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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, April 28, 2020, at 1:00 p.m. via Zoom Webinar, with Nicholas Rowland, Chair, presiding.

**Chair Rowland, Penn State Altoona:** It is April 28, 2020, and the University Faculty Senate is now in session.

The last time we met, a few days after we returned from spring break, which seems like a year ago, we held our first meeting completely on Mediasite. Now only a month later, that is no longer an option for us, so we're gathering together here today on Zoom. Of course, this has some consequences for how we will discharge the business of the Senate today.

First, there is the matter of tallying attendance. I can see that the chat bubble is already being populated, which is good. Senators that are online using Zoom, please enter your name and unit into the chat feature at the bottom of your screen. I know that a bunch of folks have done that already. But if you haven't, please do that now. For those of you calling in, who, of course, cannot use this chat feature, please email Dawn Blasko, alerting her to your attendance at dgb6@psu.edu. That's dgb6, so that we can count you among the attending.

Second, all of our voting today will need to be online, and we will use our traditional means of online voting-- namely, the polleverywhere.com feature. There is a link to this site on the home page of the Senate website. For those of you online now, log into that system so that you are ready to vote. So, when you get the chance, please do that as soon as you can.

It is a little different for those you who are calling in. Please go to the Senate website by whatever means are available to you and try your best to log in to polleverywhere.com so that you may vote with us today. All voting will be run as usual. However-- and this is just a slight modest change to business as usual-- the votes will not be revealed until we conclude with voting on all items that will be voted upon.

So, to repeat, the tally of votes on each report will only be revealed once we have voted on all items that we will vote on today. Suspenseful, I know. Third, there's also the minor matter of parliamentary procedure, which we will follow, of course, in earnest. And that is that before we vote, as with every vote, we will need both a motion and a second. We usually do that as a group with a voice motion and a voice second, but today, of course, in a webinar, we simply cannot follow our traditional path.

So, joining me on the Webinar our secretary, Judy Ozment, and our Parliamentarian, Keith Shapiro, who will respectively be doing all of our motioning and all of our seconding for the Senate today. This also has the added benefit, along with our voting procedure, of speeding the meeting along today.

Fourth, in terms of asking questions, this is probably going to be the biggest transition for us as we shift, because we're such a deliberative body. When it comes to asking questions today, we will, quite unsurprisingly, use the Q&A function on Zoom. This is at the bottom of your screen. So, if you have a question, then you will raise it there in the Q&A function at the bottom portion of your screen. If you are calling in and, therefore, do not have access to this function, unfortunately, please note that you will not be able to ask questions in this meeting today, unless you enter Zoom by some other means and telephone.
Also, please note that we have a long agenda today, so not every question-- that's important to say-- not every question will be able to be asked on the proverbial floor of the Senate. However, we record all the questions, even those for the president and the provost. And we will see to it that those in need of answers get answers by some other means. Please note, if you wish to ask a question, then just like as if we were gathering on the floor of the Senate, you must enter your name and your unit into the Q&A feature near the bottom of the screen.

Just in terms of procedure today, questions will be gathered by Chair-Elect Beth Seymour, who will also read those questions into the record. Again, not every question can be read, but if you wish to have an answer to your questions, please make sure that you enter your name and your unit in the Q&A feature at the bottom of the screen. Otherwise, of course, we'd have no idea who to contact.

Lastly, please know that this meeting, like all Senate plenary sessions, is being recorded. I think we're contractually obligated by Zoom to mention that when we record a meeting like this. So, taking a step back and summarizing:

If you haven't already, enter your name and your unit in the chat feature, so we can amass our attendance record. Next, if you haven't already done so, log into Poll Everywhere in order to vote today. And next, if you have any questions, make sure you enter your name and your unit into the Q&A feature when you do.

Now before we officially start, I simply must say, thank you, Senators. It's been an honor holding this meeting, and I am humbled that in the midst of a pandemic, we still managed to amass an impressive agenda, replete with significant Legislative and Advisory/Consultative reports, which will all be brought to a vote days before graduation and more than a month after we all, in stride, transitioned to a remote learning environment.

I personally have never been more proud of the University Faculty Senators. It is a vibrancy and resolve implicit in your actions, and for that matter, every faculty member at Penn State, every student at Penn State, and every employee, too, for making the monumental efforts necessary-- and the necessary sacrifices that have been required of us over the past month. There are simply no words available to express my sincere thank you for all that you've done for the institution.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Rowland: And so, with that said, let us discharge the business of the Senate today. Item A, minutes of the preceding meeting, or shall I say meetings. The March 17, 2020, Senate records providing full transcriptions of the proceedings of the plenary meeting and the special session was sent to the University archives and are posted on the Faculty Senate website. If there are any corrections or additions to these minutes, please send them to Dawn Blasko at her email, dgb6, that's dgb6, at your earliest convenience.

Now may I hear a motion to tentatively accept both sets of minutes as posted, and may I have a second?

Judy Ozment, Penn State Abington: So, Moved.

Keith Shapiro, College of Arts and Architecture: Second.
Chair Rowland: The motion carries. The minutes are tentatively accepted.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report

Next item B, Communications to the Senate-- the Senate Curriculum Report of April 7, 2020, is posted on the University Faculty Senate website.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Rowland: Moving on, Item C, Report of Senate Council-- minutes from the April 7, 2020, Senate Council meeting can be found at the end of your Agenda. Included in the minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President on that same day.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Rowland: Because of the length of this meeting today and the added complexity of running it over our beloved Zoom, I will refrain from lengthy remarks and simply state that with a full heart and whatever clarity of mind I have left after the long days and sleepless nights of the last past month, thank you. Thank you, all the faculty members, all of our Faculty Senators, every student, every employee for this Herculean lift that has been required of us. For my small part in the scheme of things, it has been an honor to serve you this past year on our Faculty Senate. I'm very proud of all of this good work.

OK, back to business. First, each year the Senate Committee on Student Life recognizes outstanding undergraduates, students with John White Fellowships. I am now pleased to invite Tim Robicheaux-- he is chair of our Senate Committee on Student Life-- to introduce our John White Fellowship recipients for 2020. Tim, as you join us, please unmute. You know, I betcha "unmute" is going to be the word of the year for 2020, given so much of us are on Zoom. So yeah, please, Tim, unmute, and take over on the John White recipients, please.

Recognition of John White Graduate Fellowship Recipients

Tim Robicheaux, College of the Liberal Arts: Greetings. Thanks, Nicholas. So as Nicholas said, each year, the Senate Committee on Student Life recognizes outstanding undergraduate students who are graduating summa cum laude and who plan to enroll in a graduate study. The John White Graduate Fellowship is one of the oldest continuing fellowships at Penn State.

The award was established in 1902 by James Gilbert White to honor his father, Reverend John W. White, of Milroy, Pennsylvania. Joining me on this year's review committee were Jennifer Nesbitt, Associate Professor of English at Penn State York, and Laura McKinney, president of the University Park Undergraduate Association and, like, 18 other roles that she has.

We began with 42 applicants. We whittled that down to 11 interviews. To say they were impressive is an understatement. We were deliberate in interviewing students from multiple campus locations. We intended to award four fellowships and made the tough decisions on the top four going to the last interview. But that interview led to a change in plans, so we're pleased to recognize five awardees this year.
Daniel Zahn, a Schreyer honor student, will graduate with a Bachelor of Arts in English and in Philosophy. As if those are not enough, he will also receive a Bachelor of Arts in Communications, Arts, and Sciences, not to mention his five minors in French, History, Rhetoric, Jewish Studies, and Linguistics. During our interview, Daniel admitted that he is not a big fan of Happy Valley's weather.

Fortunately for him, he will get some reprieve as he earns his law degree at the usually sunny Stanford Law School. He hopes to pursue a career in legal academia, art appellate legislation-- litigation to ensure civil and individual rights. Defending these rights has long been a passion of his.

Daniel completed internships at the office of the Lehigh County District Attorney and at the Foundation for Individual Rights and Education. He played a key role in writing legislation recently passed by the University Park Undergraduate Association, adopting language asserting the association's commitment to academic freedom and free speech for students. Daniel worked in two research laboratories at Penn State. He studied in Benin, in West Africa, as part of an embedded course in Linguistics, and he completed intensive French language courses at the Center for Applied Linguistics in France.

Daniel's campus activities are too numerous to fully list, but he was involved in Penn State Hello, the Penn State Mock Trial Association, and UP Way. He needed a bit more to do, so he is also a developmental director at Future Opportunities Reached by Mentorship Consulting, a nonprofit agency. Daniel was enthusiastic about collaboration between student organizations at Penn State, and I think he'll secretly miss Pennsylvania winters.

Maria Badanova is a Schreyer honor student and a paternal fellow. She will graduate with two Bachelors of Arts Degrees in Psychology with honors and in Russian. She will serve as a student marshal for the Department of Slavic and German languages and Literature for the College of the Liberal Arts. In addition to her role as a Research Assistant in Dr. Michelle Diaz's Language and Aging Lab, Maria also had research opportunities in Poland and in Germany across two consecutive summers.

Her work in Poland was supported by an NSF grant. These study abroad opportunities led to Maria's plan to earn a Doctorate in Cognitive Science at the esteemed Max Planck School of Cognition in Berlin, Germany. During her first year of graduate school, Maria will complete three lab rotations with three cognitive science researchers before choosing an adviser for the remainder of her graduate education.

While she would narrow her research focus in graduate school, she is particularly interested in the intersection of aging and linguistics. During our interview, Maria expressed gratitude for the Globe Special Living option, where she supervised the floor of residents from over 20 different countries. She served as a liaison between that community and the Schreyer honors community.

Maria was involved in several student organizations while at Penn State, including service as the Vice President of Penn State Students in Russian, and she was a volunteer translator at Mount Nittany Residences. In her spare time, she was also a translator and editor of a published book, a collection of Russian prose and poetry. Maria has enjoyed attending the many events at the Eisenhower Center for the Performing Arts, and even presented our committee with an idea for next year, evaluating affordable student access to unsold tickets for each event.

Our next student, Gwen Oliver, is a Schreyer honor student, is graduating with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology with a minor in Statistics. We might, one day, have an opportunity to thank Gwen for preventing the next pandemic. As the founding member and president of
Vaccinate America, she has worked to increase community awareness of vaccines and presented local parent-teacher organization meetings among others. She was accepted to graduate study at several prestigious universities and has decided that she will earn her Master's in Public Health at Yale University, where she hopes to develop statistical, mathematical, and disease transmission models that can inform public health efforts.

Gwen served as an undergraduate researcher in the Cameron Lab at Penn State. Her research on mitochondrial DNA templates led to a poster that won first place for original research at the UNBC 20th Undergraduate Research Symposium in Chemical and Biological Sciences. Sarah was a Summer ORISE Fellow at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, an officer in Science Lion Pride, and learning assistance for two different biology courses.

In our interview, Gwen endorsed our general education goals of integration, noting that knowledge of statistics can improve understanding across all disciplines. We also want to share that she heavily praised Penn State's advisers for assisting in her success.

Sarah McClure was our final interviewee for the fellowship. When the interview ended, Jennifer and I simultaneously exclaimed, wow, and knew our plans for four awardees became more difficult. Sarah will receive a Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering with Minors in Physics and Math. She will attend the University of California Berkeley to obtain her Doctorate in Computer Science with an emphasis on computer networks. She hopes to--and this is a quote--expand the horizons of usability, efficiency, and versatility in hyperscale network architecture.

So, Nicholas will explain to us what this means later, but all I know is it sounds exceptional. Sarah serves as president of the Association of Women in Computing and was the captain of the THON Technology Committee. She played an integral role in all the behind the scenes technology for THON Weekend. Sarah was part of the Penn State Research Group studying autonomy and perception in robotic vehicles as part of the Applied Research Laboratory.

She has had multiple summer internships working with Microsoft, and she is enthusiastic about expanding representation of women in computer science. As part of this effort, she has worked with the Girls Who Code program. She credited her willingness to say yes to the many opportunities at Penn State for her inspiring success, and she encourages all students to be as active as possible to find their own communities within the universe.

Finally, we recognize Yiqing Wang. He will graduate with a Bachelor of Science in Mathematics and another in Economics. He will be attending graduate school in the fall to earn a Master's Degree in Data Science. His long-term goals are to open his own company to provide business analysis for small and local businesses. In his words, he wants to help such businesses to survive and to prosper.

He has worked as an audit and assurance intern for Deloitte China in Shanghai. He has also received a Northern Hemisphere Summer Research Scholarship, which I learned sends people to the southern hemisphere to study at the University of Auckland. I also want to recognize Ian as someone who would be the ideal alumnus spokesperson for our One Penn State Initiative.

He is a product of Penn State's 2+2 program. His first two years as a Penn State student on the Behrend campus, and his final two years were University Park. For much of our interview, he expressed his appreciation for that opportunity. He currently serves as a transition leader for Link UP, where he helps
to guide students from commonwealth campuses in their decisions on whether to transfer to UP or to remain at their campus locations.

He credited his professors at Behrend for their accessibility and the availability of organizations at University Park. He likened Penn State to a family that happened to be spread across campus—across campuses across the state and believes that continuing to strengthen the connection between these campuses will benefit all students.

If anyone needs to be sold on this idea, give Ian five minutes of your time, and I guarantee you will. I know if we were in Kern, everyone would be joining me in applause. All of the nominees were a stellar group, and it was an honor to meet them and to award these fellowships. Thank you.

Chair Rowland: Thank you so much, Tim. and, of course, to every member of Student Life for all the good work there. That's an impressive array of students. Fantastic.

Next, we move to present—well, kind of—certificates of service. I'd like to offer a special recognition to a small group of elected Faculty Senators who are leaving the Senate with distinguished records of service. They include Janet Hughes of the University Libraries, Senator for four years, acting as chair and vice chair of the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Committee. Michelle Duffy, HHD, Senator for eight years, chair of Curricular Affairs and Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid (ARSSA) Committees.

Michael Bérubé, Liberal Arts, Senator for eight years, who sat on the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, was chair of Faculty Affairs, and, of course, acted as our chair. Joyce Furfaro, Liberal Arts, Senator for seven years, acting as vice chair for Education for three of those years. Kathryn Jablakow, Great Valley, Senator for eight years, acted as a Senate Council member for three of those eight. And lastly, William Butler, Dickinson Law, Senator for 12 consecutive years, chairing Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology for two of those years.

Please note, as the election results from units continue, we may have more Senators to honor. However, as of right now, this is the list. And so, the next time we find an opportunity to get all together, we should all thank those Senators for their service.

Also, as is the tradition here in our final plenary session, there needs to be an opportunity to recognize this year's leadership, so I'd just like to recognize briefly Beth Seymour, our Chair Elect, but not for long, Judy Ozment, our Secretary, Michael Bérubé our Past Chair, as well as Keith Shapiro, our Parliamentarian, and Roger Egolf, our Senate Historian. Thank you all very much.

Next, I'd like to recognize, just very briefly, leadership on the Senate standing committees. Michele Duffey, Chair of ARSSA; Mary Beth Williams, Chair of Curricular Affairs; Victor Brunsden, Chair of Committee on Committee and Rules; Shelley Stine, Chair of Education; Ann Clements, Chair of Educational Equity and Campus Environment (ECE); Renee Bishop-Pierce, Chair of Faculty Affairs; Ira Saltz, Chair of Faculty Benefits; Brian King, Global Programs; Mark Stephens, Intercollegiate Athletics; Maureen Jones, Intra-University Relations; Roger Egolf, Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology; Andrew Freiberg, Outreach; Greg Shearer, Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity; Timothy Robicheaux, of course, who just spoke, Student Life; and finally, last but not least, Lisa Posey, Chair of University Planning.
So, thank you all so much for your service. In closing, too, I'll just make a quick comment to recognize the Senate office staff. Our beloved and soon to retire Paula Brown, our already retired Patti Hoppes, recent newcomers, Erin Eckley, Sarah Silverman, and Emily Derr and our longstanding supporters, Kadi Corter, Kathe Craig, and Anna Butler, and of course, our Executive Director Dawn Blasko, without all of whom the work of the Senate would be all but impossible. So, thank you for your many and varied contributions to the Senate, many, if not most of which, the average Faculty Senator may never see, let alone praise with thanks. So once more with feeling, thank you Senate staff.

Next, we are going to move on to items E and F. I've asked Eric and Nick if they would tag team their comments to the Senate. And so today the president and the provost will make brief comments together, and then stand for questions. Dr. Barron and Dr. Jones, please unmute, and briefly address the Senate before fielding those questions.

Senators, you can start entering your questions now into the Q&A feature that is at the bottom of your screen. And when you do that, please remember to include your name and your unit, just as though we were on the floor. So, Eric and Nick, the virtual floor, I guess, of the Senate is yours.

**COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY**

**President Barron:** OK, and your interest is sustainability and resilience, and then opening across the board to lots of questions. True?

**Chair Rowland:** Well, I would give you a brief moment for the two of you to tag team and make any comments that you'd like. And then we're going to transition into the two short pieces later.

**President Barron:** OK, all right. Sorry I didn't capture that as well as-- OK, so let me just make sure that I echo Nicholas and how proud I am for the transitions that have occurred over the last month and a half. It has truly been remarkable, and the number of times that faculty stepped up and added considerable creativity-- you know, if I read something in the CDT about doing pottery on Zoom or sit in on a class that's musical theater and all these things that are very challenging, and realize that, no, the faculty are coming up with clever ways in which to do this.

And to hear our students talk about how they've evolved, perhaps with the faculty, and become used to this. And they're getting to the finish line. That's really impressive.

And although it's only anecdotal, I have talked to a couple of people that have more than one child Zooming at more than one University. And they take some effort to tell me that what Penn State is doing is far, far better than anyone else.

I said from the beginning that we had a few objectives here. The first is health and safety of our community, and second was getting students to the finish line, so they could have their degrees and have their credits and be successful in life. And the third was the financial stability of our employees and our institution and community.

I know that you've all contributed mightily to those objectives. And hopefully, you also see that the leadership is working really, really hard to maintain employment so that individuals are not harmed. So even in the case of workers that cannot come to work, to set our pay at a percentage that allows them,
with $600 a week stimulus funding, to have them be whole for all those that are under $60,000 a year, which is a vast majority of them.

So, we're working very hard at this. Obviously, the other thing that you see-- and I truly compliment Nick Jones on this-- is how thoughtful that we have moved through a lot of the issues-- 12 different task force tactical decisions, where we're at a step by step effort to be very thoughtful, not make announcements before we're ready to answer the questions that might be prompted by that. Some people might think that makes us few days slow compared to our peers, but I will tell you that it's certainly a much more effective way, and I have a lot of confidence that questions are being answered.

Myself, taking on a group that is looking at the long term finances, well, think next year in that particular case, in a highly unpredictable environment and to develop scenarios that run from best case to most likely to worst case, which in the educational environment alone, even with some of the retirement things with SERS (State Employee Retirement System) that we're working on is a hole somewhere between $90 and $450 million. It is substantial. Our best guess at $160 million, we have systematically worked through to find the ways for us to manage that. And I have a lot of confidence that if the worst case doesn't happen, this is an institution that will manage it and will manage it well.

And then, finally, what I call sort of the light at the end of the tunnel, the three groups that are focused on bringing the workforce back and bringing the students back in a way that follows health issues and health policy and safety, I think, is an important part, because in many ways, reopening is harder than flipping a switch to remote when we have a continuing pandemic.

But I have nothing but pride for what the Penn State family has been doing. We have overwhelming support from the Board of Trustees. I brief them every week for an hour. I think that they really have gained a lot of confidence, that this University is moving forward in a very careful and thoughtful way and that we will emerge even stronger.

That seems like a little bit of a cliché, but I somehow believe it's actually true that the flexibility, the capability that's there allows us even to tell prospective students that nothing will stop you from getting a Penn State degree, short of a personal tragedy, because Penn State is going to be there to help you.

Anyway, I am happy to answer questions after Nick. But I just wanted to say thanks in that process.

**Chair Rowland:** Thank you, President Barron. Nick?

**COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST**

**Provost Jones:** Thanks, Nicholas, and thanks, Eric, for that lead-in. So, I'll try to be brief. Let me just begin by also thanking Senate and Senate leadership for both the year and, in particular, for the last six to eight weeks of the year, which has really been pretty unusual.

And not that I'm the expert to be able to pass judgment here, but all I would say is I believe that shared governance is alive and well at Penn State and functioning very, very effectively. And you can tell that when we're operating in a very stressed environment, and it still is working.

So, I've been really very excited about that. And I would like to say that I think, as we've had to move very, very quickly over the last weeks to make all of the adjustments that were necessary in this new
environment, I think the administration at the University working with the University Faculty Senate, we found ourselves in a position where we were cutting corners in order to get things done, but we weren't cutting principles. And I think that has really served us very well. So, all accolades to the Senate and the spirit of shared governance.

As Eric said, we've been busily focusing on the many, many issues that arise in a typical day. It's structured mainly around these 12 task groups. Eric mentioned three new ones that are future-focused, which is-- it's very exciting to have those in place and be thinking that there is an end ahead, maybe not in sight, but ahead. Nonetheless, then, it's great to be bringing good minds to help us think that through.

The 12 that we've been really depending on for the past eight weeks-- and I'll just read them very, very quickly. These are all co-led by folks who've done really amazing work in addressing the many, many challenges that we have faced. We have a communications team. We have one focused on campus health preparedness and response, one for international students, one for emergency response, one for community relations and engagement, one, of course, focused on course delivery and enrollment management, housing and accommodation for students on campus primarily, business continuity, research, events and athletics, and academic matters, the latter one co-led by Kathy Bieschke and Yvonne Gaudelius.

And that group, that last group probably is the one that has, over the past eight weeks, had the most interactions with folks on the Senate as we've worked through many, many policies and considerations and made the adjustments necessary in order to support our faculty and their needs moving forward.

Many examples I could give, but probably most notable is the extension of the probationary period by a year without questions being asked and without really formally having to request it, just to acknowledge that that is intent. I think that was a strong joint statement made very early about not only the importance of that process remaining robust, but also that the flexibility that we need to afford it in these difficult times.

So that's probably-- I know there are many questions. Most of you will have been seeing the outcomes of a lot of the effort of these task groups and the various other efforts that are under way. I should mention, also, just one other group that Damon Sims and I charged a week and a bit ago, about 10 days ago. And that is-- I think you're all aware that we should be getting $55 million from the federal government, half of which is to support students and half of which is to support our employees.

We are being very careful about how we navigate this, because if you've been watching the news, you'll see there's a little bit of interesting behavior going on with the Department of Education and in articulating its expectations to some of our sister institutions. But we have a group that has put together thinking about the 27 and 1/2 million dollars that is to support students and how we will most effectively distribute those support dollars to students who have needs and burdens associated with the impact of the coronavirus. So that group we gave a very short runway to operate, and they will most likely be making their recommendations as to procedures and protocols, if-- but before the end of this week. So, we will be ready to disperse those funds when they arrive.

So that's probably a good place for me to stop, and I'm happy just to go to the Q's, and hopefully we have some good A's to go along with them.
Chair Rowland: All right, thank you, Eric. Thank you, Nick. We very much appreciate that. I'm going to give Beth just a moment to put together some of the questions, and she will be responsible for reading them out. I'd like to start with one that, in fact, I mentioned to you both earlier today.

So, here's the question. This is from a faculty member, Dr. Eleanor M Brown, School of Law, School of International Affairs.

"The CARES Act, passed by Congress in response to COVID-19, provides an impertinent part that with respect to 401(k) and 403(b) plans, the 10% early withdrawal tax penalty for distributions is waived up to $100,000 for corona-related health-- corona-related purposes. I was previously employed as a law professor at George Washington University. I received clear guidance from George Washington as to the University's policy on such withdraws. I have received no such guidance from Penn State.

I contacted TIAA and requested a withdrawal, which I was told had been authorized by Penn State. The next day, TIAA contacted me to indicate that the transaction had been canceled since the withdraw had not been authorized by Penn State. I have pursued every possible avenue in an effort to get this question answered, including correspondence with Ask HR, the University's HR quick response portal, the HR advisor in my own department, and the head of HR for the whole University.

I have not been able to get a response from these channels. My concern is that the opportunity for withdrawal with reduced tax penalty is entirely the result of congressional benevolence. It could change at any time, at which point we would no longer have the opportunity. By way of further background--" I have-- this is part of the second part, I suppose-- "further background, I've been reading the reports recently released by several universities, the latest being Johns Hopkins. A clear pattern is emerging.

To preserve cash in a time of profound economic uncertainty, universities are reducing their contributions to retirement accounts. This may have implications for the question that I had raised first."

So, they have not seen anything for Penn State. Do you have a sense of those two questions, please?

Provost Jones: Perhaps, Eric, do you want to take the second one about the retirement contributions? I can take the first.

President Barron: OK, so we have not followed that suit of stopping paying the retirement benefits, and we are operating on what we think is the-- our best guess of what our finances will be like and our enrollment will be like for the fall. And we've set up a way at which we can manage those shortfalls. A part of it will include-- --borrowing. I can't actually shut off a phone, even when I answer it. It just keeps going. So, I don't know why that is, but anyway, so we are operating on a best guess, where we believe we can manage what those shortfalls are like. We've been thoughtful about it, and so unless something really goes south, we don't see that as something that's very likely to happen.

Provost Jones: Yeah, in response to the first question about retirement withdrawals, so Dr. Brown is correct that the federal government has given permission for that to occur. But in order for it to occur, it has to be approved by the institution. And so, this topic, when it was issued, when it was raised three weeks ago, was taken to the Retirement Oversight Committee for consideration.
And they have approved the application of that action to Penn State. So just to read what that means, to be clear, qualified participants are no longer subject to the 10% excise tax applicable to early withdrawal, if the withdrawal is of no more than $100,000.

Further, there's another provision that was approved, which I will read also, just so that I get it correct. Qualified participants with loans already in effect on or after the CARES Act enactment date of March 27 that would otherwise be due between March 27 and December 31, 2020, can suspend their loan repayment obligations for one year akin to the rules involving suspensions for military leaves or unpaid leaves of absence.

The interest continues to accrue during the suspension period and the statutorily allowed maximum of five years for repayment does not include the year of suspension. That also was approved by the Retirement Oversight Committee.

There is a communication that has been drafted, and it's being reviewed and will be distributed broadly to all faculty and staff just to clarify the University's position on that.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you.

President Barron: And is that already communicated to TIAF?

Provost Jones: TIAA-- correct. Yes, I believe that has been communicated, and the information that the response that TIAA provided in that first round was not accurate.

Chair Rowland: OK, thank you.

Provost Jones: Or actually, the part that was not accurate was saying that the University was not allowing it. What would have been accurate is the University has not approved this yet. So, it was--

Chair Rowland: Yes, OK. Thank you very much. I appreciate the clarification. Beth, would you like to select a few questions? We probably have time for another, say, four to five questions.

Beth Seymour: OK, yes. This question from Annie Taylor at Earth and Mineral Sciences. "With students not coming back until at least summer 1, will faculty and staff continue to work remotely until then as well? The last we heard was May 8th, which is a week away."

President Barron: So, I would look at the dates that are being announced as rolling dates that are watching the pandemic. And so, the University would continue to follow. Certainly, we won't be earlier than the governor in terms of stay at home orders. And this is likely to be a phased process, so I don't-- I personally don't see people not working remotely for well past May 8th.

Provost Jones: And we are planning for Maymester to be delivered remotely. And so, obviously, it can be delivered remotely from campus, but to Eric's point, until we get clearance to allow people to return, I think, until further notice, folks should be planning on working from home.

President Barron: And I do think Lawrence Lokman in strategic communications is working on a communication to have people understand these dates and the fact that they are evolutionary dates. And
so, when it's safe, that's when we'll take those steps and have the permission to do so. And Nick, we've also, based on that question, committed to remote education, at least, for summer session 1 as well.

Provost Jones: Correct, yes. Yeah.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you. Beth, would you like to move to the next question, please?

Beth Seymour: Yeah, it's a related question, and thank you. This is Amanda Byrd from Earth and Mineral Sciences. "When can students expect to hear an announcement about whether or not fall courses will occur in person?"

President Barron: You want to just take turns here, Nick--

Provost Jones: Sure.

President Barron: --or do you want to just answer. Huh?

Provost Jones: I'm happy to take turns. I'm sure what's prompting this question is the increased number of universities around the country that are making statements about fall and their-- generally, what we're hearing is it's their intention to be open for business and open for class and bringing students back. As Eric indicated earlier, we don't want to be making statements like that until we can answer the myriad questions that arise as a result.

So, we will have a formal notification about fall on or before June 15, so not until six weeks from now. But if we are in a position where we can announce it sooner, we will certainly do that. But we're always trying to juggle the two competing desires for people to know what's ahead of them, but also to be making the best decision with the most up to date epidemiologic and health information at our fingertips.

And so, we sort of put a stake in the ground June 15, and we're letting people know that on or before that date, we will make a.

President Barron: We do have an operational plan A, though.

Provost Jones: Right, which is to return for the fall. That is what we are optimistic we will be able to do, and we are working towards that. And a plan B.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you very much. Beth, would you like a field couple more, please?

Beth Seymour: Sure. This is from Joshua Kirby at Education. "Could the president or provost provide us with any high-level enrollment projections or observed trends for fall 2020 that they have been briefed about-- undergrad, grad, World Campus, et cetera, any--"

President Barron: So, in the spirit of just taking turns, we asked as part of our budgeting process for best case, likely, and worst case, we have admissions scenarios of which you can imagine countless numbers. But I think this is the way to think about it.

Part A, in any case, there is a greater challenge for international students who are freshmen to come because of visa offices. So, there is some level of discounting there. For current students that are
international, many of them remained in the country, and we have been surveying them to see where they are. We don't have a full accounting, but a significant number of them are still in country. This suggests that they are more likely to return if they're in country, but there are a number that have not responded.

For an out-of-state student, we see some tendencies to sit there and say, you know, this is an unpredictable world. I'm going to stay a little closer to home. This is an unpredictable world, so I might pick a less expensive option. In terms of Pennsylvania resident, more likely to come, and they're close by.

So, if they said they're coming, more likely. All the way to a worst-case scenario, which is you can't be residential in the fall. You lose a lot of students, particularly out of state and international. You convert a number of them to remote education with the hopes that they can come residential in January.

So, these are our big, broad range of scenarios. It seems unlikely to us, particularly from a budget viewpoint and the fact that the most vulnerable population not to come are those that generate more tuition. That's why we have some level of budget implication, even in the best case.

Now, in terms of paid accepts, we have deferred that past May 1, so that makes it a little bit more difficult to predict. But if we compare dates to dates, it looks pretty good. And the question is, will it melt in a different way than it has in the past? That is difficult, and what will we get with the extended deadline?

Now there are some people who believe that we are being much more effective because you are being much more effective in delivering remote education. And compared to others, who were talking about whether their institutions will fail because of enrollment and the cost of COVID and who have not been prepared to go remote, that Penn State may really seem like quite a safe harbor. And so that could counteract everything that I've just said, because our capabilities are rather different.

So fundamentally, that range from $88 million hole in the A&G budget to $456 million hole in the budget is really entirely a picture on who comes and who enrolls and what their distribution is. But that gives you an idea of how it's being thought through and how the budget implications are being thought through at the same time.
carefully what the-- both needs and risks are associated with reopening the daycare centers and make that decision accordingly.

We do know that as we start to have our faculty and staff return to work, that they will have childcare needs. But we also acknowledge that a childcare center is a very special environment. And so, we have to be mindful of that as we move towards reopening. But again, we're following the governor's lead, and as he allows us to start to emerge from this, we will make decisions in as timely a manner as possible. So again, hard to put specific dates on that at this point.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. Beth, the next question, please.

**Beth Seymour:** Yes, this is from Kimberly Blockett at Brandywine. "Is there a scenario in which some campuses will open, and others not based on what's going on in their region?"

**President Barron:** So, we do have messaging from the governor that they're contemplating opening based on occurrences over a period of time, new cases over a period of time. And if we look at the guidance that is there, then we see that, potentially, the northwestern corner of the state and the north central part of the state could have permission to start to return to work that is different from areas, such as Philadelphia.

And so, it is possible that that would be the case. Now our thought process is before a lot of people are returning, the first people that are returning are a lot of the workforce-- preparation for buildings, because they've been dormant for a little period of time, research under certain conditions, perhaps faculty under certain conditions. So that is something that is a possibility, again, guided by the governor.

It would be a bit more challenging to think about students coming back and having some campuses open and some campuses not for residential education. But I think the first bridge we cross is beginning to bring back our employees before we think about that. Nick, I don't know whether you have more to add in there or whether that makes sense.

**Provost Jones:** That makes-- yes, I mean the governor has this-- I think the green light, yellow light, red light model. Yeah, there's no question that if some of our campuses are in an area that is designated green light, provided we are ready and feel comfortable that we can have the appropriate safeguards for health and well-being of faculty and staff in place, you know, we know that people are anxious to get back to work. We know that they're anxious to get back to their offices and their laboratories.

And so, we will be working very hard to ensure that we have an environment that makes it safe to do so. And when we get green lighted, we will be thinking about how we can return people safely for sure.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. For sake of time, Beth, let's take one more, and then we will have to move along.

**Beth Seymour:** All right. This is from Kevin McDade at Shenango. "Under conditions of remote learning, library electronic resources have become critical to quality education. Will the University keep the current library funding in place during possible budget cuts?"

**Provost Jones:** Yeah, that's a very good question. I would preface my response by saying that the budget unit plans for next fiscal year's budgets are due on Thursday of this week, April 30. And so, we are
anticipating receiving any budget requests from the library. Clearly, the libraries have played a vital and critical role to the University in supporting us through this difficult period. And so, we are going to work to maintain the library operation as best we can.

But unfortunately, it's probably fair to say that with few exceptions, nobody is going to be immune from budget challenges as we move into this next fiscal year. And everybody will be rolling up their sleeves and thinking creatively about how to do that. I suspect on the library side, we will be, as we are in most of the operation, prioritizing people over stuff. So, if anything, the library might look to reduce its strategic acquisitions for the year rather than look to move people, just because those people are so critical to supporting our faculty, staff, and students.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Well, thank you both. Thank you, Beth, for the questions, and thank you, Eric and Nick, for fielding them. At this point, we're going to move along. If you asked a question that did not get answered on the floor, those questions, along with your name and unit, will go to the president and the provost's respective offices to respond to you at a later time.

At this point, we are going to transition and do something that's just a little bit different from the norm. A number of our committees went to great lengths to determine how sustainability figured into their committee work, and there are great examples of this in our agenda today that we'll see later on. In all, a major theme and topic of discussion in the Senate this year was this notion of sustainability.

And to that end, in our final plenary session, we will hear a panel of four brief presentations, one by the president on sustainability at the University, one by the provost on institutional resiliency related to our strategic plan, and then we have two guests, Haley Stauffer, a Penn State graduate student, who will speak about how faculty can respond to student concerns about the future of climate, and Steve Levitsky the chief sustainability officer at Purdue Farms on sustainability and resiliency through collaborative partnerships.

Their combined presentations, as a group, that address the Senate today constitute what I guess I have been thinking about as a sustainability summit here on the proverbial floor of the Senate. And so, without further ado, President Barron, would you please address the Senate?

President Barron: Sure. So, I'm going to talk a little bit about the sustainability side of things. So, I think the best way to look at it is a balance of three elements. Element number one is the importance of actions that are good for the health of the planet and the health of everything from local to planetary conditions. Second is, OK, in our actions, who pays for them? Because we're cost conscious. People spend a lot of time telling us we're charging too much for whatever we do. And of course, who pays for it is students and parents.

And the third is the balance of very diverse opinions, because there is no one opinion among the faculty, and there is no one opinion amongst all the students. Quite the opposite. So that's one element is balancing the diversity of opinion, who pays, and our convictions on doing things for the importance of the planet.

A second thing that I might toss in there is I'm not actually a big fan of signing pledges. You know, it's perfectly OK, because I can merrily go along and hit my retirement date. And after I've left I don't know how many presidents with future pledges, and I don't see, necessarily, that pledges is something that people are keeping.
I would much rather take those three issues and do my best to balance them in order to make a decision. So, we can take a couple of examples. Certainly, one that's related to our carbon footprint and to topics like climate change. And so, what we see is a University that, a short time ago, transitioned its coal facilities for natural gas. It resulted in a significant decrease in our carbon footprint and also saved money. The combination of those two things this is-- makes them irresistible in a lot of different ways.

OK, well, then we see another case where we build a solar array on our property close to Mount Nittany at University Park. And in this particular case, we knew that the solar array was actually going to cost us in terms of its production of energy. So, we were essentially having to spread that cost among our student population.

However, we also integrated into that a research agenda. And so, the research agenda and educational agenda, compared to the cost, which was not great, made it something that was still a win-win, because we were doing something that was better for our environment. We were doing research and teaching, and the extra cost was modest.

Then we'd take the next step for which I got to do the shovel with the governor, and that's a public-private partnership in central southern PA of 150,000 panel solar farm. And in this particular case, with a public-private partnership, it actually is more cost effective. And that solar farm will provide 25% of the energy needs for Penn State University and move us to cross a threshold, which is 50% renewable.

Now this is a powerful argument, and clearly, it's a no brainer, because it balanced these issues of our conviction for climate change with a cost factor that made it much, much easier to step forward with. The same thing, I think, can occur in terms of LEED building certification. We have that as a goal, not necessarily the very top goal if the cost becomes something that is hard to recoup. So, we're very sensitive about this balance between cost and being able to do these things.

We see it in things like waste. My favorite example is the president's box is a waste-free zone. It takes some effort with people their guiding people what to put where, but it is fully recycled. We'd like to do that for the stadium.

That would be a huge-- what do we bump up against in all the recycling and the elimination of waste? What we bump up against is that people put plastics wherever they want, and they go, well, I'm not sure. I'm going to put it here. And we end up with mixed plastics that then the recycling groups actually tell us that they can't accept it, and they charge us more.

So, this is not cost effective, nor is it helping anything, because now the mixed plastics just get dumped, despite the effort at recycling. It would make a difference if we had a local facility that did construction, say, of plastic Adirondack chairs, where they take mass plastic mixed, and to be able to do something with it.

But unfortunately, we do not have that, particularly in central Pennsylvania, and I don't think in eastern Pennsylvania. So, there is no industry that accepts these plastics that are mixed. So, in this particular case, if the humans involved on the campuses are not putting things in the right place, it actually is more expensive for the University, not less expensive for the University.

There are a number of other things that are tricky issues. So as part of a climate change focus, one of the things that you hear about is divestiture for fossil fuel industries. And this is not actually the University's
decision, to tell you the truth. The Board of Trustees has a policy, and, again, it balances these ideas that I've said, which says that the investments must be done in a way that maximizes the return on the investment.

And so, there are no-- there are not exceptions that are done for particular industries or particular foci. And there is, I think, an appetite to make sure that the objective is to maximize the return on the investment. And this is especially true if you start to imagine the diverse opinions both on the board and in terms of the faculty in terms of energy. And finally, I would say that our trump card in all of this is the research enterprise.

The research enterprise on climate here is profoundly strong. The research enterprise on energy here is incredibly strong. And we are watching the faculty make significant impacts on policy, as much as is allowed in this day and age, on policy and people's thinking on these. And, of course, that's a big part of our focus on sustainability is the intelligence and know-how to be able to make good policy decisions.

So, I probably already talked too long, but I'm hoping in just a couple of examples that I gave, that you have a sense of how we think through these things.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you very much, President Barron. Nick, would you like to take over and think about resiliency in the context of this strategic plan, please?

Provost Jones: Yeah, great, thanks, Nicholas. So, most of you are familiar with the five thematic priorities that exist in the strategic plan-- enhancing health, stewarding resources, transforming education, digital innovation, and arts and humanities. As we sort of rounded the-- we're finishing up the first lap of our strategic plan, the first five years, many of you were involved in an assessment of strategic planning process and a visioning for where the institutional plan should go for the next five years.

And one of the things that emerged in those conversations was the-- I would characterize it as, perhaps, a desire to have an overarching theme, sort of an uber theme that rolled up all of those together. And if we were to have an uber theme, what would it be?

We had a-- we discussed that probably for a nine-month period in multiple environments and had really great constructive conversations. One thing that did emerge as a possible uber theme was climate. In fact, that was one of the first things that we talked about. And it was characterized as one of the challenges of our time, and why shouldn't Penn State make that a focus. And the discussion evolved.

We felt maybe that was a little too specific, and I would say we went to the other end of the spectrum, where we said, why don't we just embrace the 17 UN sustainable development goals? I mean they-- I'm looking at them now-- no poverty, zero hunger, good health, well-being, affordable and clean energy, reduced inequalities, gender equality, quality education, so on, life below water, life on land, climate action. This seemed pretty good, and it felt a little odd to just say, well, our uber theme is something that the United Nations identified.

So the discussion continued, and then we ultimately ended up settling on the notion of resilience as being something that really linked those five themes well and was pretty consistent with things that we also articulated in our foundational elements. And to cut a long story short, we ended up with a new paragraph in the executive summary of the draft revised strategic plan, and it's worth reading it, given that we put
this out on the website for comment and review back in November of 2019, if I've got my date about right. And it reads as follows.

"Further, to advance Penn State's mission and vision for the next decade and beyond, the University is committed to empowering resilience as a unifying concept. Leveraging our commitment to impact, Penn State is uniquely able to help individuals, our University community, and society to respond effectively to adversity, and even more impactfully to bounce forward, creating new solutions in response to complex challenges of the 21st century."

That was a pretty awesome statement for us to be making in November, and I think as we were putting that out, none of us ever imagined that we could be potentially living that three months later. So, it was really pretty extraordinary. I don't want anybody to think that, at that point, we started thinking about resilience as a unifying concept, because we'd been thinking about it for a while. And if I look at some of our signature initiatives that emerged in the first phase of the plan, One Penn State 2025 is a plan for resilience in education.

The Consortium to Combat Substance Abuse is an effort that focuses on resilience of individuals and communities in the face of challenges from addictions. So, we were doing it. We were thinking about it. It was kind of in our blood as February of 2020 emerged, and so that thinking, I think, that helped prepare us well to respond and live the challenges that we are facing now with a view towards resilience and the fact that we're able to think now about bouncing forward to the fall and beyond and what the other side of this looks like. So, it's really a bit very timely.

So I think this is something the institution is committed to through its strategic vision and strategic plan, and I think aligns very nicely with many of the things that we've been talking about, the things that Eric talked about, and it's sort of exciting to have that out there so crisply articulated at a time that we really need it. So, I'll stop there.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you, Provost Jones, for that. Our next guest, as noted, is Haley Stauffer. She's a graduate student here at Penn State. Haley, would you like to unmute yourself and join?

Student Perspectives on Sustainability

Haley Stauffer, Graduate Student: Yes. Hello, everyone. My name is Haley Stauffer. Thank you for that introduction. I'm a Penn State graduate student in the Department of Agricultural and Biological Engineering. Thank you for having me. It's an honor to speak here today.

I wanted to take this opportunity to talk specifically about sustainability and resilience at Penn State from a student's perspective. Change the slide, please. My history at Penn State has totaled over four years now, while my history with environmental stewardship has summed far longer. I came to Penn State not for the football games or Greek life, but not for the revered creamery or glorified tailgating, but for the globalized recognized research opportunities, faculty expertise, and the depth of resources specific to the agricultural sector.

I graduated from the College of Agricultural Sciences this past spring having served in various climate action-oriented groups. Throughout my undergraduate career, I met many inspiring students, faculty, and staff that curated the sustainability space we have here at Penn State. Now in graduate school, I have continued to connect with change makers at this institution and push for a necessary climate action across
all operations. I am here today largely due to my previous activism work at Penn State, namely a letter that my colleague, Rashmit Arora, and I wrote to President Barron back in September regarding the graduate school orientation, during which there was no mention of sustainability whatsoever.

It is my understanding that at undergraduate-graduate transfer and international orientations at Penn State, only a small segment is devoted to sustainability and resilience initiatives made at the University. Why is that? Or put another way, how can that be? Surely, that's not how the students want it to be.

Change the slide, please.

According to a survey conducted this past fall by climate activist group, Awakened State, and administered to roughly 1,500 students in participating professors’ classrooms, most student respondents did not feel prepared by their institution to face the future of climate change. In fact, when asked how respondents felt when facing climate changes, the most common responses were powerless and anxious, followed by guilty, confused, angry, and hopeless.

Again, why is this the majority response of students surveyed, and what can faculty and curriculum do to make students feel more empowered and hopeful when faced with the challenges of the ecological and climate crisis? A professor once told me that the antidote to numbness is action. Therefore, I am proposing that the best way to effectively handle the next global crisis, the climate crisis, is for each of us to transcend our understanding of sustainability and resiliency.

Our language has reduced these words exclusively to nouns. They cannot be siloed as individual terms. Sustainability and resiliency are powerful actions that require a collective urgency and response. Next slide, please.

Sustainability is not confined to a term or a report or a token graduation requirement or major or even in the work of a task force that this Faculty Senate resolves to form. We need more calls to be resolute. We don't need more courses or textbooks that focus on sustainability as a concept. We don't have to learn about it. We need to act with it.

We need to press and put sustainability as a concept-- put sustainability and resilience-- excuse me-- on the forefront of our actions, and for our educators, as often as is feasible, to incorporate sustainability and resiliency in our lessons inside the classroom and laboratories, places I cannot wait to return to. And we must do this as a collective.

Universities have tremendous power to cultivate global change leaders through their most influential tool, the truly untapped potential of our curriculum, your curriculum. What students learn-- the structure, the content, the delivery, all of it-- acts as a commitment to important traditions that PSU wants to endure. Faculty members have a profound impact on their students, and you need to know that-- not just know it, but to act with that understanding in order to cultivate a more equitable, inclusive, just, and honest future.

I am proposing that sustainability and resiliency be integrated into the curriculum to the extent possible as a non-trivial segment of every course, whether that be a sustainability-centered example in a math problem or a business strategy in a marketing course or a homework question for an electrical engineering assignment. For example, a question on an exam for a mechanical engineering course could focus on how a wind turbine operates, or the meat slab in the animal science curriculum could talk about meat alternatives and cellular agriculture.
I am aware that an event similar to what I am suggesting took place this past week and was deemed Climate Crossover Week by the multigenerational climate activist group, Awakened State. I encourage you all to look into the Climate Crossover Project at Penn State linked here below in green, as it is one of the many solutions we will need to embrace for our good, the good of our students, and the good of this mighty institution.

In addition, I am aware that an engineering design 100 course focused on finding local climate solutions as per their partnership with Project Drawdown this past semester. I'm also aware of the specific sustainability efforts outlined in the strategic plan under the key thematics of transforming education and stewarding our planet's resources and the extension of the strategic plan for 2025 that is due in December.

Furthermore, Penn State's recent ranking of 35th in the world by the Times Higher Education University Impact Ranking for our commitment to the UN's sustainable development goals is a considerable success and will only grow if faculty continue to infuse sustainable actions within their curriculum.

These actions make me proud to be a Penn Stater. Penn State is clearly a huge force and purveyor of sustainability across the world, which means that we can always be doing more. We have the ability to respond and, therefore, the responsibility to do so. Next slide, please.

We are the beneficiaries of the curriculum, and it has shaped us as members of the global community. It may start in the classroom, but it is about the future. That's why I'm talking to all of you today as the caretakers of the undeniable force that is the curriculum. I cannot just go and ask Vice President Jones to make you do this, because he doesn't have the power to do that, and neither does President Barron. You are the faculty. It is your curriculum. Only you can do this.

So, I am proud that I see a resolution with sustainability and resiliency written all over it. We need that, and building from that, we need more calls to be resolute. It does no good if we have a solar power purchase agreement and are donned "the energy University," and yet most students are unaware of how much of Penn State's energy needs are offset by solar.

We cannot sit here in the comfort of our own homes and tout sustainability and research and in the operations of the office of physical plant, but not bring it into our classrooms every opportunity that we get. Every subject is ripe for sustainability. This is not about how to integrate terms or concepts. This is about us asking ourselves how we can be more sustainable in our actions, and what does that look like at a classroom level.

So, look at where we all are now and how life has changed. You are now at work at home, in your living rooms, kitchens, and home offices. I think about what I want in my home—safety, comfort, and security. And what I want in my home is what I want in my future. The University's most important stakeholders, the students, want that, too.

In closing, if you are wondering what students want and what you can do, adopt sustainability-oriented examples. Ask sustainability-oriented questions to your students. Support the Climate Action Plan proposed by students and linked here below. Think deeper about the interconnectedness of the problems that we face as a society and converse with multiple disciplines on these issues. Ask yourself if you are doing the best that you can. This must be part of our vocabulary and an organic part of who we are as Penn Staters.
That's all I ever wanted as a student, and it's what I still want. It's what I want in my home and in my future. Thank you for your time.

**Chair Rowland:** Wow, thank you so much, Haley. That's wonderful. Steve, were you able to join us?

**Sustainability in the University Context and Beyond**

**Steve Levitsky:** Perdue Farms: Yes, I am.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good, Steve. So, thank you for joining us. The virtual floor is yours.

**Steve Levitsky:** OK, well, first, I want everybody to see my background. Wish I was there. And I'm humbled by the invite to speak to the president, the vice provost, and the Faculty Senate. Haley, great job, and actually, kind of ironic. Neither of us spoke, but her presentation aligns very well with what I'll cover today. So, let me share my screen here.

So again, good afternoon, Steve Levitsky vice president of sustainability for Perdue Farms, and one of the things I learned at Smeal is try to grab attention of your audience first. So if this doesn't grab your attention, that's a bit unfortunate. But what I will do here is just run through some slides quickly, so carbon dioxide in the atmosphere over a millennium, so 800,000 years, you can see the carbon dioxide levels, and you can see where we're at currently.

Global temperature-- 1880 to today-- one-degree climb. Global freshwater use from 1901 to 2014, so you go from 500 billion to 4 trillion. And then humans and the extinction crisis-- purple line is the human population. The green line is extinctions by populations, so you could see a nice correlation there. And then the human population currently in its growth potential. So clearly, these are things that we should all be aware of and concerned about.

So what I'll be covering today-- first, a little bit about myself and my background and role in sustainability, then Perdue Farms, who we are and what we do, and then Penn State's sustainability, an alum and sustainable professional's view of where we're at today.

So little bit about myself-- so three brothers went to Penn State before me, all Penn State degrees. I started Wilkes-Barre campus and finished my degree at University Park campus. 95 classes, 242 credits, $124,000 in tuition, a BS and MBA and almost an MS at Penn State, so I definitely paid my dues. But I love the institution, love everything you've done for me as an institution. So very proud of Penn State.

27 years’ experience in the environment sustainability arena-- former director of global sustainability at American Sugar Refining, which many of you probably are familiar with Domino Sugar. That's one of their brands. And then a lifelong passion for sustainability and addressing environmental and social issues.

So really quick story to kind of give a guide to my path on the way to sustainability as a profession. So, this landfill is the Greentree Landfill, which is just north of Penn State in Brandy Camp, Pennsylvania. This area right here was a cell that was being used for trash at the time I was working on it, so I graduated, and here I am, work for an environmental consulting firm in State College, and we were actually working on the expansion of this landfill.
This area to the south was all wooded, and we went out to the wetlands delineation, actually another ERM or other Penn State grad and I, spent a week there doing wetland delineation—grouse, turkey, deer, beautiful woods. And he and I both looked at each other and said, OK, we went to college to protect the environment, and we're now permitting to essentially cut down all the trees here, put in a plastic liner, and put all human waste in this disposal site.

Now, we are proud of the fact that we are doing it the right way and we're protecting the earth, but we also were questioning, wait a minute, this isn't what we went to school for. This is environmental compliance, and that's great. But how do we keep from needing this additional cell? How do we keep from having waste and trash to go to this cell? So that was really the turning point for me to decide on ongoing effort, sustainable career, and then direct me to work on the soil science, masters, and also the MBA.

Perdue Farms, what do we do, and who are we? So, founded in 1920—this is Arthur Perdue to the left. Arthur started it in 1920. This year's our 100th year anniversary. We had a bunch of stuff planned this year, which is now on hold due to COVID.

This is the original Perdue farmhouse. This is Jim Perdue, my boss when I started here. Frank Perdue, which most of you probably know from the commercials, 70s, 80s, 90s. And then Arthur, and then this is the fourth generation of the Perdue family. It's a family owned company, great company to work for.

Perdue Farms, our vision to be the most trusted name in food and agricultural products. What many people think about when they hear Perdue is they think about the poultry, the chicken you buy at the store. That's our Perdue foods division. What most people don't know about it is our Perdue agribusiness. And this started in the 60s by Frank Perdue, mainly to source feed, corn, and soy to feed his chickens because he wasn't happy with the feed produced by other feed processors.

What's interesting now is agribusiness makes up almost 50% of our revenue, so it really has grown in size. And we now sell a lot of feed to Tyson and Mountaire and other protein companies. By the numbers, third in US sales, 7% in chicken market, top 10 US grain companies, 21,000 associates, 1,900 poultry farmers, 760 pork farmers, and over 8,000 grain farmers. So, we source our meat and grain from those farmers.

Why is sustainability important to Perdue? Values. It lines with two of our core values specifically. So integrity, we do the right thing for the right reason, and then stewardship, protect the environment, ensure the well-being of our associates, provide for the welfare of the animals in our care, live up to our civic responsibilities, and generate earnings for the future of our company.

Those people familiar with triple bottom line—people, planet, profit—probably would think, wow, that's well-aligned with our stewardship value, which is pretty amazing. When I started here, no one here really knew of triple bottom line. I came in the door and said, wait a minute. Our stewardship value essentially aligns well with this thought process. And stewardship is ingrained in the company.

So, after I started here four years ago, one of the things we didn't have was any goals associated with our drive towards sustainability. So, I sat down with our operations group, looked at what we could do in the short term, and came up with these BHAG goals. Greenhouse gas goal reduction, 30% reduction of scope one, scope two by 2022. Potable water goal 25% reduction by 2022. Waste goal, increased waste
diversion from landfill by 90% and have five facilities certified zero waste to landfill by 2022. Nutrient reduction associated with operations and stakeholder engagement.

How are we getting there? We actually have a planet scorecard. And this scorecard is managed by my group. We collect data on environmental compliance, environmental audits, waste and recycling, greenhouse gas, energy, water. And I report every facility each month and I report back to our executive group. I report directly to the CEO and I sit with our executives and each month go over our scoring, who’s scoring well, who's scoring poorly, how do we get those poor numbers up, and what the issues are associated with them.

The real driver here is this is tied to our personal development plans, each associate of 21,700. And then also it's tied to our incentive programs. Our bonus program actually has the planet portion in the bonus program. So, approaching our second century, our goal’s to be better, not bigger.

So how does this relate to Penn State? It's kind of interesting. When we were talking, I was telling Nicholas about Penn State and Perdue both have over 20,000 employees. We've got $6 billion in revenue annually. You've got a $6 billion budget at Penn State, large group of diverse stakeholders, many NGOs that want to see immediate action regarding climate change, nutrient use, water pollution, et cetera. So, although very dissimilar businesses, many of the same hurdles to overcome.

Penn State sustainability. An alum in sustainability professional's view. And hopefully I don't get myself in trouble here. So bad news first. Penn State is five to 10 years behind the best sustainability universities in the world. As Haley noted-- and I've seen we ranked 35th in the World University rankings for UNSEGS. It sounds great, but Arizona State ranked fifth. They started their program in 2005. Penn State started its Sustainability Institute in 2012. So, we're a little behind the eight ball. But that doesn't mean we can't catch up and take over.

Some things that I think we really need to focus on. Lead by example, 100% renewable. And as President Barron had mentioned, we've got some great solar programs. We're looking at zero carbon footprint, reduced water usage, zero waste.

And this is the big one. And I think President Barron really did a good job because I have the same issues here at Perdue. You'll find ways for low-to-middle income families in Pennsylvania to go to an Penn State-- tuition is too expensive-- but then some of the things above cost money. So, it's really trying to find the win-win solutions. But I really think these are the table stakes, and the time is now to try to address these and have goals to go after these things.

I think the biggest strength here at Penn State is the research and teach sustainably in every facet, program, college, et cetera. And again, I did speak with Haley beforehand, but I think we had the same thought process here. And in my mind, it's not producing a standalone sustainability program. Use the strength of Penn State and interdisciplinary research to make an interdisciplinary sustainability curriculum.

History, calculus, chemistry, arts, humanity, business, every class should incorporate something in regard to sustainability in the curriculum. You might ask, well, history, how could you bring sustainability into that type of course? You can look at the multiple issues over history of fighting over land, resources.
WWII is an excellent example where you have the fact that there was recycling programs and other programs to capture the resources needed to fight the war. Many of those recycling programs, if they were kept in place after WWII, we would not be in the bad shape we're in today. So, there are many things throughout these different courses. Chemistry, again, you've got situations where you have a finite resource that humans are utilizing. How do you recycle and reuse that resource?

Smeal College of Business has started this process. They've called it the best model business education for sustainability transformation. With each discipline, they have outlined various sustainability aspects that can be addressed in that arena. I'm just going to give you one really quick because I know I'm short on time.

But when students create a marketing major in Smeal, you'll have to acquire these sustainability related skills and knowledge. So, segment consumer based by sustainability relevant values. And I could go through the whole bullet point list, but I think you'll get the point, that with each discipline, there are certain aspects to sustainability that we can incorporate into the curriculum.

So, when a student graduates, you're not going to maybe educate 100 to 1,000 students in a sustainability major. You're going to educate 100,000 students over their four, five years and touch on these points in every class they take. So when they leave Penn State and they get to their job, they get to Perdue, when I reach out to them and say, look, we need to do something regarding waste, they already have a mindset of, yeah, I understand what that is. I understand what the issues are. I understand how to address it.

Really, I think the bigger impact-- we could go back to the couple of things I called out here-- what Penn State could do internally. But I think the biggest impact is what we can do with the curriculum and have 100,000 students with that knowledge base and that skill set to get out of college and utilize it. So again, I'd like to thank you all for the ability to speak today. from an alum that bleeds blue and white and wants Penn State to be the best in the world of sustainability, I thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you so much, Steve. And of course, thank you to everyone who participated in the panel. You've given us a lot to think about and a lot to sift through. It is very much appreciated. President Barron, would you like to make a closing remark?

President Barron: I don't necessarily need to. I do think it is interesting to watch that there's been a very positive evolution over the last five or 10 years, and a lot more than we can do. I know that the notion of every classroom is a faculty decision, not an administrative decision. And I think we're going to continue to do our best to think through this from an administrative viewpoint on this notion of doing what's right, balancing against what it costs, and recognizing that we have very diverse opinions. But I will eagerly await hearing how the faculty feel about many of these different topics.

Chair Rowland: Very good.

President Barron: Thanks for having me.

Chair Rowland: Yes. No, thank you so much for your time. As noted, before, it is very much appreciated. If there are questions for any of the guests that we just had on the panel, please enter them into the Q&A box and they will be addressed. Unfortunately, not here, right now for sake of time, but in the very near future. Because, of course, we can save the questions and they can be responded to one by one.
Thank you, everyone of your panelists. It was a pleasure and we appreciate your time. At this point, we'll be moving on. And so, Eric and Nick, I suppose you can continue to join us. Thank you.

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Rowland: Moving on, item G, forensic business. Mercifully, we have none of that today.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Rowland: Item H, unfinished business. We do have one item found in appendix C, which is, and with impeccable timing after wrapping up a microsummit on sustainability, a Faculty Senate climate action resolution which was introduced in the last meeting, and hence, no need for a motion to appear before the Senate. If there are essential questions about the resolution, you can start entering those questions now by using the Q&A feature at the bottom of the screen. And when you do, please remember to include your name and unit.

We will now, therefore, consider this action item and determine if the Senate endorses this resolution. Now, typically we read the full resolution into the Senate record. However, for sake of time, I'll simply read a brief passage as well as the resolution text itself. So here we go.

Whereas Penn State both has a rich history of energy science, and related engineering disciplines, and a continued spirit of excellence entering a transformative period in our global energy economy, whereas Penn State faculty are committed to ensuring safe and just space for ourselves, our staff, our students, and our children, future generations, and all life on Earth. The Faculty Senate-- here we go.

Now, therefore, we resolve that, one, the Faculty Senate shall call on University's senior leadership to develop a University-wide climate action and adaptation plan that is grounded in the best available science and in principles of transparency, cooperation, equal participation, and justice and focused on available solutions and the development of new solutions. Two, the climate action and adaptation plans should be aimed at both interim and long-range targets that aspire to achieve, A, 100% reduction in purchase electricity generated GHG emissions by 2030. Next, 100% or more reduction in net GHG emissions by 2050 based on 2005 levels through direct mitigation activities, carbon sequestration, and offsetting opportunities. Three, the climate action and adaptation plans should include planning to adapt to the changes already happening in our local and National Climate. Four, significantly increased investment and academic, co-curricular, outreach, and research initiatives focused on climate science, solutions, and management that are grounded in the spirit of transdisciplinary, collegiality, and active hope. Five, and this is the final one, engage peer institutions, government, the private sector, and civil society to raise awareness and identify courses of action to reduce the impacts and embrace the opportunities created by anthropogenic climate change.

Now, that said, if there are questions about this resolution that we would like to raise before we vote, this would be an opportunity to do that. Senator Brandi Robinson who is identified in sort of the cover page, I guess you'd say, of the resolution is available to field questions. Beth, if you're still there, have you seen any questions raised about the resolution before we vote?

Beth Seymour, Chair Elect: No, Nicholas. I don't have any questions.
Chair Rowland: OK. In that case, may I have a motion to endorse the resolution and the script?

Judy Ozment: So, Moved.

Chair Rowland: Keith?

Keith Shapiro: Second.

Chair Rowland: Thank you very much. Faculty senators joining us today, please join me on poll everywhere.com in order to cast your vote. Once you get there, you will press A to accept the motion and thereby pass the resolution. Or if you wish to reject, then please press B. As you're going on Poll Everywhere right now, as we vote, I just wanted to re-mention what I had previously stated, and that is that, not in any kind of an attempt to drum up anticipation here, but in order to keep the meeting moving along and moving expeditiously, we will wait until all of the reports requiring votes are finished and only then reveal the results of each vote all at once and all as a group.

So, this would be after the next section, which is legislative reports, and then following that section after, which is advisory and consultative reports. So please enter your vote now regarding the climate resolution, and then we will move on to our next item of business. This is item I. These are our legislative reports. We have seven legislative reports today on the agenda.

Yeah, thank-- I mean, I'm also shocked that we have this many report. It really is fantastic. So, thank you for these reports. No one can accuse the Senate for having sat on their hands during this time of crisis.

**LEGISLATIVE REPORTS**

**Changes to Senate Policy 60-10 Concurrent Majors Program**

Chair Rowland: Now, the first legislative report, this is from our Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid. This one is entitled Changes to Senate policy 60-10. This is our concurrent majors’ program. This can be seen in appendix F. Michelle Duffey, who is Chair of ARSSA, will present the report and respond to any essential questions that senators may have.

As before, during the presentation, you may enter questions into the Q&A box near the bottom of the screen. And when you do, please remember to include your name and unit. Michelle, I think I just saw you pop into the Zoom. If you'd like to unmute and join the discussion, the floor is yours.

Michele L. Duffey, Health and Human Development: Thank you, Nicholas. So legislative report on concurrent majors 60-10 is really a fairly simple change to policy 60-10. Because the procedures are now available to elect a concurrent major through electronic systems instead of paper submissions, we've changed that language. So this legislation merely brings us up-to-date with our current practice and systems.

Chair Rowland: OK, very good. Thank you very much, Michelle. Beth, have you seen any questions pop into the Q&A on this legislative report regarding concurrent majors?

Beth Seymour: I do not see any questions.
Chair Rowland: All right, very good. All right, in that case, senators, please join me on polleverywhere.com to cast your vote on our report Changes to Senate Policy 60-10, Concurrent Majors. To accept the motion and pass the report, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B. Please go to Poll Everywhere right now and take a moment to cast your vote, please.

OK, as noted, as a desire to remain timely during our meeting today, we’re going to continue on and reveal all the votes at the end of all items to be voted on. So, I’ll move to our next legislative report now. This is both from the Senate Committee on Admissions record scheduling and student aid as well as our Senate committee on education.

**Creation of Senate Policies 01-99, Temporary Methods for Classification of Undergraduate Students and Verification for Admission Under Emergency Circumstances, 42-83 Temporary Extension of Credit Verification from Accredited U.S. Institutions, and 83-99 Temporary Suspension of Limitations on Source and Time for Credit Acquisition**

Chair Rowland: This second item is titled Creation of Senate Policies 01-99, 42-83, and 83-99. Can be seen in appendix BB, which you don't see very often. Chair Duffy will also present this timely report. She'll be joined by Shelly Stein, who is the Chair of our Senate Committee on Education. Same with all the reports, if there is a question about the legislation, please enter it into the Q&A box near the bottom of the screen. And when you do that, you're going to have to make sure to include your name and your unit. Shelly and Michelle, could you walk us through the second report, please?

Michele L Duffey: Absolutely. Thank you again. So, this is a package of three new policies that we've put together. And due to the impacts of COVID-19 and the subsequent closures of many educational institutions, many high school counselors, students, families are not able to secure an official transcript, diploma, or a GED transcript prior to enrollment at Penn State. The recommended legislation enables us to create a record of a series of policies that allow for self-certification of high school or equivalent completion, temporary verification of transfer credit, and completion of degree credits, which will be made available for the 2020 and 2021 academic year, so just this upcoming year. The policies will then stay on the record for historical purposes.

So in brief, 01-99 supplements the 05 and 06 Senate policies, allowing a student who is seeking admission to a four year degree program and is classified as degree-seeking to be able to self-certify the receipt of the high school diploma. As an aside, Penn State's existing Faculty Senate policy requires an official document which is more strict than what is needed, and though it's not federally required. Because of our more strict policy, students are held to a higher standard. And if they don't supply an official high school diploma or equivalent, financial aid is delayed until the receipt of that document. Thus, we can't require an official record at a later date for this group.

Senate policy 42-83 would be a supplement to 42-82, which deals with transfer credits. 42-83 new policy would allow the University to admit students with official documentation pending that could be then presented in a reasonable time at a later date. And then policy 83-99 would supplement current policy 83-80 so that we could grant exceptions for admissions to the University that have to do with completing program credit and residency requirements. We don't ensure admission into any particular program, but it allows us to be transfer-friendly.

Chair Rowland: OK, very good. Thank you very much, Michelle and Shelly. Beth, have you seen questions populate on this report?
Beth Seymour: No, I have not.

Chair Rowland: OK, very good. OK, senators, once again, please join me on polleverywhere.com in order to cast your vote on this report from ARSSA and education on the creation of three new Senate policies. To accept the motion and pass the report, please press A. To reject, please press B. So please jump onto Poll Everywhere and take a moment to cast your vote.

Revision to Bylaws, Article IV, Committees Section I

Chair Rowland: And of course, like the others, this is the same deal where we will reveal the results of the votes later on, once we're done voting on everything that needs to be voted on. Next, there is an astonishing four reports from the Committee on Committee and Rules. Chair Brunsden is going to speak to and present each of the four reports. The first of the four from Committee on Committee and Rules is titled Revision to Bylaws, Article 4, Committees Section 1. This is found in appendix G of your agenda today.

As this is a revision to the Senate bylaws, this report is presented today. But like any change like that, it will not be voted on until our September 2020 meeting. Victor, have you been able to join us yet? Victor? It looks like Annie Taylor. Annie Taylor is the Vice Chair of our Committee on Committee and Rules. And she will be joining us any moment. Oh, Annie, I think that's you. There you are.

Annie Taylor, Earth and Mineral Science: I'm here. I would think Victor--

Chair Rowland: Oh, thank you so much for joining us. Could you tell us a little bit about the document we'll be voting on the next time we get the chance to gather together?

Annie Taylor: Yes. So, appendix G is revision to the bylaws, Article 4, Committees Section 1. During the year, CC&R noted that there was a considerable amount of duplicated language in the standing rules concerning who was supposed to be a voting member. And we had understood they were confusing some committees as well. This change will make that moot and nails down who is a voting member of a committee, as we've always intended.

Chair Rowland: OK, very good. Thank you. Thank you, Annie, for joining us, last minute like this, too. Much appreciated. As noted, before, because this is a revision to bylaws, it was just presented briefly today, and there will be time for vote in our September 2020 meeting. So, thank you, Annie. We look forward to seeing that.

Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6 (n), Committee on Student Life

Chair Rowland: Our second report from CC&R today is titled Revisions to Standing Rules, Article 2, Section 6, and Committee on Student Life. This can be found in our appendix H. This one we will be voting on today because it's a change to our standing rules. What's more, this report is brought to the floor by committee and, therefore, of course, is going to need no second at this point.

During the presentation of this report, just like the others, if you have an essential question, please enter it into the question and answer box with your name and unit. So, Annie, could you tell us a little bit about the addition to the Student Life Committee and what it's going to imply in terms of future presentations and so on?
Annie Taylor: Absolutely. So, Student Life would like to add sustainability to its charges. CC&R felt that we were supportive of this. In order to make that happen, you'll see some very minor changes to these rules, adding the nature of the charge, adding the executive director or another student representative from the Council of Sustainable Leaders to its membership, and adding an annual summary of student's sustainability efforts to the Student Life Committee as a mandated report. Previously, this committee had no mandated reports.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you, Annie. Beth, have you had a chance to see if any questions have populated about the second report here from CC&R about the Student Life Committee?

Beth Seymour: We do not have any questions.

Chair Rowland: OK. In that case, seeing no questions at this time, just as we did moments before, senators, please join me on polleverywhere.com in order to cast your vote. Be reminded, this is our report from CC&R on changes to the Committee on Student Life. To accept the motion and pass this report, please go into Poll Everywhere and press A. To reject, please go into Poll Everywhere and press B. So please take a moment now, and get online, and vote on this report.

Revision to Standing Rules, Article III, Other Functions of the Senate, Section 4

Chair Rowland: All right, at this point then we will move on to the next item. This is the third report then from CC&R. This is Revision to Standing Rules, Article 3, Other Functions of the Senate in the always riveting Section 4. This is going to appear in appendix I. This report, like the others from CC&R is brought to the floor by committee, so in this case it needs no second.

During the presentation, same as before, please use the Q&A box if there are questions that have emerged. Make sure to put your name and your unit next to those questions so we know who's asking. And at this point, I'm going to pass it over to Annie once more. And could you tell us a little bit about what's going on in Section 4?

Annie Taylor: Absolutely. You'll remember from previous legislation that the president has formally recognized the World Campus Student Organization in addition to UPUA, CCSG and the grad student or professional organizations. So, this legislation simply adds the newer World Campus Student Association to the list of student bodies that can be represented on the Standing Joint Committee on General Education.

Chair Rowland: OK, very good. I look forward to welcoming members of World Campus Student Government Association. They've been great to work with. A relatively new group, but they are getting on to the Senate as quick as they can. So, thank you, Annie, for that. Beth, have any questions populated in our Q&A box at this point?

Beth Seymour: No, there are no questions.

Chair Rowland: No questions. Very good. in that case, senators, please, once again, join me in your favorite place, polleverywhere.com, for us to cast our vote on this report, this report changing Section 4 on some of the other functions of the Senate. Polleverywhere.com. To accept our motion and pass the report, please go in there and press B. To reject it, please press C. C? I meant B. OK, so please go take a moment and cast your vote on this report.
Revision to Standing Rules, Article II, Senate Committee Structure Section 6(e), Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment

Chair Rowland: OK, and we have, as noted before, four reports from CC&R. So, I'll take a moment here and I'll start to introduce the final report. So, our final report from CC&R, this is Revision to Standing Rules, Article 2, Senate Committee Structure Section 6E, Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment-- this is Ann Clements and crew-- appearing in appendix J. Like all the others, this report brought to the floor by committee, so we don't need a second. During the presentation, if you want to ask the question, at this point I think you know what to do. So, in that case, Annie, could you walk us through this and help unpack what's going on in this report?

Annie Taylor: Absolutely. So, this is really just a rewriting, revising this committee's duties so that it is more in line with the way duties are written for the other standing committees. And it reflects what the committee has actually been doing all along. Some of that, for whatever historical reason, had not been properly included, so actually relatively minor but important changes.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you so much, Annie, for that, and for the hard work of the committee, of course. Beth, any questions emerging on this fourth report from CC&R?

Beth Seymour: No, there are no questions.

Chair Rowland: In that case, folks, you know what to do. It's time to vote. Let's go to polleverywhere.com in order to cast that vote. As before, to accept the motion and pass this report, please press A. If you'd like to reject, please press B. So please jump on Poll Everywhere in order to cast your vote now.

And then from there, in the total number of legislative reports, we only have one left. OK. And thank you, Annie, for stepping in in a moment's notice. That's wonderful. Thank you.

Revisions to Senate Policy 67-30, Division III, and PSUAC Athletic Competition (non-University Park), Section IV on Athletic Schedules

Chair Rowland: Our final legislative report, which will be presented by Mark Stevens, the Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, this report from Mark today is titled Revisions to Senate Policy 67-30, Division 3, and PSUAC Athletic Competition non-University Park. This comes in Section 4 on Athletic Schedules. This report appears in our appendix L. Again, brought to the floor by committee, needs no second.

Same as before, if there is a question regarding this piece, please put it in the Q&A box along with your name and unit. Intercollegiate Athletics Chair Stevens will present the report and lead whatever discussion does ensue. Mark, whatever proverbial floor of the Senate that we have right now is yours.

Mark Stephens, University Park: Thank you, President Rowland. And in the context of athletics, if my eyes don't deceive you, that's a Champions League Olympiacos scarf over your head. I'd like to hear the story of that at some point. Back to the order of business, the IAC proposes changes to 67 tack 30, which is the Senate policy governing commonwealth campus athletics, specifically for non-conference competitions, altering policy to allow Saturday competition with certain restriction, prohibiting Sunday competition on University study days. Over.
Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you, Mark. That was outstandingly efficient. In that case, Beth, seem like any question has popped in about our athletics report?

Beth Seymour: We have no questions for the athletics report.

Chair Rowland: Very good, folks. You know what to do. Polleverywhere.com. Get out there and cast your vote from this report on Intercollegiate Athletics. To accept the motion and pass this report, please press A. If you'd like to reject, then please press B. Very good. Thank you for that one, Mark.

As noted, before, all of the votes will be revealed together as a group once we're done voting on all of our items. We have now completed voting all the items for legislative reports, but we're not going to reveal those votes until we've voted on everything. So, we're going to shift to the advisory consultative reports now.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Enhancing Academic Advising Across Penn State

Chair Rowland: First item of business, under advisory consultative reports-- this is really something-- in what might be a record of some sort, the first report is far answered by a shocking seven committees. And after a quick tally, I realized that even if only the members on each of the committees that already voted in favor of those reports voted in favor of it now, it will fly through a majority vote. This report, Enhancing Academic Advising Across Penn State, appearing in appendix M, is sponsored by Senate Committees on Admissions Record Scheduling and Student Aid, Curricular Affairs, Education, Educational Equity, and Campus Environment, Faculty Affairs, Intra-University Relations, and Student Life.

Just like the other reports, it's brought to the floor, needs no second. During the presentation, if you have questions, please populate them in the Q&A. David Smith, this is just a much-needed special shout-out to David Smith right now. David Smith presented this report to each and every one of those committees and oversaw probably a dozen drafts of this report developed over the past year. So, thank you for that, David. You've demonstrated a lot of moxie here. And we really appreciate your good work.

So, on that note, fittingly, I guess, David Smith, the Associate Dean for Advising and Executive Director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies, will be here to present the report and oversee what discussion ensues. David, I see the jar here. The floor is yours.

David Smith, Undergraduate Education: Thank you, Chair Rowland. This is a report that has seen and had a lot of input from a broad range of senators in the faculty Senate, so it's been a real pleasure to work on it and to work with many colleagues in Senate to move it forward. It really is an attempt to exercise shared governance.

So over the last several years, there have been some policy changes that have passed through Senate to further enhance advising, namely changes to the Senate policy on academic advising, a subsequent forensic that really tried to draw out some of the concerns that faculty saw around reaching the aspirational goals of that policy change. And so over the course of this year, there have been conversations with these seven committees, conversations with senators and faculty at campuses and locations across the Commonwealth. And so, this consultative report to the president and the provost is
really trying to make three concrete recommendations of things that fall within the administration's purview that could help further enhance academic advising at Penn State. I think the current situation that we face and the need for advising and the capacity to affect students and their positive ability to succeed in the challenges that are in front of us really speak to the ways that continuing to think about academic advising is important at Penn State.

Chair Rowland: Very good, David. Thank you very much for this and everything that you've done for the Senate over the past year, and obviously before that, too. Beth, have any questions on--

David Smith: Thank you, Nicholas.

Chair Rowland: Yeah, of course. You're welcome. Of course, David. Are there any questions that have popped over the Q&A, Beth?

Beth Seymour: No, we have no questions for the advising report.

Chair Rowland: Very good. In that case, folks, let's go to polleverywhere.com to cast your vote. Keep in mind this is the report on enhancing academic advising across Penn State. To accept the motion and pass this report, please press A. If you'd like to reject, then please press B. So take a moment. Jump online. You can cast your vote now. Thank you, David, for that.

We will continue to move along here. Our next report, this one is going to be presented by Kathy Bieschke, our Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. And also, our Associate Vice President, Suzanne Adair, is also going to make herself available in the event that some questions and some discussion arises. They were responsible for much of the work here.

Just for a little bit of sake of the context, for those of you that are familiar with AC13, the report that you have before you is-- it's a little more than just a revision. I mean, it really is just a full court press renovation of this policy. A ton of work has gone into it. And it's been circulated and gotten a lot of consultation. And both Kathy and Suzanne have been extremely responsive to the consultation with the Senate.

And so, this report, which is sponsored then with two sponsoring Senate committees, the dynamic duo of Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations, this one is entitled Revisions to AC13, Recommended Procedures for Hiring New Faculty. This is going to appear in appendix N if you haven't had the chance to read it yet. It's been brought to the floor and needs no second.

If there are questions about this report, same as always, put it in the Q&A box-- name and unit, please. As noted, Vice President Bieschke-- sorry, Vice Provost Bieschke will present the report, and Suzanne will join to field questions, should we have them. Kathy, I can see that you joined us. Thank you and welcome. The floor is yours.

Revisions to AC-13, Recommended Procedures for Hiring New Faculty (Formerly HR 13)

Kathleen Bieschke, Office of the President: Great. Hi, everyone. As Nicholas said, when Suzanne and I both assumed our positions in 2017, we realized that AC13, the recommended procedure for hiring new faculty, didn't provide-- didn't really match our current administrative processes or provide very good
guidance on two units about how to conduct faculty searches that attended diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Starting in fall of 2018, Suzanne and I worked together to revise AC13 and engaged in a pretty robust consultative process to do so. We consulted with a wide variety of units, including the Academic Leadership Council, Senate leaders over the course of a couple of years, the Office of General Counsel, the Senate Committees on Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations. We got a tremendous amount of feedback. And I think, as is probably evident, this is pretty much a brand-new policy. We worked on a variety of issues, all of which came up in committee.

Just a few comments about what guided our revisions. One, we definitely wanted AC13 to align with Penn State's current practices and strategic goals in regard to diversity, equity, and inclusion. We wanted to provide more specificity guidelines about specificity when we could. That's reflected in the search committee composition.

The policy lays out the responsibility of committee members, the committee chair, and the appointing authority. And the revisions strive to make it clear that search committees are-- their primary duty, they're held accountable for creating a candidate pool that's highly qualified for the position being advertised. And they're also accountable for implementing recruiting strategies that result in an appropriately diverse candidate pool. And then we wanted the revisions to align with some change in administrative processes at Penn State, such as confidentiality, job postings, and the locus of decision-making authority.

That's sort of the background. And I want to turn it over to Suzanne, because we did receive a question in advance of today's meeting. She'll address that and then provide a few additional comments.

Chair Rowland: Great. Suzanne?

Suzanne Adair, General and Academic Officers: Thanks, Kathy. Thanks, Nicholas. We did get one question that was specifically about the search committee representation. And the question was about what's in the guideline-- it's 3A if you happen to be looking at the policy. And it's all search committees should represent a broad range of diversity within its members, which includes members of underrepresented groups. That's the statement.

The question was, does the use of the plural members of underrepresented groups mean that search committees should each include two members? So really, the question is asking, do we have a specific number that we're required to put for underrepresented faculty members on a search committee? That's essentially the question.

And the answer is kind of nuanced, right? The answer is it depends, quite frankly. And there are a number of things that we know that folks need to consider. And so, I just want to talk through those briefly. And one is this definition of what we mean by underrepresented groups.

And so here it's intended to be specifically race, ethnicity, sex. But we're also talking about broadening that a bit and talking about folks with disabilities, gender identity, sexual orientation, and other relevant underrepresented populations. So, it is a somewhat broad term, and we expect that folks will be thinking and be mindful about who that includes and who it is that they need to have on a search committee.
Secondly, I think the size of the committee is something that has to play a role in these decisions. And so, if you have a small committee of, say, five members on a search committee, it may be sufficient that you have one or two faculty members from an underrepresented group. But for some of our committees, they are very large. And if you've got these larger search committees, we would say the expectation is that you have more than one or two underrepresented faculty on that committee, particularly for larger committees.

Now, clearly, folks are going to need to consider availability of faculty, whether there's competing service demands that folks have. And we want to make sure that folks are really clear. It's important to be mindful of the potential that we have to overburden our underrepresented faculty with service. And that's particularly true for our junior faculty.

As we know, they tend to be asked to be on numerous committees and involved in other activities. They are on diversity committees. They are asked to be advisors for diverse student groups and organizations. And so, we do need to be thinking about that. And so, clearly, units have to balance this need to diversify our search committees with ensuring that underrepresented faculty aren't hindered in their career path, particularly because we know folks end up with heavy service burdens.

And so, it's a hard and challenging balance. I know that. We know that. But we have to attend to it, nonetheless. And so, we know what we're asking folks in that request.

And then note that, if you see in 3B, we indicate that if units are having difficulty assembling a committee that has sufficient diversity, they should solicit committee members from related academic units. And so part of what we're saying is, you don't have to have every single faculty member on the search committee who is in your particular unit, especially if you're having trouble trying to create this diverse committee that we're looking for.

And so, we've built in some flexibility so that units can make arrangements as needed. And so, within that context, we're not requiring a specific number of underrepresented faculty on a search committee. We want folks to be mindful and to be intentional. And then note that part of what we have added and included in this policy is that if a search committee isn't diverse, the appointing authority, so that is the dean or the chancellor at a campus, has to provide a rationale for the composition of the committee and explain the lack of representation, which will be documented in the search record.

And so, we don't want to see repeats of that, right? We actually want folks to be thoughtful about how they put together a diverse committee. And so the bottom line here is that the goal is to put together search committees that represent sufficiently diverse group of members of faculty who bring a multitude of lenses, and perspectives, and experiences to the table in order to advance efforts across the University to more effectively recruit and retain a more diverse faculty population than we currently have. That's our goal.

And our expectation is that academic programs and departments are not passive, that frankly folks are very intentional in these efforts. And so that's really the bottom line here and what we tried to clarify in this policy around search committee representation, to answer that question. The other thing I want to make sure that I just note for folks is that we do have a companion document we're finalizing that will be disseminated and go along with this revised policy. And so that document will have more specific guidelines, details on search committee responsibilities, screening candidates, conducting interviews and other aspects of the search so that it's designed to help you all implement searches in a way that really
accomplishes the goals that we are trying to accomplish here and advance Penn State in this DENI space. So, I think that's all I'll take up the time for today.

Chair Rowland: Well, that's very good. We appreciate voluntarily bringing clarity to that question. I sort of feel like--

Suzanne Adair: Absolutely.

Chair Rowland: --the spirit of Carrie Eckhardt might have been hiding in there somewhere.

Suzanne Adair: Thank you.

Chair Rowland: Carrie, if you're watching, how you doing? Beth, are there any questions that are populated in the Q&A box on AC13?

Beth Seymour: Yes, there are. I have a few questions.

Chair Rowland: Fire away.

Beth Seymour: The first is from Karl Reichard in Engineering. Do these changes apply to all faculty positions including research faculty?

Kathleen Bieschke: All full-time faculty. Yes.

Beth Seymour: OK, the second question is from Allen Larson at new Kensington. Is the premise that every search committee must have at least five members?

Kathleen Bieschke: Yes, that is the-- we know that there may be exceptions to five, but we thought that- -we think five is a reasonable number to have an expectation to have on a search committee. There will be occasionally times when it's lower than that. And we’ve built in an exception mechanism into the policy.

Beth Seymour: All right. And I have another question, one from Josh Kirby at Education. The revised policy doesn't address consequences for failing to adhere to the conditions outlined. Are there consequences? What are they? And who is the arbiter?

Suzanne Adair: So, yeah, we didn't put in specific consequences. Part of this is about Kathy's office and my office monitoring searches and what the search process looks like. We have requirements that we need to meet, both for federal requirements and guidelines. And then we've got the other side of this, which is the vision. What it is that we're trying to accomplish?

We know that we need to further diversify our workforce. And so, we will be paying attention, and we will be having conversations with colleges and campuses as we watch what happens once we implement this new policy to talk about, why is this not happening? What is it that you need to be accountable for? Here are what our expectations are. So, we didn't lay out particular sanctions, if you will. But there will most definitely be conversations and some monitoring around adherence to these kinds of efforts that we expect people to put in place.
Chair Rowland: Very good. Beth?

Beth Seymour: One more question, Nicholas, if we have time.

Chair Rowland: Sure.

Beth Seymour: This is from Gregory Shearer. Do we know that this is a key reason we don't recruit underrepresented groups? I have a hard time thinking that committee composition is the big problem. I'm thinking it's more likely getting them to want to come here and the application pool.

Kathleen Bieschke: I think it's a combination of things. Do they want to be in this community? But it's also, who gets to interview at all? Who gets into the pool? Making sure that we have a very qualified pool and making sure as well that we have a diverse pool.

Those two things are separate but they're important. And if we don't get them to apply, we can't even evaluate their credentials. We can't solve everything with just a hiring policy, but we can take a step in that direction.

Suzanne Adair: Right. And I would say, related to this issue of the composition of search committees, best practices and some research, frankly, tells us-- and we've seen it in action-- we know, when we have more diverse search committees, people do bring this multitude of perspectives to the table. It allows folks to push folks. It allows people to challenge people a bit more, diplomatically, hopefully.

But certainly, that happens around, well, what do you mean by fit when people are in the middle of a search committee saying somebody doesn't fit? It allows for that kind of conversation. And I call them sort of candid conversations or critical conversations that need to happen. And that makes a difference.

Chair Rowland: OK, thank you. I think that, at this point, it is now time for us to move to the vote. So, thank you, Kathy. And thank you, Suzanne, for joining us to do that presentation.

Suzanne Adair: Sure. Thanks, Nicholas.

Chair Rowland: Senators, please join me on polleverywhere.com in order to cast your vote. To accept the motion and pass this report on a brand new AC13, please press A. If you'd like to reject, please press B. Please take a moment and cast your vote online now.

OK, we're going to shift gears now and move to our final advisory consultative report. I see that Brian King is already here. Good. This is from the Senate Committee on Global Programs.

Sustainability Opportunities and Sustainable Experiences Abroad

Susan Fredricks, Brandywine: I'm sorry. I'm having some technical difficulty with my Zoom. Go figure. Let me try-- this is a global program sustainability report. And at this time, I would like to thank Brian King and Brian Brubaker, who is the Director of Education Abroad. Well, I hope everybody can hear me.
So, this report is about the global program of sustainability. It was divided into three different sections. The first one was on the current information on our study abroad and what courses we have involved in sustainability. The second one is on sustainability in practice, and then finally, our recommendations.

So, the first section, we reviewed the existing study abroad programs with a particular focus on those that engaged, particularly with and specifically with study abroad. We provided a number of examples, and we have a fabulous table that looks at and highlights the courses and how many offerings we have. The second section was on sustainability in practice. And this one really looks at the carbon footprint that we have. And-- I'm sorry. Was there a technical problem with that? No?

**Chair Rowland:** I'm not sure what just happened there.

**Susan Fredricks:** Oh, I lost the screen. Was there a technical problem with my sharing?

**Chair Rowland:** I mean, the quality of the sound, it sounds a little crackly, I guess.

**Susan Fredricks:** OK. I'm sure that's probably what's going on. Hold on. I'm sorry about that. I got a text saying that nobody could understand what I was saying.

**Chair Rowland:** I just got a text that said, maybe if you shut off your video, you might get clear audio.

**Susan Fredricks:** Let's try that. Sorry about that, everybody. Let me try this again. OK. Wonderful technology.

So, what I was going over was the three different components. And the second component was on the current information on study abroad, and then which had a wonderful chart. The fourth one was on the study abroad with the costs and the actual carbon footprint. And it really dived into the costs of flying and information like that. It looked at the sustainability through the different study abroad programs. And it also looked at a table that has the assessment of our carbon footprint from State College in Pennsylvania and other world regions and different locations.

The final part of the report has the idea of what our recommendations are. And our recommendations include such things as the current and future study abroad experiences and how we need to consider what Provost Jones talked about with the 17 United Nations SDGs and how we incorporate those into our interactions and additional educational experiences. We also recommend that we need to update our cataloging tracking of global courses, because I believe that we have a number of courses that are aligned or that have some sustainability component to it but aren't necessarily tracked as such. So, we need to take a look at how we're offering, what we're offering, and how they incorporate sustainability for future.

Our third recommendation is that we need to encourage our study abroad courses to support the faculty Senate. And it's probably part of the bigger sustainability issues, providing that support for all of our travel experiences for students, understand that global programs is an essential component on sustainability for our students, and trying to work in specific assignments into the syllabus, looking with the community of where we travel, where we have global programs. And I know now we're looking at how to be global when we can't necessarily travel, so that's a bigger experience.

And then, of course, the fourth recommendation is that we have sponsors for our study abroad programs, because there is a value in international travel. We have to look at if that outweighs actually going or
having more of a global focus on that. So that is it for this. Does anybody have any questions? And I apologize for the technical difficulty.

**Chair Rowland:** Oh, please, no need to apologize, Susan. We've all had plenty of experiences on Zoom. So, thank you for that presentation. And, of course, also for the report itself. Beth, have we got any questions populating in Q&A?

**Beth Seymour:** We do not.

**Chair Rowland:** We do not. In that case, senators, this will be the last time. And then after all the suspense, we will reveal all of the votes. So please join me on polleverywhere.com to cast your vote. In order to accept the motion and pass this report from Global Programs, please press A. In order to reject, please press B. Go on there and just take a moment and cast your vote in order to--

Also, it's worth noting, I suppose, from a logistical point of view, it's going to take just a moment to capture this vote itself. And so, we're going to have to just take a brief 30 or so seconds, the way that we would normally on the floor of the Senate, and just wait for the system to tally all the votes. And once we're able to do that, we will reveal all of the tallied results from our votes today.

And for those of you that are joining us by phone that may not yourself be able to see the screen that's being presented-- I know that happens to me all the time-- Anna Butler is going to join us shortly and is going to read the results of our votes into the record before we transition and start to review our informational reports. The first batch which will be web-only. And the second part, the second half, rather, will appear as presentations.

And so, once Anna is ready, we will see that. Also, as a side function, now that I reflect on it, as Anna reads it, that will give us the opportunity to have the votes officially read into the record, which if you recall from times when we're on the Senate floor, we'll oftentimes have our beloved Paula Brown read the count on the floor. Oh, and here we are. So, Anna, do you want to take over and read the results, please?

**Anna Butler, Office of the Senate:** Just bear with me a minute. Can you hear me?

**Chair Rowland:** Yeah, we can hear you.

**Anna Butler:** OK. All right. So, what I can say is that they all passed, first of all.

**Chair Rowland:** Thank you.

**Anna Butler:** Faculty Senate Climate Action Solution, that was appendix C in the addendum, we had 104 accept and 14 reject. Changes to Senate Policy 60-10, Concurrent Majors Program, that was appendix F, we had 133 accept and zero reject. Creation of Senate Policies 1-99, 42-83, and 83-99 was appendix BB, and we had 141 accept and one reject.

Revision to Standing Rules, Article 2, the Committee on Student Life, we had 134 accept and six reject. Revisions to Standing Rule of Article 3, Other Functions of the Senate, it was 144 accept and three reject. Revisions to Standing Rule of Article 2, EECE Committee, was 135 accept and two reject. Revisions to Senate Policy 60-30, which was the Division 3, Athletics Schedules, we had 134 accept and two. Reject.
Enhancing Academic Advising across Penn State, which is appendix M, 136 accept and six reject. Revision to AC13, which was appendix N, 119 except and 16 reject. And Sustainability Opportunities and Sustainable Experiences Abroad, appendix T, we had 112 accept and 12 reject.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you, Anna, for all that hard work today. I know that was a slightly unorthodox way for us to do voting, but I appreciate that it worked out so well, so thank you very much there. We will move on now to item K, our informational reports.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Chair Rowland: Early this month, members of senate council voted to place the following informational reports which appear in the agenda in an online-only format. As with other reports, I encourage you to read them and disseminate them to faculty in your unit. These reports include ARSSA's annual report on the high school student’s enrollment non-degree in course credits. This is appendix o, Research Scholarship and Creative Activities, Evaluating Collaboration Between University Park and the Commonwealth Campuses and Research and Graduate Education Survey, which is appendix W, as well as Gaining Graduate Status, which appears in appendix AA.

Student Life, their report on Student Complaint Form Informational Report appears in appendix X. The Election Commission's roster of Senates by voting unit, which is a real page-turner, appears in appendix Y. And then lastly, we have our Report of Senate Elections. This appears in appendix Z. These reports will not be discussed at today's meeting. If you have questions or comments about these reports, a quick email off to senate@psu.edu -- that's senate@psu.edu -- is all you need to do. And those questions will be forwarded to the proper committee chair for response.

That said, there are still informational reports. And I can see Steve has joined us already. That's wonderful. So, let me introduce you quick, Steve, and then we'll pass the floor. There is -- this is apropos of why Steve is here -- a special informational report that's sponsored by Senate Council. This appears as appendix b. And the title is Freedom of Speech and College Campuses. This presentation has been allotted 15 minutes for our friend Steve Dunham to join us. Steve, please join us. The floor is yours.

Freedom of Speech and College Campuses

Stephen Dunham, General and Academic Officers: OK. Hope everybody can hear me OK. So the background for the topic, I think, is that, over the last few years, I give to the president and others in senior leadership a list of the top three or four legal compliance issues that the University faces. And free speech and related cultural and political issues have been at the top of the list for the last two to three years, obviously taken over now by the Coronavirus. But nevertheless, it remains a significant set of challenging issues for the University.

And then because of this being a political year, the overlap between the free speech issues and the political issues-- and there is definitely an overlap-- Nicholas and others who saw me give some version of this to those in academic leadership thought it would be helpful to share 10 minutes or so with all of you with any time for questions, if you have any. So, let me do this in a very summary-truncated form. But the purpose, really, is to give people enough background about the perspectives on legal and political issues that appear on campus so that you have a good understanding of where and how they may arise in the classroom, and extracurricular activities, and social media, and enough general knowledge of it to be able to respond.
So with that background, let me start with the fundamental proposition I have that leads to be on University campuses, which is that universities are ground zero for the social and political and cultural issues we see in society. So if you think about the topics that cause political division, cause cultural division, they include-- and I’m going to read the list because I think it helps capture the scope of what we're talking about. It's certainly politics, just electoral politics. It's one of the core issues. Race, diversity, gender, inequality, foreign influence, all the activities relating to Chinese and other influence in American universities, religion, guns, elitism, access and affordability, civility and respect, sustainability, and climate change.

Every one of those issues is important on University campuses. And every one of those issues touches on free speech and academic freedom issues that help organize the way we think about them. Free speech itself is a divisive issue. So, think hate speech. Hate speech is typically thought of as people who say hateful things about somebody else based on their race, say. And hate speech in the courts is protected speech.

As much as we may not like it, it is protected speech under the First Amendment. There are exceptions, which I'll touch on in a minute. But by and large, hate speech is protected. And that leads to divisions over, well, what good is the First Amendment if it allows people to engage in hate speech that hurts others, hurts students, hurts other employees? And so, it is itself a potentially divisive issue. And it's part of why we need to educate both students and ourselves as to how these issues intersect.

But free speech is also an organizing principle on universities. And when I say free speech, for this purpose, I'm including three related ideas. So free speech under the Constitution, First Amendment, academic freedom, which is unique to universities and is more matter of policy than of law, but it is law also, and politics and the ability of political activities to get involved in the classroom, so those three things. But free speech as an organizing principle stems from the old traditional notion of the marketplace of ideas.

So, you've all heard that, right? The best way to react to speech you don't like is more speech. And universities are the classic marketplace of ideas. It's an inherent part of our tradition. I would argue universities more than any other sector of society, along with the press-- I think I have to include the press-- own free speech in American life because of the importance that knowledge, research, teaching, exchange of ideas take place on the University campus.

Using free speech as a way to talk about the social political issues that come up on campus is useful, I think. A very little background about each of the free speech academic freedom politics that I mentioned. Free speech is eight words in the US Constitution. Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech. That's it. It applies to the states through Supreme Court interpretation, and it applies to public universities through judicial interpretation that says Congress means governments, and that can include public universities.

But everything else is interpretation. There is no other Supreme Court doctrine for what free speech means other than universities shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech. Academic freedom is similarly simple. It's freedom to research, freedom to teach, freedom to express views. It comes historically out of the AAUP. It comes historically as a faculty right vis-a-vis government. Governments shouldn't interfere with academic freedom of faculty, principally.
But institutions like Penn State also have academic freedom rights, vis-a-vis the government. Students have academic freedom rights, vis-a-vis both institutions and governments. It's a way to expand, not the law of free speech but notions of free speech to things like what can employees, what can faculty, what can citizens say about matters of public import without getting into trouble on University campuses?

And then the third trilogy, free speech, academic freedom, politics, the law for non-profits-- and for this purpose we'll treat Penn State as a non-profit-- is that we may not spend resources for or against a political candidate-- for or against a political candidate. Obviously, we can have speakers on campus. We can have young Democrats. We can have young Republicans. We can have various other ways.

Politics is part of campus. We can have faculty teaching public policy courses. We can have faculty talking about how they vote, because that may be relevant to their teaching of a public policy course. But we can't spend resources for or against a candidate. And that's in University policy. That's policy 92, 80-92. And that's the third trilogy in these ideas.

So, I'm going to pick 10 random free speech concepts and just mention them and then stop. But first I want to say a lot of the University's commitment to free speech is incorporated in University policies. Policies are the internal law of the University. Obviously, the Senate, all of you through shared governance, through your authority as part of the University, as a decision-making part of the University, have unique roles and importance on policies. And policies are a way for the University to express its commitment to free speech principles, academic freedom principles. So, there are policies on use of open space.

The Old Main Lawn. There are policies on free speech in outside speakers coming on campus. There are policies on discrimination and bias and harassment and how that overlaps with free speech. There is an academic freedom policy. There's a professional responsibility policy.

Policies have a lot to do with this. And at another time, we might talk about whether the University's policy structure adequately promotes the University's interest and mission in free speech. So, with that said, I've got 10 very quick one-sentence-each statements about free speech on campus, free speech and higher education. And let me say, these issues are not quite as directly relevant with all of us teaching virtually and being on Zoom. But they're still highly relevant.

There's Zoom bombing. There's classroom content. There's virtual politics. There's virtual speech. There's social media. There are all kinds of ways universities, faculty, students, employees continue to engage in the marketplace of ideas, even in a Zoom-based world. And so, it will be even more relevant when we open back up. But it remains relevant now.

OK, so my 10 sentences of ideas to keep in mind. One is there are exceptions to absolute free speech protection. That includes defamation. It includes sexual harassment. It includes racial harassment. It includes interfering with University operations. It includes obscenity. And so that's a world unto its own, those issues, but there are exceptions.

Second, it requires sometimes what's called a forum analysis. Has the University opened up the space for free speech? So Old Main is 100%, the lawn of Old Main, a public forum where anybody can say and do anything. Inside a classroom is a limited forum. It is not a public forum. Neither the faculty nor the students can say or do anything. It's a limited forum, and there's restrictions on free speech in a limited
forum. And things like bulletin boards run the gamut all the way from public forums to limited public forums.

OK, number three, speakers on campus. We have a policy. It's AD2. There's policy 2A that regulates speakers on campus. It was a hot topic post-Charlottesville with white nationalists wanting to come speak on campus. It remains a very important topic as we move into a political season.

Hate speech I've already mentioned. It's hateful speech but it's protected by the First Amendment. Time, place, and manner restrictions. Consistent with public forum analysis, universities can still control, a little bit, time, place, and manner, as long as it's not so extreme that it ends up infringing free speech. And that's, of course, a world unto its own.

Classrooms. Academic freedom is probably a more relevant concept in classrooms than free speech. But free speech is, also. And the right of faculty members to say whatever the hell they want, or students to say whatever the hell they want, those are interesting issues that have free speech and academic freedom connotations.

Seven is chilling speech. So there's this doctrine that, frankly, I don't much like because I think it itself chills speech, but that policies that appear to discourage speech can be held to violate the freedom of speech even if nobody's rights are infringed. So, think an overly broad sexual harassment policy could conceivably chill speech. And there's been a lot of recent litigation on whether anti-bias policies on University campuses chill speech.

Speech in a personal capacity, that should be protected by academic freedom. You should have the right as faculty members, employees, to, on social media, anywhere you want, express your personal views. Academic freedom should protect that. To the extent it crosses over to commenting about University related issues or interfering with University activities, it gets more complicated.

Number nine is civility and respect. Everybody believes in civility and respect, except if it's used to squash free speech. People who disagree with a speech they don't agree with and then discipline it, that's a problem under free speech notions. So, civility and respect have to be kept as principles and not disciplinable words in most circumstances.

And finally, there's a lot of buzz words about free speech on campus, microaggressions, trigger warnings, prior restraints, content neutral speech codes, speech zones. And I'll leave for another day talking about those. But they give you all a sense of the breadth and scope.

So, my final statement is I'm essentially here to proselytize for the First Amendment. The First Amendment on campus is core to our mission, core to our core values, core to who we are as an institution. I hope and believe most faculty completely believe in that as well. And I think the more we understand how the First Amendment operates, the better we're able to defend it, the stronger we make the principle, and the more we reinforce the University's mission. So, I will stop with that.

Chair Rowland: Thank you, Steve, for that. Much appreciated. Are there any questions, Beth?

Beth Seymour: Yes, I do have one question.

Chair Rowland: All right, we have one minute. What a coincidence, so let's take it.
Beth Seymour: Cindy Simmons from the College of Communications. The Willard preacher frequently says demeaning things about gay and lesbian students. Is this hate speech? Does it create a hostile learning environment? Or must it be tolerated?

Stephen Dunham: Yeah, by and large, Willard the preacher and other proselytizing religious figures in front of the hub-- and there've been some recently-- are protected by the Free Speech. If they're blocking sidewalks and paths, we can control them because they're interfering with University operations. But the speech itself is protected, even though it has hateful consequences.

It probably is not included with sexual harassment or other forms of harassment. Although, in a classroom, the same speech would. Or in a workplace it would. But in a public forum where, really, the preacher speaks and where the other proselytizing religious figure spoke last year when there was a big confrontation, that's probably protected.

Chair Rowland: Interesting. Very good, Steve. We really appreciate it. Our time has come to a conclusion, so we're going to move on. Thank you for being the guest of the Senate. It's a real pleasure. Thank you.

Faculty Salary Report

Our next report is from the Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits. This is a Faculty Salary Report. It appears in appendix P. I believe that Assistant Vice Provost Karen Vance is going to present this report over a period of 10 minutes time which we have allocated. And so same thing with Steve, if there is a question, please put it in the Q&A. So, Karen, floor is yours.


Karen Vance, Office of the President: I unmuted myself. Thank you.

Chair Rowland: Thank you. Welcome.

Karen Vance: Thank you. So, can everyone see my screen? Or, Nicholas, can you see my screen that shows the report?

Chair Rowland: Mmhmm.

Karen Vance: Thank you. So, the Report on Faculty Salaries is produced nearly every year for the faculty Senate for almost 10 years. This past year, we did not produce this Report on Faculty Salaries for a number of reasons. AC21, we had to adjust for AC21 and the implementation of workday affected some of the data, and we needed to work through those issues. But the Faculty Senate Benefits Committee was very kind to us and allowed us additional time to produce this report.

The Faculty Salary Report contains descriptive statistics on salaries, specifically contract salaries. And there a number of comparisons in the report where we look at location. we look at EAP faculty, Commonwealth campus faculty, faculty at the College of Medicine, Librarians, and Law. And we provide these salaries in a number of different ways, by rank, by gender, by time and rank, by college, by tenure line status.
And one way that we compare these descriptive statistics is not only within the University but across universities as well. So, we compare salaries with our AAU peers, some of the large peer institutions who we can compare University Park faculty salary rates against. We also compare some of the salaries against our Big Ten peers. And then as I mentioned earlier, we also have some Intra-University comparisons as well.

There are different dates for these reports. When we compare across universities, we're looking at 2018-2019 academic year salaries. And the rep-- 2019, so it's a more recent set of data. And we're able to compare these salaries across universities because of a data exchange agreement that we have with a AAU. And we're fortunate to have that agreement.

Where can faculty senators find these reports? In the past, if you can see-- do you see the box folder, Nicholas? OK, wonderful. We're navigating well.

In the past, senators would have found these reports in the box folder. Knowing that box may go away in the future and because of some changes that we made to the report, in here you can find the narrative to the report for 2018-19. And within that narrative, you can find the link to the additional tables. Senators can also find a link to the report by going to the au pair website and clicking on the Faculty Senate Salary Report.

So, I mentioned that the Faculty Benefits Committee was very kind to us in allowing us some additional time to produce the reports. And one of the reasons is that you can imagine, whenever you look at the various statistics by a number of different variables, whether it's rank, whether it's gender, whether it's time and rank, tenure line status, that report becomes very lengthy. And for those of you who have looked at the PDF report that we've provided in the past, it's about 90 pages of tables to filter through. So, we thought we might make a change this year with the Faculty Benefits Committee's approval and to provide something that's interactive, using some more modern technology.

And so, on my screen here you can see a few interactive reports. I don't necessarily want to click on the reports, if that's OK. Because with our agreement, we can't show some salaries to the general public. And because this session is being recorded, those would then be recorded as well. But we wanted to make you aware of how to navigate to these reports and to make you aware of the different types of reports that are available.

This first box right here will lead you to salary comparisons for tenure line faculty, and that's comparisons with our AAUPs, our AAUP peers. Our AAU peers-- sorry. Faculty rankings, that is also a comparison report. We don't necessarily rank faculty, so that may not be the best label for this box, but that's actually how our salaries compare when ranked against other large University salaries.

And then we have a number of different more interactive reports that look at salaries by college, by gender, by division, by rank and so on. I want to recognize the College of Medicine, because the College of Medicine provided us with some data for their peer comparisons, as well as the Librarians. This last report right here that's non-tenure line, this is a new one for this year. And when we met with the Faculty Benefits Committee back in September, we talked a little bit, because of AC21, we needed to revise the look and feel of this non-tenure line report because of the re-titling and the additional ranks.

So, we created a new report specifically to look at non-tenure line faculty salaries. And, senators, whenever you go in and explore these reports, you'll see that we have 2019 data only at this point,
whereas in some of the other reports, you'll see multiple years. And the reason for that is because of the re-titling and the inability to really compare it to have year-over-year comparisons that were really ba18 data this year. And then in future years, we'll be able to just append the data so you can see longitudinal data.

And so, again, I want to thank the Faculty Benefits Committee for working through these challenges with us to make sure that we can provide the senators and others in the University with really some meaningful reports this year.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. Thank you very much. Beth, are there any questions for Karen?

**Beth Seymour:** Yes, I just got one from Laura Pauley, Engineering. I did not see a link to the Salary Report and the Senate Agenda Report. Can link be included on the Senate website? How will non-senators be notified when this information is available?

**Chair Rowland:** Karen, did you hear the question?

**Karen Vance:** I did. I'm sorry. I was deferring to you. Is it possible, Nicholas or Elizabeth, to add it to the Senate website?

**Chair Rowland:** I will look into it. It's hard to know in a moment exactly like this, but--

**Karen Vance:** OK.

**Chair Rowland:** Yeah, to Laura Polly asking that question, we'll look into it. That's a legitimate question and we'll see what we can do. Thanks for the heads up on that. Anything else, Beth?

**Beth Seymour:** Yeah, there's a question from Susan Fredricks, who's at Brandywine. The Commission for Women used to have a gender report on salary. Is that included?

**Karen Vance:** I'm not familiar with this particular report, the Commission report, but there are comparisons in these reports that allow senators to compare salaries across gender.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good.

**Karen Vance:** Between gender.

**Chair Rowland:** OK, it appears that our time is up, so we're going to move on. Thank you, Karen, for joining us on the Senate. Much appreciated. And thank you for that new more interactive approach to salaries. It's much appreciated.

**Karen Vance:** Your welcome.

**Chair Rowland:** Our next report, we're going to bring Ira Saltz. This is Faculty Raises Versus Increases in Faculty Spending on Health Care '13 to '18. This appears in appendix Q We've got five minutes, Ira. Could you give us a quick rundown on the report, please? And thank you for writing it.
Faculty Raises Versus Increases in Faculty Spending on Health Care 2013-2018

**Ira Saltz, Shenango:** OK, can everyone hear me?

**Chair Rowland:** Yep.

**Ira Saltz:** OK. And can everyone see my slides?

**Chair Rowland:** You're good.

**Ira Saltz:** Yeah. OK, good. All right. This report just is a comparison of average faculty raises versus average increases in out-of-pocket expenses and premiums for the period of 2013 to ’18. And this just comes back because there were numerous concerns raised by faculty that there may be a significant portion of their raises being eaten away by increases in their out-of-pocket health care expenses.

And so, the Senate has cast faculty benefits to look at this. I think, originally, we wanted to go back to 2008, but the data that we needed just wasn't there. And one report just showing faculty raises versus average increases in out-of-pocket spending just didn't make sense because of the structure of premiums here at Penn State, and the differences in plans, and that stuff. So, we wanted to take a different approach. And we can thank Willis Watson whatever-- Willis Towers Watson-- yeah, that's it-- for performing this analysis.

Some additional background. 2012, Penn State switches from flat dollar amount premiums to the premiums as a percentage of salary. 2014, Penn State introduces the high deductible health plan or known as the PPO Savings Plan. 2017, Penn State gains access to deidentified claims and income information going back to 2013, that data. And then in 2018, we switched from Highmark Express Scripts to Aetna CVS Caremark.

And so just quickly, what the analysis looked at was, for three different salary levels and for four of our plans, again, what was the average salary increase versus the average increase in out-of-pocket plus premium expenses? The salaries chosen was, for the individual plans, $40,000, $60,000, which was roughly the median salary in 2013, and $100,000. For the family plan, the median salary was more like $72,000, so that was chosen-- $40,000, $72,000, and $100,000. OK. And here's the average raise pool for those five years. Remember, that pool is used for merit adjustments, equity adjustments, promotional salary increases.

All right, so now to the results of the analysis. For those on the PPO plan, employee-only, a person making $40,000 in 2013, over that five-year period, the increase in their out-of-pocket expenses would have been $69 on average, eating up about 1.4% of their raises. The other two groups did even better. Their actual average spendings went down.

And the same for family coverage. So, during that period, average premiums plus out-of-pocket expenses went down. So, you see they're jumping for joy. I mean, that was good news.

Looking for the PPO Savings Plan, it looks like a very different story. Those in the employee-only coverage I see earning $40,000, there actually was a $292 average increase over the four-year period--this is only from 2014 on-- eating away almost 7% of their raises, or 9% of the higher salaries. Looking
at those in the family coverage, the spending increases eat away at about 20% of the salary increases. And so, I think, at this point, those in the PPO Savings Plan are really, really upset.

But please don't jump. Give me a minute to explain. One of the shortcomings was that, before the switch to the two plans, everyone was on the PPO plan in 2013. And so, the person making $40,000, for example, on the employee-only plan paid a premium of $856 in 2013. But if they switched to the PPO Savings Plan in 2014, their premium was only $200, for $640 difference.

And a person making $100,000, their premium went down from $2,140 to $500. So, this decrease was not reflected in those previous numbers. And it's even nicer for those in the family coverage plan. The premium savings was, again, quite substantial. A person making $100,000, premium fell from $6,040 to $1,469. And so, when we account for those differences, again, it appears that either those in PPO Savings Plan didn't have any of their salary eaten away by these increases in out-of-pocket expenses, or they may even have had lower expenses.

So that's much better news, thus the happy dance there. But what isn't included in that last table were the out-of-pocket plus premium expenses. So that last slide I showed, that wasn't the final amount that they're spending changed. But again, clearly, 20% of their salary increase was not eaten away on average.

The other important thing to note about that analysis was that here in the left column is the percentage of employees enrolled in the PSU health plans, enrolled in the P--

What? Oh. --are enrolled in the PPO Savings Plan. In 2014, only 13%. And you can see that doubles, more than doubled by 2018. And so what's very likely is that the original set of people who moved from the PPO plan to the PPO Savings Plan were those who had well below average claims and were very, very confident that they would save money by moving to that plan.

Over time, more people migrated into the PPO Savings plan. And while they may have had below average claims, they had, on average, probably higher claims than those who moved right away into the new plan. So, the average person whose out-of-pocket expenses we're measuring in this analysis is not the same average person from year to year. So, if we take that into account, the savings for the people who moved into the PPO Savings Plan is even larger.

And then, again, the choice of time period probably affected the results quite a bit. During this timeframe, overall spending on health care declined for the University. One, a large part of that came from the voluntary retirement program, which led to the retirement of a lot of high claims individuals. The movement from Highmark Express Scripts to Aetna CVS Caremark, Aetna CVS Caremark had some deeper discounts for Penn State employees.

Hopefully, also some of it's because of more prudent spending, especially by those who did switch to the PPO Savings plan and were paying more out of pocket, may be thinking twice about what providers they used or whether or not to visit the doctor. And hopefully some of the pricing tools we provided have accounted for that, too. As I said, and the results may vary depending upon what year we started this analysis, I suspect that, during the recession following the financial crisis of 2007-2008, when raises were very low but we were still seeing some significant health care inflation, that it could very well have been the case that the very low salary increases had a significant reduction due to increases in out-of-pocket expenses.
Chair Rowland: Very good, Ira. Much appreciated. We have used up our five minutes, so unfortunately, we're not going to be able to take any questions. Although, the report itself is very well done and probably, I hope, answered many of them outright. So, thank you very much.

Ira Saltz: Yeah.

Child Care at Penn State University

Chair Rowland: We'll move on to the next report. This report is also from Faculty Benefits, report on Child Care at Penn State University. This appears in appendix R. As it happens, this report was going to be presented on the floor of the Senate, but it has been voluntarily put online at this time. And so, we will not have a report on that one.

Moving on, from our Senate Committee on Global Programs, we have a report-- this is going to be presented by Dena Lang-- Explore Treatment of International Students, appears as appendix S. Dena? Has Dena been invited to the panel?

Explore Treatment of International Students

Dena Lang, Engineering: I am here.

Chair Rowland: Yes, Dena, there you are. Wonderful. We have set aside 10 minutes for this report, and so you know what to do.

Dena Lang: All right. Erin was going to share my presentation. So, I'm going to go ahead and get started while that's coming up. Our committee was charged with looking into the treatment of international students and community establishments, like restaurants and bars, as well as institutional locations, such as post offices and DMVs, both at University Park and the campuses.

These prior issues were brought to our attention in the fall of 2018, and our committee had presented an earlier report to the Senate in March of 2019. That report described unfair visa inspections and entry denial of international students at local establishments. And our current charge was to follow up on that report.

Next slide. To determine the extent of the unfair treatment, we reached-- excuse me-- out to a number of individuals and student groups. This included the University Park colleges through administrators and an international diversity and inclusion or education equity program within each college. We also reached out to the campuses, including the Great Valley Student Services, Penn State Harrisburg Office of Student Life and Intercultural Programs, and Penn State Hershey Office of Respectful learning.

We also reached out to all advisors in the DISSA office and as well as all global education coordinators. And we reached out to several student groups, including the International Student Council, the UP Undergraduate Association, the Graduate and Professional Student Association, the Latin American Graduate Student Association, the Indian Graduate Student Association, and the Lehigh Valley International Student Group. In addition, we reached out to two student related initiatives, and that included the EPIC Center and the faculty from World and Conversations.
Next slide, please. The majority of those that we contacted had indicated that they had not heard of any of related reports of unfair treatment. We did hear some reports of unfair inspection of visas at local establishments, but these were mostly a few years old. The graduate and professional Student Association had reported that there was a general awareness of these inspection issues in the past, but they couldn't say that it was going on right now. They did feel, though, that Puerto Rican population was being targeted more than other populations.

We did hear about issues with getting driver's licenses. These were reported at the DMVs in Norristown in McKeesport, and these seem to be due to errors in the system and available personnel to process the paperwork. We heard of issues with the Social Security Administration in Harrisburg and Behrend, and these were thought to be due to training issues and understanding the process. And three to five years ago, international students from the Fayette campus had issues with the Social Security Administration where those students were interviewed excessively. But that's no longer being reported.

In Harrisburg, there were problems reported with apartment complexes in York that were taking advantage of students because of their lack of knowledge regarding deposits and evictions. And then there were a number of reports of discriminatory comments. One faculty had indicated on the streets of downtown State College that their daughter from Guatemala had encountered numerous shouts directed at her to go back to her own country.

In Harrisburg, there were reports of hate messages targeting an alumnus that was trying to open a restaurant. And at Penn State Hershey, there were three incidents reported of discriminatory comments towards a Syrian refugee, the Latino community, and a black student on campus. And the Graduate and Professional Student Association had reported a number of other concerns from international students. And these ranged from a hardship in the timing of when they get their first stipend payment, unequal access to jobs on campus, and unequal consideration for University fellowships or scholarships, and a feeling that they were not free to speak their native language in public spaces.

They also reported problems getting paperwork through the DISSA office on time and with how they were being treated. There was a sense that the office was understaffed, and the students needed more help with the visa process. The EPIC center also reported that they consistently hear from international students that they feel excluded or ignored during class discussions or group work, and they can find it difficult to develop friendships with American students.

The DISSA office had provided some context for some of these issues. The restaurants and bars have denied entry due to the visa stamp being expired. However, an expired visa cannot be used to deny entry to a bar or restaurant. Apartment complexes and landlords sometimes deny rentals to those without a social security number who have an insufficient income history. And the DISSA office believes that the landlords are not aware that international students and scholars must have a documented means of support before they can be issued an I20 or DS 2019.

The DISSA office also has established a strong working relationship with the DMV and Social Security Administration, and they indicated that the data transfer issues from the DHS within the electronic system creates a significant amount of work for them in their efforts in helping students. Masume Assaf, the director of DISSA, communicated her concerns to the PA Control Board, Liquor Control Board, about discriminatory behaviors, and the board followed up with a letter outlining the liquor code and described the inspection of visas as discriminatory. And that letter was circulated to some in the community. And we feel that that letter may have helped to reduce the number of these incidents.
Next slide, please. We have the following considerations we'd like to put forth. We think a reporting system should be in place where international students can report any incident of mistreatment. And a review committee should be in place to review the reports and a task force in place to look over if any reports of mistreatment is found and determine the next steps. We also think that an overview of the liquor code outlining this discriminatory action should be sent to local establishments, just to make certain everybody's heard about this. And incoming international students should check with global programs to ensure all their records are current and updated in the government systems.

And finally, it was recommended or considered that international students should be encouraged to obtain a Pennsylvania photo ID. These are issued by the DMV. And if they have these, it would also eliminate the need for them to carry around their passports. That's all I have. And I'd be happy to answer questions.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. Thank you so much, Dena. Beth, have any questions come through on Q&A?

**Beth Seymour:** No, Nicholas. We have no questions.

**Chair Rowland:** Good. In that case, Dena, your work is done. Thank you so much. We really appreciate you looking into this.

**Dena Lang:** Thank you.

**Chair Rowland:** Our next item, we will invite back Karen Vance who joined us previously to talk about the-- must be hitting all the committees, a little bit of Faculty Affairs, a little bit of Faculty Benefits. This next report is sponsored by our Senate Committees on Intra-University Relations and Faculty Affairs. For their Stated Duties and Our Standing Rules, They Are To Deliver A Promotion Flow Report. This year, that is appearing in appendix U.

Five minutes has been set aside for this report. You might recall that, in the December 2019 meeting, this was the first time that the Senate had called for this by putting it into our standing rules. And if it appears in this meeting, that means it was being circulated in the last meeting, or a couple of days after spring break. And so, it is encouraging to see that we have it. Has Karen been able to join us?

**Promotion Flow Report**

**Karen Vance:** Yes, I am here. And I am wondering if we might want to pull Kathy Bieschke in the conversation.

**Chair Rowland:** That's going to be hard to do on a moment's notice like this. I'm not sure she's at her desk. But--

**Karen Vance:** OK. I can speak to it. I wasn't expecting to speak to it.

**Chair Rowland:** I'm sorry.

**Karen Vance:** But I certainly can. I think Kathy's office did the majority of the work on the report.

**Chair Rowland:** OK, Erin, could you bring Kathy in? And maybe, Karen, you'll just start us out.
Karen Vance: Sure. So, one of the things we wanted to look at when we began looking at the non-tenure line report was the promotion. And what we found was through AC21, that with the re-titling and the change of ranks, that we weren't really able to do a longitudinal report. Oh, Kathy, I'm glad you're here. Kathy and Nicholas and Beth and I met earlier this year to talk about the possibility of doing a baseline report where we start with 2019 numbers and then grow from there.

Kathleen Bieschke: You want me to say a few words here? Since we implemented AC21, I knew from the Senate that there were some issues that were of particular importance. Were people getting salary increases as specified by-- can't hear me?

Chair Rowland: Oh, there you go. That's better.

Kathleen Bieschke: OK. Maybe I have to do this. Were people hearing me-- I'm sorry. Were people getting salary increases as specified by policy? And there was a real push from the Senate and supported by the administration that those at the highest ranks would get multi-level, multi-year contracts. I wanted to be able to oversee whether those things were happening, so I just started collecting the data on my own, not knowing that Karen and I would get to work on this later, and just wanted to monitor, were people getting promoted each unit? Were the salary increases happening? Were the multi-year contracts getting awarded?

You can see that those things are monitored and seem to be reflected in the report. We didn't include the College of Medicine, Law, and the Libraries. They're sort of treated separately in AC21. But I think, probably moving forward, we would like to include both of those in there.

We also recognize that we should have tiered it. So, there are people who are-- it's a little complicated to tell from the report if somebody is on a track with a master's degree or with a PhD. And so, we will monitor that and separate that out moving forward as well. So, at any rate, Karen and I have a lot of ideas about how to move this report into even better shape. Abby Diehl, the new assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs in my office will be working with Karen on this. And I expect that this report will just get better and better. And I know, Karen, you've been talking with Beth about getting the committee together to continually improve this report to make it meaningful for the Senate.

Chair Rowland: Wonderful. Thank you, Kathy. And thank you for pinch-hitting momentarily there, Karen. Beth, do you see any questions?

Beth Seymour: No, Nicholas. We don't have any questions.

Chair Rowland: Not at this time. Very good.

Ira Saltz: I had a question, but I couldn't type it in because I'm still a panelist. So--

Chair Rowland: Just give it a rip then, Ira. Let's go.

Ira Saltz: Yeah, OK. Sorry. Is it still the case that the promotion raises are coming out of the raise pool? And do you see that changing at any time?

Kathleen Bieschke: The promotion increases for non-tenured line faculty are funded at the unit level, not the University level.
Ira Saltz: Right. So, it comes out of--

Kathleen Bieschke: I think that's a good question to ask Nick, as our person who oversees the budget.

Ira Saltz: OK, all right.

Kathleen Bieschke: But there will be promotion increases this year. Oh, Nick is here.

Provost Jones: He's here. Yep. No, Ira, the raise pool and the general salary increase pool are separate pools.

Ira Saltz: Great. Thank you.

Provost Jones: As Kathy just indicated, this year there is no GSI, but there are still resources available for raises.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thanks for that clarification, Nick, and for jumping on so quick. That's very good.

Provost Jones: No problem.

Chair Rowland: OK. Any more questions? Ira, are you good? I presume so, judging by your silence.

Ira Saltz: Yes, I'm good.

Chair Rowland: OK, in that case, we're going to move on to the next presentation. The next one will be presented by Don Welch. He is the acting Vice President and CIO here at Penn State. The report is coming and is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology. It's entitled IT Sustainability Initiatives. This one appears in appendix V. Don?

IT Sustainability Initiatives

Don Welch, Office of the President: Yeah. Thanks, Nick. And are you seeing the presentation now?

Chair Rowland: Yep, looks great.

Don Welch: Great. OK, so I am going to just give a quick update on some of the things that we're doing towards sustainability. And we know our definition from sustainability. And really, things have been part of some large efforts and some small efforts. And we've been moving in the right direction in terms of our impact on the environment, but we're also not ignoring some of the other things that contribute to sustainability.

Server virtualization is probably the biggest thing that we've done. And so, in the old model, we had a lot of physical servers, and they would normally be running at about 5% of their CPU capacity. We started combining those, running in virtual servers so that we get more utilization out of the hardware. And there's a lot of benefits that come from that.
In the new model, we're going use, obviously, less energy. And you see some of the impact that we've had there. And I think what's also important is less e-waste. The fewer physical servers that we have, the fewer of the heavy metals and other things that are in electronic devices that have to go into our landfill. So, you see over a 10-year period, we have really driven down the amount of power that we've used. And when you look at how much we've increased the computing that the University does, then I think you can see that it's really made a significant impact.

Very quickly, back 10 years ago, one server, then we moved to a model where we were putting 40 physical servers on one-- 40 virtual servers on one physical server. And now we are up to 80 to 1. And so, we're increasing that utilization. And we're also freeing up space.

We've had a number of occasions where we've been able to close down data centers throughout the University, turn that back over to either lab or classroom space. And that space overall contributes because it has to be heated and cooled and maintained there, too. We have 11,000 square feet of space that's returned, and we're going to be working on some initiatives, too, to look at labs and how much we need to have those labs dedicated.

Little things. Desktop power settings. So, on the computers that are managed centrally, we have changed the power settings so that, when the system is not in use, it will cycle down. And we've saved a lot of money, which, of course, is important in this environment, but also quite a bit of power. Even though we're burning natural gas and being more efficient, still we are putting carbon out for all the kilowatts that we produce.

One of the things that we're working on, we have started monitor lifecycle refreshing in a period or in a standard lifecycle. Monitors tend to last longer than PCs, so we're trying to reduce e-waste there. We've got a signature project underway. We're trying to reduce the need of the University to print out paper, sign it, and scan it back in. Some processes require this multiple times.

Password reset improvements. Doesn't really save much in terms of our carbon footprint, but happiness is part of sustainability. And the fewer times you have to reset your password or log in, generally speaking, the happier you are. We did this presentation before the pandemic, but trying to reduce our need to travel, especially with our one University geographically dispersed. The ability to have these virtual meetings and to use those is important. That was just a quick rundown of some of the things that we're doing so you get an idea there. And I'm open for questions.

Chair Rowland: That was fantastic, Don. Thank you. Beth, have any questions popped in the Q&A for us?

Beth Seymour: No, Nicholas. We don't have any questions.

Chair Rowland: Well, in that case, Don, very efficient, very effective. I'm sure we'll continue talking in the future. So, thank you for joining the Senate today.

Don Welch: Yep, thank you.

Chair Rowland: Thank you. OK, in that case, for our final report, I'd just simply like to draw everyone's attention to the Report of Senate Elections. This appears in appendix Z of your agenda. It's just a moment
to take a real heartfelt thank you to everybody who stood for all of the elections this year. It was, really, a wonderful slate. And congratulations to those who were victorious.

COMMENTS BY THE OUTGOING CHAIR

Chair Rowland: Next item, comments by the outgoing chair. I'm going to make this exceptionally brief. It's really been an honor to serve as the chair of this Faculty Senate. I enjoyed it all, every minute. I'm grateful for all that I saw this year and for all that everyone is able to accomplish. Even against categorically unpredictable setbacks, just felt like the senators were like warriors out there. And I for one am very proud of all that we have done.

Between our resolutions, our special sessions, the rarely used provisions to empower Senate Council, shared governance is strong right now at Penn State. And our efforts have proved that. And it's so very good for us. Because in times like these, where everything is moving and changing so fast, and the leadership of large organizations like Penn State, and including Penn State, must respond to this shifting environment quickly and with agility, well, it is in times like these that shared governance is also susceptible to tremendous violence.

My fellow senators, we must remain vigilant and protect shared governance from the predictable threats to it, to identify unacceptable justifications for why guidance to units simply has to go out before we can get Senate feedback, to avoid a world where the notion of consultation is cheapened and so utterly spent that consultation becomes synonymous with and means little more than. This is why we are doing what we are doing to you.

Thankfully, that is not the situation at Penn State right now. And I'm very pleased to hear that. But as a single outgoing remark to the Senate, we cannot blink, and we mustn't lose grip of our faculty rights, our jurisdiction over our curriculum, and our collective will to be a moral voice for good in the institution. But alas, of course, my time has come and gone, and it is passing very quickly at this moment.

So, I will proudly relinquish the gavel that has been such an honor to have ever held at all. And so, at this point, we're going to move-- when you do it in person, it's much more dramatic. But since we're all on Zoom, it kind of takes some of the drama and the pomp out of it. But we'll move to ceremonially seat our new officers.

And so, based on the report in appendix Z, Lisa Mangel has taken the mantle of our new secretary, so she will ceremonially take Judy Ozment's seat. And so, thank you, Lisa, for your will to serve. And, Judy, thank you for all that you've done this year. It's been wonderful.

Bonj Szczygiel, as new chair elect, will take, again, ceremonially, Beth Seymour's current place. And in turn, Beth will, I guess, take mine. So, thank you both for your willingness to serve. I'm really looking forward to the next couple of years. It's really amazing. So, the next time any one of you gets the chance, please thank Beth, Bonj, and Lisa for their willingness to serve. It's really wonderful. And it's just a real bravo moment for me.

And so, before I pass it over, just briefly I'd like to say something, because in other circumstances, I would now give Beth a parting gift. Although, the gift that I selected has become slightly less useful than when I originally bought it. What I got is a genuine professional-grade antique fatigue kitchen mat to reduce stress while holding long meetings standing at the podium.
So in my mind's eye, when I was first getting it at the beginning of this year, I imagined rolling it out for Beth so that she could have it immediately there in front of the podium, in front of the Senate. However, of course COVID's changed all that. But for my part, I refuse to be robbed of the sentiment that I believe that this gift implies. And that is, Beth, may you have many long and productive Senate meetings as our chair. And with that, Chair Seymour, will you kindly take over the remainder of this agenda? The podium, both virtual and literal, is yours.

**COMMENTS BY INCOMING CHAIR**

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, Nicholas. And thank you for that gift. I look forward to seeing it. I really appreciate it. I also have a gift for you. You will have to virtually-- well, you'll virtually see it now, but we'll have to exchange our gifts, keeping in mind physical distance.

I deeply appreciate your guidance, support, generosity, and leadership over this past year. You've really shown us how to lead, and you've helped me so much as chair elect, so I thank you so much about that. Your help has been invaluable.

I also want to thank Michael and Judy for being wonderful colleagues. I've appreciated your counsel the entire year. Congratulations to Bonj and Lisa on taking their new roles. I look forward to working with you and Nicholas over this coming year.

I'm pleased to announce that Keith Shapiro has agreed to remain the parliamentarian of the Senate, and I'm looking forward to working with him as well. I can't thank the Senate office staff enough for all of their hard work in supporting this and then me during my year as chair elect. So, thank you, Dawn, Kadi, Emily, Anna, and Kathe, for all that you do to make the work of the Senate happen. I'm looking forward to continuing to work with all of you over the coming year, as well as to work with our newbies, Erin and Sarah, who recently joined the office staff.

I must also thank the members of the Senate office who left during the past year. They supported me a lot in my year as chair elect, so I'd like to thank Patty Hoppes, Allison Albinski, and Reci Grabowski for their service. And finally, thank you, Paula. You've provided tireless work for the Senate, our office, and for the senators and guidance to me in my role over the past year. And I wish you the absolute best in the future. You will be deeply missed.

I also look forward to working with all the senators, administrators, staff, and students over the coming year in a climate of shared governance. This coming year is guaranteed to be both interesting and challenging. The COVID-19 crisis poses many challenges for all of us personally, as well as for the University. We'll need to be flexible and adaptable as an institution, and we must keep our focus on the health of our students, staff, and faculty.

As a Senate and faculty, we need to ensure that our eye is kept firmly focused on the academic mission of the University, maintaining our high quality teaching, research, and creative activities, and our service to our communities as the Commonwealth Land-Grant Institution. Shared governance is our strength, and it will help us get through this. And it will ensure that we not only survive as an institution but will also strengthen our ability to fulfill our core mission.

However, the current COVID-19 crisis should not mean that we don't continue to work on items of importance to the Senate. And in fact, many of the same items that we focus our attention on every year
are even more relevant during this year of the Coronavirus pandemic. So, I plan to focus on the core work of the Senate, improving governance and communication to the faculty across the University, improving the curricular process and strengthening the curriculum.

As an institution, we continue to struggle to achieve our goals in building a diverse faculty, staff, and student body. And I plan to focus Senate energy on this topic. I'm optimistic, and I look forward to working with you all in the year ahead. I'm also keeping my remarks brief, so I'm going to move on with the agenda.

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Seymour: Item L is new business. Is there any new business? If you've got any new business, put it in the Q&A. Seeing none?

Nicholas Rowland: I'm not seeing any.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Seymour: Item M, comments and recommendations for the good of the University. Are there any additional comments for the good of the University? OK. May I have a motion to adjourn and a second?

Judy Ozment: So, Moved.

Keith Shaperio: Second.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Seymour: I'm going to take that the motion carries, and so we're adjourned. The next Senate meeting will be on September 15, 2020. I wish you all well, and I'll see you soon.

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, September 15, 2020, 1:00 p.m.
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- Abel, Jonathan
- Abendroth, Catherine
- Aebli, Fred
- Allerheiligen, Nathan
- Amador Medina, Melba
- Aurand, Harold
- Barron, Eric
- Bartolacci, Michael
- Bérubé, Michael
- Bieschke, Kathleen
- Birungi, Patricia
- Bishop-Pierce, Renee
- Blakney, Terry
- Blockett, Kimberly
- Blood, Ingrid
- Boas, Erin
- Borromeo, Renee
- Bosha, Philip
- Boyer, Elizabeth
- Breakey, Laurie
- Browne, Stephen
- Brunsden, Victor
- Bryan, Julia
- Byrd, Amanda
- Byrne, Christopher
- Calore, Gary
- Casper, Gretchen
- Clark, Mary Beth
- Clements, Ann
- Coduti, Wendy
- Conti, Delia
- Costanzo, Denise
- Czymoniewicz-Klippel, Melina
- Davis, Dwight
• Davis, Felecia
• DeFranco, Joanna
• Dreisbach, Debra
• Duffey, Michele
• Eckhardt, Caroline
• Egolf, Roger
• Elias, Ryan
• Engel, Renata
• Evans, Edward
• Fairbank, James
• Farmer, Susan Beth
• Fausnight, Tracy
  Folkers, Deirdre
• Forster, Peter
• Fox, Derek
• Fredricks, Susan
• Freiberg, Andrew
• Furfaro, Joyce
• Gallagher, Julie
• Gibbard, Sydney
• Glantz, Edward
• Glenna, Leland
• Goffe, Lorraine
• Grimes, Galen
• Guadagnino, Frank
• Guay, Terrence
• Han, David
• Hanes, Madlyn
• Hardy, Melissa
• Hardyk, Andrew
• Harte, Federico
• Hayford, Harold
• Hodgdon, Kathleen
• Hoffman, Robert
• Hosseinpour, Helia
• Hoxha, Indrit
• Huang, Tai-Yin
• Hughes, Janet
• Jaap, James
• Jett, Dennis
• Jones, Maureen
• Jones, Nicholas
• Jordan, Matthew
• Kaag, Matthew
• Kahl, David
• Karpa, Kelly
• Kass, Lawrence
• Kenyon, William
• King, Brian
• King, Elizabeth
• Kirby, Joshua
• Kitko, Lisa
• Kramer, Lauren
• Kubat, Robert
• Kunes, Melissa
• Laman, Jeffrey
• Lang, Dena
• Larson, Allen
• Larson, Daniel
• Le, Binh
• Libby, C
• Liechty, John
• Linehan, Peter
• Linn, Suzanna
• Liu, Dajiang
• Lowden, Max
• Mangel, Lisa
• Marko, Frantisek
• Masters, Katherine
• Mathews, Jonathan
• Maurer, Clifford
• Maximova, Siela
• McBride, M.Scott
• McDade, Kevin
• McKinney, Karyn
• Melton, Robert
• Messner, John
• Michels, Margaret
• Miles, Andrew
• Mocioiu, Irina
• Mookerjee, Rajen
• Moore, Jacob
• Najjar, Raymond
• Nesbitt, Jennifer
• Neves, Rogerio
• Novotny, Eric
• Ofosu, Willie
• Ozment, Judith
• Page, B.Richard
• Palmer, Timothy
• Pangborn, Robert
• Pauley, Laura
• Peng, Xuwen
• Perkins, Daniel
• Petrilla, Rosemarie
• Phillips, Kathleen
• Pierce, Mari Beth
• Posey, Lisa
• Pragg, Brianne
• Precht, Jay
• Prescod, Diandra
• Pyeatt, Nicholas
• Rasouli, Mohammad
• Redmond, Brian
• Reichard, Karl
• Reid-Walsh, Jacqueline
• Rhen, Linda
• Riccomini, Paul
• Robertson, Gavin
• Robicheaux, Timothy
• Robinett, Richard
• Robinson, Brandi
• Ropson, Ira
• Rowland, Nicholas
• Ruggiero, Francesca
• Rutherford Siegel, Susan
• Saltz, Ira
• Santos, Diego
• Saunders, Brian
• Scott, Geoffrey
• Seymour, Elizabeth
• Shannon, Robert
• Shapiro, Keith
• Sharma, Amit
• Shea, Maura
• Shearer, Gregory
• Sigurdsson, Steinn
• Sillner, Andrea
• Simmons, Cynthia
• Sims, Damon
• Sinha, Alok
• Skladany, Martin
• Smith, David
• Snyder, Stephen
• Specht, Charles
• Speer, Stephen
• Sprow Forté, Karin
• Stephens, Mark
• Stine, Michele
• Strauss, James
• Strickland, Martha
• Subramanian, Rajarajan
• Suliman, Samia
• Szczygiel, Bonj
• Tavangarian, Fariborz
• Taylor, Ann
• Thomchick, Evelyn
• Townsend, Sarah
• Troester, Rodney
• Tyworth, Michael
• Van Hook, Stephen
• Vasilatos-Younken, Regina
• Volk Chewning, Lisa
• Vollero, Mary
• Vrana, Kent
• Wang, Ming
• Warner, Alfred
• Webster, Isabella
• Wede, Joshua
• Whitcomb, Tiffany
• Whitehurst, Marcus
• Williams, Mary Beth
• Williams, Nicole
• Wolfe, Douglas
• Wong, Jeffrey
• Zaffuto, Michael
• Zhang, Qiming
• Zilleruelo, Arturo
• Zorn, Christopher

Elected  177
Students  11
Ex Officio  5
Appointed  10
Total  203