators and registrars decide to change or not follow this?

**Chair Rowland:** Just to clarify on that question, and I think it's important at this juncture to make this [INAUDIBLE] clear to everyone that is listening to this discussion. This is not the equivalent of an advisory and consultation report. None of this will be binding in any way. This is, in my mind, a reflection of an attempt to have an earnest discussion about how to move forward. And so, to me, in somewhat, this is the commitment to investigate the extent to which this policy related to satisfactory and unsatisfactory is viable at this institution.

So, we're more, in my mind, exploring this issue. So no campus-- there's nothing that we could do in this moment right now that would make the campus do one thing or another. I just want to make that clear and set that level for everybody because I know that we're on unfamiliar footing today, that things don't seem as familiar as usual. So, this is truly a matter of exploration.

There's nothing that's going to happen in this room that's going to set any course of action into play, other than, I do believe, the attempt to investigate this for further utility, if in fact, it is feasible at Penn State. It's such a complex institution, the extent to which this will be legal or not is based on so many factors that they need to be considered more robustly than the discussion we're having here. Nick, would you like to make a comment?

**Provost Jones:** I appreciate those comments, and I would say if that is true, then I think the temperature among a lot of my staff just probably lowered by several degrees instantaneously because I have about 60 emails in the last 20 minutes, and it's hard to keep up with this, but I think there is real concern. And I think the language there doesn't sort of suggest that this is an intent to investigate. It says it is a resolution, and we recommend doing this, and because it's curricular-related, it looks legislative.
So we are just concerned about them-- I mean, all kudos for thinking about this, and figuring out ways that we can provide-- lower anxiety and provide flexibility, but I think there are a lot of serious concerns about the implementability of it. And if there is just some time to think this through or modify the language to reflect that this is a suggestion, or an intent to investigate, I think that would be a whole lot better.

Chair Rowland: Do you want to comment about the nature of resolution?

Keith Shapiro, College of Arts and Architecture: No, I think it's fairly clear it's aspirational

Chair Rowland: OK. I was just momentarily conferring with Keith Shapiro, the parliamentarian. Just as a reminder, every resolution that has ever come on the floor of the Senate is aspirational in its tone. That is the nature of a resolution, that we would resolve to move in that direction. Is that correct or did I overstate that?

Keith Shapiro: I think you may have overstated it. But I think that the intention of this wasn't to be legislative, otherwise it would've been brought up in new business. So, at this point, it is investigative. It also suggests this is the direction, perhaps, that the Senate wishes to go, and to give some indication to administrators or what the feelings are of the Senate.

Chair Rowland: If that's the case, Keith, are you saying that a faculty member that would support something like this is simply signaling their preference?

Keith Shapiro: Yes. There is no binding. Nothing binding about this, legislatively. It hasn't gone through any of those legislative channels. It's simply a resolution. Past resolutions in the Senate, they have worked this way. Otherwise, it would be a legislative report.

Chair Rowland: So just to reiterate what Keith said, if this were truly legislative in that the changes were being requested, it would have taken the form of a legislative report. Instead, this is an opportunity for the Senate to explore these issues. Is that fair?

Keith Shapiro: Yeah.

Chair Rowland: Thank you, Keith. Are there more questions online? Or Nick, did you want to respond, since this was in the thrust of your discussion?

Provost Jones: I guess I would-- so you made the reference to advisory and consultative. So, I want to understand where this would fit. Would this be a resolution that would be shared with the president? For him to refer to his team administrative team for implementation of all or part of it. Is that what the intent would be?

Chair Rowland: I would not say that that is correct, otherwise we would have taken the form of an advisory consultative report that would include recommendations, which are different from, in this case, the resolution.

Provost Jones: OK.

Chair Rowland: Could you move onto the next comment, then? I know I just asked.
Provost Jones: One more. If this is truly aspirational, I think we're probably OK because we do actually already have a group that is looking at this issue. This is why I was kind of asking about to whom does this go. If this is really a vehicle by which the Senate conveys its aspiration to that group that is looking at it so that group can react and respond, I think that that is what--

Chair Rowland: That would be the most immediately useful outcome of this process.

Provost Jones: Thank you.

Chair Rowland: You are correct. I'm sorry, Anna. Please, go on.

Anna Butler: OK, so this is again from Cynthia Simmons. This is a continuation of what her question was. Katie O'Toole wrote I would love to see us go to a pass/fail type of grading system. It would allow us to focus all our attention on teaching and learning instead of devising new ways to weight assignments. For the core courses I teach, I feel like I will have an excellent sense of which students are prepared to move onto the next level, and which will need remedial work.

For both core and non-core courses, I do not think satisfactory-unsatisfactory system would compromise the academic rigor or integrity of the class in any way. Every class I teach is a production course, and the bottom line is that nobody will be able to produce what would ordinarily be an A work because they would not have access to the tools they need to do so.

So rather than lower the standard for what A work should look like, it makes sense to simply allow students to demonstrate that they have the skills, if not the equipment, to do the job.

Christopher Ritchie: wrote, while satisfactory-unsatisfactory grade might simplify things, having only two grade categories somehow seems unfair to students who have completed some very strong academic work in the first half of the semester, and might be declined or inclined to keep it up. Perhaps, having a third category to recognize that would work.

Unsatisfactory, the student who would have gotten a D or F under normal conditions, satisfactory for those who would normally would be getting a C up to a B, and completion with distinction or something like that for those who would otherwise get a B plus or above. Based on these comments, I think we should be aware that moving to pass/fail grading should not be a one size fits all decision. What would work for lecture style classes might not work for hands on skills class. I think we need to be very careful to protect the Penn State brand in this decision.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you. Is there further discussion online?

Anna Butler: There is. From Lisa Tuning, what would it mean for repeating course GPA? If a student is given an unsatisfactory, what would that mean for them in terms of passing that class?

Chair Rowland: Should we check with Mary Beth?

Mary Beth Williams: [INAUDIBLE] I understand the question. If a student is to repeat a course, and they got an unsatisfactory the first time, can they repeat it? If a student opts in and requests to be graded on satisfactory-unsatisfactory, there is no grade point average impact. There is no quality grade assigned,
and so it does not impact their GPA. But I'm not quite sure what the question was, in terms of repeating classes.

**Chair Rowland:** OK, just some clarification from the parliamentarian, and then I think, soon, we are going to move on in this discussion. According to Robert's Rules, a simple resolution expresses an opinion or a position. Just for sake of clarity. To move this discussion forward, because it is clear, as noted prior, that there are so many complicated matters to deal with in this instance, what I'm going to, I suppose, motion right now that is in the language you're observing here now.

One solution to the issues that we've been talking to would be it resolved that the administration should consider, and then adapt after that-- or in this case, be it resolved that the administration should consider that students be permitted to change, and we'll just make the adaptation at that point. And this would clarify the comments also raised by Provost Jones about the communication gap that appears to exist between Senate language about resolution, and what it would, in a more, I guess operational sense, imply or action.

So, in this case, we would do that for both of the resolved items. Keith, under circumstances like this, where we are in such unorthodox territory that the chair is making a motion to change the resolution in a special meeting, do you have any idea what we should do? I've made a motion. Judy has seconded it. Does that mean that it is now time for us to vote?

**Keith Shapiro:** Yes.

**Chair Rowland:** OK.

**Keith Shapiro:** If you're making an amendment to change--

**Chair Rowland:** Yes. Oh, I'm sorry. I made a motion to amend. So, do we need to vote on the motion to amend?

**Keith Shapiro:** You need to-- [INAUDIBLE] we need to have a discussion, and then after the discussion is completed, we can vote on that.

**Chair Rowland:** OK. Anna, this is probably going to get complicated because of Media Site, but we are going to take a brief moment now, and wait for questions associated with the motion to amend this resolution to include language that is up on the board now, suggesting be it resolved that the administration should consider that students be permitted to change, and so on. And be it resolved that the administration should consider that no student will have their academic standing penalized, and so on.

So, we'll wait for questions about that amendment, and if we see none, we will move to vote on that amendment. Do we know what our lag time is right now, roughly? I just don't want to give it-- I don't want to shut anybody out if they have concerns about this amendment. I don't think that it's controversial, but I don't know that everyone would agree. In that case, can we prepare a vote for a Poll Everywhere?

**Anna Butler:** What are we voting on? The amendment?

**Chair Rowland:** Yes, that's correct. Anna, let me know when the vote's ready, and I'll walk everyone through it.
Anna Butler: OK, I have the amendment voting going on right now.

Chair Rowland: Very good. So just to be clear, then, with everyone that's online right now, we are voting on the motion to amend the resolution. Voting in favor is a vote in favor of the change. That is the amendment. A vote against is a vote against the amendment or the change.

Anna Butler: I would say that's sufficient. 103 accept and seven reject.

Chair Rowland: Very good. In that case, we will conclude discussion on this item, and we will now move to the vote on this item, as it has been amended. In that case, in order to accept this resolution and signal from the Senate to the administration, please press A. To reject this resolution, please press B.

For those of us that are waiting right now, of course, for the next resolution, I would just like to make clear my intention that I will motion, again, to make the same clarification in the next resolution as soon as we open it up for discussion.

Anna Butler: OK, on Poll Everyone, I have 97 accept, and 23 reject.

Chair Rowland: Very good. The motion passes.

**COVID-19 RESOLUTION: SRTE**

Chair Rowland: We move onto the second and final item of our special session. This is the second resolution that was brought forward today. I'll just read it for sake of clarity for those of you that may not be able to see the board. This is the resolution on SRTE. Whereas the first piece reads the same as the last.

Due to the impact of COVID 19 on our communities, we live in a time of uncharted experience and uncertain for faculty, students, and University as a whole, and whereas open ended responses and ratings should be evaluated as a way to learn from this exceptional set of circumstances. They should not be used in any punitive way that could impact promotion, tenure, renewals, or graduate instruction continuances, and whereas in this extraordinary situation, we need to provide faculty and instructors with significant grace as they traverse uncharted online teaching situations, adjust to new expectations, and be agile to student situations and hardships.

And whereas would commend the Penn State faculty and instructors efforts to provide our student body at 24 campuses across the Commonwealth with continued rigorous educational opportunities in their courses with no break in continuity, and whereas their willingness to quickly adjust to these new circumstances has taken significant effort and time to use the SRTE in any way, other than informative would be irresponsible.

Be it resolved that spring 2020 SRTEs be used only as formative, and not summative feedback for both graduate instructors and faculty at all ranks and titles. I will again make the motion to adapt the resolution at the bottom, where it be resolved. In this case, we'll change the language to that the administration should consider that spring SRTEs be used only as-- yes, there you go. And you put it in bold. This is a good first day. Thank you very much.

Keith Shapiro: Second.
Chair Rowland: There's a second on the floor. Let's wait just a brief moment for discussion about this amendment that should come through the Ask a Question Box on Media Site.

Anna Butler: I have a question from Ira Saltz.

Chair Rowland: Yes.

Anna Butler: The problem with the current proposal is that even if we intend the SRTEs to be formative, once an administrator sees the comments, they can use them in a punitive way, if they choose. I propose instead that SRTEs be administered, but only the faculty member sees the results and comments. No administrators will be given access to faculty SRTEs this semester.

Chair Rowland: Yeah, we can revisit that item, or conceivably, since it now indicates that the administration should consider that they only be used as formative, that could be part of the discussion.

Keith Shapiro: So, I think right now we're only discussing just that amendment.

Chair Rowland: Yeah, right now, we're only discussing the amendment. So that is important feedback, though, and we can take that back to the appropriate body. Is there another question about the amendment?

Anna Butler: No.

Chair Rowland: OK, Nick.

Provost Jones: Are we doing one amendment at a time, or are we making amendments, and then talking about them?

Keith Shapiro: Just this one right now.

Chair Rowland: OK, I guess in a technical sense, we need to then vote on this if we don't see questions. Were there any questions that seemed to be about the amendment?

Anna Butler: No.

Chair Rowland: OK, in that case, could you please prepare another vote that probably looks very similar to the last one about the amendment? To vote in favor of this amendment to our resolution, please press A. Anna, are you setting it up, or do we need to set it up here?

Anna Butler: I am setting this up right now.

Chair Rowland: OK, very good. So in that case, to reiterate, sorry for the pause. Please press A to accept the amendment, and please press B to reject the amendment. Also as I reflect on the matter of the previous comment that was brought up by our Senator Ira Saltz, it occurs to me in looking at the amendment, in combination with the resolution itself, that what he suggests is one way that the administration could implement this out of an array of options. I don't think that it's off the table, and so I can assure you that that will be thought through at the appropriate time.
Anna Butler: OK, I just started the polling for the amendment.

Chair Rowland: Thank you.

Anna Butler: And I think that's sufficient.

Chair Rowland: Very good. The motion passes. The amendment will be accepted. Now, if there are questions about the amended—questions or comments about the amended resolution, please let them be known now.

Keith Shapiro: No, about the resolution itself.

Chair Rowland: Oh, resolution itself. Thank you. Thank you, Keith. Nick, yes, please. Of course.

Provost Jones: Just a friendly suggestion. In the last whereas, I think the message comes across if it ends after it's taken significant effort and time to use the SRTEs, period. The piece about in any other way other than informative would be irresponsible feels quite--

Keith Shapiro: It's in the resolution zone.

Provost Jones: I think the message is communicated with the first half of that sentence.

Chair Rowland: It's very good. In that case, could you please strike through that piece? It is my opinion at this moment that based on Provost Jones's logic in this recommendation, this is merely editorial as to follow the intent and structure. And so I think we can move--

Provost Jones: Actually, I think it needs to go back to the and after time for it to be grammatically--yeah, right there. I'm not doing this piecemeal, but yeah.

Chair Rowland: That makes sense. Very good. Have additional questions come in, Anna?

Anna Butler: Yes, from Alan Larson. It has only ever been responsible to use SRTEs as formative, rather than evaluative.

Chair Rowland: OK, noted.

Anna Butler: From Chris Byron. How can we tell if any administrator privately gives SRTE weight? Perhaps, we should not give the SRTE at all. It was just scooped by a great idea.

Chair Rowland: I'm not sure I understand the second part of that question about scooping, but I do think that as noted about the previous comment from Senator Ira Saltz, that is one way that the administration would consider this resolution.

Anna Butler: From Mark Stephens. I would propose that should consider is soft. I would suggest consider with a plan for positive action is the direction we want to head.

Chair Rowland: Yeah, Senator Stephens, thank you very much for that comment. I think that as this is a resolution and it is nonbinding, I think that I can tell you right now that if we leave the language the
same, it will effectively be considered, as we will definitely bring this to the proper body at the proper time. So, in spirit, it will for sure be as is recommended.

**Anna Butler:** From James Fairbank. I concur strongly with my colleague who recommended SRTEs be provided only at the faculty. Given the circumstances, I view that as a superior alternative to the amended proposal. And that's all I have right now.

**Chair Rowland:** In that case, by the lack of comments, I do believe it is time to vote on this resolution. So, Anna, could you please prepare a vote, and we will move forward.

**Anna Butler:** And I think 106 accept and 9 reject.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. The motion passes, and the resolution will be sent to the appropriate body. In reflecting on the process that we've all just gone through, these are uncharted times where we are moving in new directions. And in fact, to quote Nick Jones, our single greatest commenter today, it seems in terms of count and quality, Nick said to us-- and I think that this moment reflects it very clearly-- that shared governance and moments that are so extraordinary as this don't look like everyday life.

This was not what we're always accustomed to, and does not reflect our business as usual, but sometimes you gotta do what you gotta do. And apparently, this was it. So, I'm proud that we did. May I have a motion to adjourn?

Keith Shapiro: Second.

**Chair Rowland:** It has been moved and seconded on the floor. I am going to, in my mind, imagine that everyone who is joining us remotely is in love with this idea, and is saying loudly, aye. Thank you very much, everyone. Take care.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>