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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, September 15, 2020, at 1:00 p.m. via Zoom Webinar and in person at the Foster Auditorium, with Elizabeth Seymour, Chair, presiding.

Chair Seymour, Penn State Altoona: Hi everyone. Can you hear me? Good. Let's start the meeting. It's 1:00 PM Tuesday, September 15, 2020 and the Senate is now in session. We are running a modified in-person meeting with a group physically distancing in Foster auditorium at University Park, while the vast majority of the Senate is participating individually via Zoom.

We ran our last two plenary meetings in different ways, and we adapted to remote meeting formats. We've learned from both of those previous meetings and have tried in this meeting to adjust the format to allow for more interaction and transparency. We wanted to have a meeting that is ordered and deliberative while also allowing for the sharing of ideas and vigorous discussions. Let me go through the instructions for the meeting.

Who can speak at the Senate meeting? Only those who are elected, or appointed student faculty administrative or retired Senators or past Chairs have the privilege of the floor. The meetings are public, and others can join and listen, but please do not try to ask a question if you are not a Senator. You can email executive Director Dawn Blasko if you would like to request to speak at a future meeting. Our Zoom capacity is 500 and if we reach capacity you may not be able to attend if you're not a Senator.

We do create a complete record of the meeting that will be available about three weeks after the meeting. This meeting, like all Senate plenary meetings, is being recorded. We have brought you in with your microphones muted and your video off. If you are presenting a report, when it is time for your report, unmute and put your video on. Please wait to speak until you are introduced by the Chair.

When you're finished, please mute and turn your camera off. We're using the various Zoom features for different purposes. Chat will be turned on for you to communicate with each other, but we are not closely monitoring chat. You may use it to post a comment, let us know you're having a technical problem, let us know you joined late, or to tell us that you are joining by phone, and if so please list your phone number for attendance. But do not use it to ask a question for a presenter or to be recognized to speak and have the floor.

If you have an emergency, email Kadi Corter at kkw2. How do you ask a question? You have two ways to ask a question. You can raise your hand using the raise hand function. Once I recognize you, your role will be shifted to panelist and then you can ask your question. Like our in-person meetings, you must begin by stating your last name and academic unit-- for example, Seymore, Altoona.

Please speak clearly and slowly as the audio is not always clear on Zoom calls. You can also enter your question into the Q&A with your name and unit. Please skim the Q&A before posting to make sure you will not be asking a question that is similar to ones already posted. Just like fully in-person Senate meetings, we might not be able to answer everyone's questions, but we will capture the Q&A and pass along questions that haven't been answered.

How do you vote? For those on Zoom, we're using Poll Everywhere in order to vote. If you haven't done so already, log in to Poll Everywhere as our original first order of business, but I'll get to new order in a minute. As with every meeting is a vote on the minutes from the previous meeting. For those in Foster Auditorium, when prompted you'll raise your hand to vote for or against a motion.
A final note, please be patient. Running a meeting like this has a lot of moving parts. So, give us time. Before we officially start, I want to welcome everyone and thank you for being here. During this time of intense stress and pressure, I appreciate your work with the Senate even more. We are all busy with the work of our day jobs—teachers, researchers, administrators, staff, and students, so I appreciate all of the time Senators put into making the Senate work.

We have a robust agenda which is evidence of that effort and commitment. I want to thank our guests for attending and engaging in the work of the Senate. This is also important. And I want to thank the Senate office for their hard work. Without their support, the Senate could not get its work accomplished. I don't know what we would do without them, frankly.

So, let us move to the agenda. And this is where I'm going off script a little bit. So, the first vote that I'm going to ask for is a vote to reorder the agenda. I ask the Senate to reorder the agenda as the Provost needs to leave early and I would like to move his portion up in the agenda so that we have full time with him. The Provost also may be a little later than he's listed in the agenda, and if that's the case, I want him to be able to come in after whatever order of business has finished at that point.

So, may I have a motion to reorder the agenda to allow this change? Do I have a second? Thank you. At this point, please join on Polleverywhere.com to cast your vote. So, we get to experiment with using Poll Everywhere for our first motion. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

I'll give Poll Everywhere some time to do that. And I'll ask for votes in the room. Everyone who supports the motion, raise your hand. Do I have somebody counting? Anyone oppose the motion?

OK, thank you. We'll have the results as soon as Poll Everywhere is done. Thank you, everyone. The motion has passed. And:

Just so we can have full time with the Provost, I want to move him up and have his remarks now. So, let me get to my script.

Hi. President Barron, you have the floor. So please—

**COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY**

**Eric Barron, President, Penn State University**: Great, thank you very much. So, a couple of apologies and thanks. First of all, I'm sorry I'm not sitting six feet between Nick Jones and Kathy Bieschke. But I am recovering from knee replacement surgery, so sitting at my desk at home, trying to do my best to focus on all the different things that we need to. And second, thank you for changing the order as we have a call from the governor's office where they've asked us to participate in. And so that that's an important step.

So, if the call is short, I will return and I will stay in the room for as long as I can to listen to the business of the Senate until it is time for that call. So third, and basically what I wanted to focus on, is that I have started down the path of giving a different talk which I've entitled, Extraordinary Challenges Versus Extraordinary Efforts. It's what I intend to present at the board of trustees in the public meeting.

And although I won't provide all the details of that, I did this with the opportunity to step back, and step back first and think about how proud we were that we were able to go remote after spring break and get
63,000 students in remote classrooms on 10:00 AM for the first morning. And then of course, to realize that going back, returning, is a far bigger challenge than going remote was. But I'm struck by the fact that we put forth an extraordinary amount of effort, lots and lots of input, some very positive and some less positive but we have to have both, of what we went through with the same guiding principles, health and safety of faculty, staff, and students being important, the financial well-being of our employees being important, and our sense of responsibility in the community.

Sometimes it may seem that we can't accomplish all of those goals. But certainly, they were high on our list. So, for example, we really worked hard to make sure that none of our employees through the summer were financially harmed by the pandemic and the fact that they couldn't come to work. And we have a continuing commitment to our faculty and staff to make sure that you are employed at this institution and you're happily employed at this institution, even though in the midst of a pandemic we can't manage every single problem. But then I look at how that also played out. And we have the concept of meeting students where they are.

Extraordinary amount of effort by an awful lot of people where, OK, you want to change campus? That's fine. Different price structure because you need it? That's fine. You want to go to World Campus? That's fine.

You're not going to go for two years; you're doing this for short term until you feel comfortable? That's fine. You want to go fully remote? That's fine. And basically, we sent a signal-- and I don't think many institutions were capable of the breadth of that signal-- to say, we will meet you where you are. And that means the students that are coming to a campus across this University have done so either because there was a portion of the curriculum that they must have in person, or because they made this as a decision.

And the next part of this was faculty and what faculty wanted and needed to do with respect to what your home situation was like with respect to underlying conditions. And I marveled at the fact that we had more faculty interested in teaching face to face than we had facilities, socially distanced facilities, classrooms, in order to be able to manage that. And ended up with about half of the sections-- of course, that's not half the students-- half of the sections which were either hybrid or face to face.

For my own class I chose face to face because of the level of discussion. And I must admit, I found it to be extremely rewarding, good discussion, felt really wonderful to be in a classroom and I felt safe. And the students actually verbalized that they felt safe. So that third part of that effort all summer long was really a transformation of the facilities. And the folks I know, OPP and other folks, that effort that they put forth in order to manage this IT, in order to manage this, was truly remarkable.

And the fourth part was testing and tracing strategy. And we made the argument that, based on our pre-arrival testing, we could predict accurately the number of cases that might come on campus. and that a combination of surveillance and symptomatic testing, or people who wanted to be testing because they're worried they would come into contact, that we would-- and contact tracing, and isolation, and quarantine-- that we would have more control and more ability to mitigate than other institutions. And a lot of people had different thoughts and models which they preferred. Very common to hear about Illinois, testing everybody every day.

But the interesting thing about the Illinois model is, they saw the cases, but they didn't have all the strategies we did to mitigate them. So, they leapt forward in terms of the number of cases that were there, where it's taken us three weeks to get close to that first week or 10 days for some of our peer institutions.
And our strategy was really born of our faculty, our experts telling us what the best thing to do was. And I sort of marvel at the degree to which they accurately predicted a lot of the evolution of what has happened.

That doesn't stop the numbers from being concerning because we've watched them grow. And we've watched a community where you can have a wrestling tournament in one of our townships with well over 1,000 people having a great time, or seeing a competition for a junior soccer where nobody is wearing a mask-- not adults or not students-- or our own students having activities and parties, maybe at a complex. And we know this adds a great deal of risk. And we spend a lot of time-- a lot of time thinking about this.

We know we have certain constraints, that the students were going to be here off campus no matter what because they had leases they could not get out of. So, we've known, and it's a discussion among Provosts across the Big Ten, that all of us have college towns full of students that would be here whether we were remote or not. And therefore, in all of our collective opinions, doing our very best to promote activities, and have class, and having more control, and having a full up testing and tracing quarantine and isolation effort, is a better way for us to manage what would be there regardless of what decision that we might make.

And we have the added factor-- I see that someone in the chat, Sarah Townsend, said they're testing twice a week. Yes, they're testing twice a week, but they didn't have any contact tracing, any mitigation efforts. So, they just watched. They were testing enough to watch their numbers grow and grow but they've now adopted that contact tracing and other things that we have done in order to control what those numbers are. And I think if you look at their numbers, they're quite high. We also know that the feds, and our own Department of Health, have said that it's very important that we not send student's home.

A lot of challenges there. The numbers worry us. We have to be very honest about that. But we are looking beyond the numbers, because the numbers aren't the key. The key here is one hospital capacity. And so, this is something we're in close contact with. The second is what our quarantine and isolation space is. And I can tell you that that's flattened out quite a bit as we start to have more and more students now age out and back into the population, no longer being positive or having quarantined a sufficient amount of time that we know that they're safe to return.

And the third part of this is community transmission, or transmission between a student and a faculty member. And so that is something, also, that we're watching very carefully for and we're not seeing. Doesn't mean that we won't see it. We worry about this a great deal. But I just want you to know, it's not all about the numbers. It's about hospitalizations, quarantine and isolation space, and community transmission.

These are the signs of our level of control on what's going on. In the midst of all this, which I went through this sequence of how we thought about this. In the midst of all this, we're breaking research records. That's an extraordinary statement about what the faculty is doing and how they managed research even while being remote. We're watching some marvelous innovations in teaching. I never would have dreamed that we would have a faculty member from Altoona that would be teaching a class remotely in Shanghai in order to make sure that we captured students that couldn't come to this campus.

We see lots and lots of effort on behalf of the faculty, and philanthropy too, increasing in this extremely stressful time. So this is what I mean by extraordinary challenges, because they're considerable, and extraordinary effort, because I can't believe without all these people working so hard that we could have
accomplished so much during a time which is a pandemic, and so hard on so many different people. So that basically is a summary of my comments. I suspect there may be a lot of people that are very curious about what the Big Ten is doing.

There's plenty of rumors out there about what's going to happen tonight. Basically, this institution is committed to the health and safety of the athletes. And we're going to do everything we can, basically, to make sure that we can do that, or we have no business playing. It certainly is very different from a classroom where we can socially distance and mask. It's very different when it's a contact sport. So, it requires extra effort.

So hopefully you will look forward to what might emerge as we move through that discussion among Big Ten Provosts and chancellors. So why don't I stop there. And I'm happy, however mechanism that works for you, to answer questions.

Chair Seymour: So just to remind everyone, if you have questions for President Barron, either raise your hand and you'll be called upon to speak, you'll be elevated to speak from the floor-- the virtual floor- -or put your question in Q&A if you're shy and you don't want to actually speak. So, we're giving you these two ways to be called upon. Dawn, do we have anyone in queue who's raised their hand? Oh, Julio Palma. And I believe you're at Fayette, for the record. Just have some patience as we figure out the technology. Ah, Julio, is that you?

Julio Palma Anda, Fayette: Yes, that's me.

Chair Seymour: OK, you have the floor.

Julio Palma Anda, Fayette: I'm at Fayette. First of all, thanks for your comments. And I wish you a speedy recovery in your surgery and knee replacement. One of our University's initiatives is to advance values like equity, equal opportunity, and social justice. And we know since May, since early May, that this pandemic affects unprivileged groups like Black people, Hispanics, and low-income families.

Several of our commonwealth campuses are community campuses that are located in underserved and low-income areas that has long lasting health and social inequities. For example, Fayette county is one of the poorest counties in the state and is ranked as the second unhealthiest county in the state. Some of our students don't have health insurance. How were these inequities and specific challenges considered in the back to state plan?

President Barron: What is the last part?

Julio Palma Anda: The question is, how these inequities in our communities and specific challenges were considered in the back to state plan?

President Barron: Yeah. So I'm not so sure that you can say directly, other than the sense of whether or not we were going to be a source of considerable community transmission, or whether or not your discussion is also including students in that category. And of course, we focus a lot, at least to the best of our ability financially and otherwise, to make sure that we were as balanced as possible. There were some that would argue that the University operating is even more important for the economics of some areas that than others. But of course, as I think as you're saying, the health care outcomes are extremely different based on income and based on race.
And although that may or may not be something that we directly involve ourselves in, in an overall sense of trying to protect a community financially as well as in terms of health, those things come into play. But I can't say that we went back and said that explicitly.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I don't think we have anyone else who's raised their hands, but we have a few questions in Q&A. So, I'm going to ask the Chair elect, Bonj Szczygiel, to address those. And basically, she's going to read the questions.

Bonj Szczygiel, Arts and Architecture: Doctor Barron, this is from Cindy Simmons College of Communication in University Park. I'll read it to you.

President Barron: I cannot hear the question.

Bonj Szczygiel: Hello, Dr. Barron. Sorry about that.

President Barron: No worries.

Bonj Szczygiel: This is a question from Cindy Simmons from the College of Communications at University Park, and it goes like this. This is actually addressed to both the Senate officers, as well as you and Provost Jones. There has been a robust discussion in the College of Communications about the appropriate use of SRTEs in faculty performance evaluations during the extended time of COVID. Professor Mike Schmierbach asks for a continuation of the SRTE policy change limiting administrative action. It is clear that any idea this would be a normal semester with faculty able to have full autonomy over course design is false and faculty may be vulnerable as targets for student frustration. This Professor also backs a continuation of spring grading policies which allowed students to opt for a switch to pass/fail.

President Barron: Yeah. So, from my viewpoint, there's been a lot of discussion and working with the Faculty Senate on doing that, taking those actions in the spring and additional actions as well. And I know that as we were moving into the fall, a lot of continued discussion on that topic as well. But I think it's probably better for Kathy Bieschke, or perhaps for Nick, to address where those groups have gotten to at this time.

Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost Faculty Affairs: So, I can let the Senate speak for this as well. But there was consultation on whether to continue the alternate grading system for all. And it was decided that at this time, and this is a shared governance decision, not to change the grading system. People have worked hard all summer to deliver their courses in a variety of formats. They had notice. It is a difficult semester, but it would be-- it's complicated to change the grading system. It's unclear that it will necessarily benefit all students. So, I'll speak more about that in a minute when I sit down. In terms of the SRTEs, we have suspended their use in promotion and tenure dossiers for the spring and the summer. And so, we have-- they can be added by the candidate if they're trying to address a problem that they had in their record that the SRTEs would address. But from an equity perspective, given that some courses don't translate as well to the remote format, we didn't want the use of the SRTEs to signal that somehow not including them meant that they would negatively reflect upon the instructor.

So, in our guidelines, we've made it very clear that SRTEs for spring and summer may not be used against-- not including them may not be used against the candidate. And we have a whole appendix
focused on alternative ways of assessing teaching effectiveness that will be useful for candidates to look at if they want to supplement their record in some way. We've also provided more guidance just recently on how to do peer reviews, given that those were suspended in the spring.

But policy is clear. You need student input and you need peer reviews to be considered for tenure. And in fact, many, many candidates have contacted me asking me why they can't use their SRTEs and asking me to continue the use of SRTEs. So, we are charging a committee. I'm meeting with Angela Lindsey within the next day or so to talk about, how can we collect student input in a meaningful way so that candidates may use that in their promotion packets? And this is applicable to both non tenure line and tenure line individuals.

We have to have student input in the dossiers to promote people. So, we will continue to think about creative ways of doing that. Whether we will use the standard SRTE is very much in question. I think Beth can talk a lot about the efforts of the Senate. We've had a lot of talking about that in a special faculty group I've been leading helping me manage this COVID situation that includes representatives from the Senate. But that's where that stands right now.

**Chair Seymour:** And I'll just address this briefly because we have a lot of other questions out there. So as far as the SRTEs, that's an ongoing conversation. I'll leave that aside. But at least now for alternative grading, the Senate conversation has been to not invoke it. If situations change, we might. Some of the other additional considerations are that some students might have problems with entrance to major and other movement in their curriculum if we continually invoke alternative grading.

But that is a conversation we need to continue as the Senate. So, I encourage you to email me at ems22 if you want to give me more feedback on that.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** That is, it for us. That is, it for Q&A. Oh, I'm sorry. We have Tim Robicheaux.

**Chair Seymour:** I recognize Tim Robicheaux. If you could speak and give us your name and unit.

Hi. Rainier Foley-Defiore, please take the floor and the mic. And Tim, I think yours is a written question. I'll get back to that.

**Rainier Foley Defiore, Undergraduate Student:** Hello. Please let me know whenever I'm ready to speak.

**Chair Seymour:** You're up. You are allowed to speak. Please give your unit as well for the record.

**Rainier Foley-Defiore:** Thank you. So, my name is Rainier Foley-Defiore. I am a senior at University Park in the Smeal College of Business. I sit on the Educational Equity and Campus Environment Committee in Faculty Senate. I am also a member of the University Park Undergraduate Association. I have a question directly to President Barron.

And I would like to just ask the question. So understanding the disproportionate impact that COVID-19 has had on Penn State student, faculty, and staff, moving forward in making the decisions with how Penn State will continue, what specific measures are being taken to ensure the decisions impacting our community are being made equitably and with consideration for groups in varying circumstances?
President Barron: Well, so it depends on the specifics of the question you're asking. A common one is financial matters, for which we have said from the beginning this is a priority to us to make sure. And work study students, even not working we paid them. People that were at home and couldn't work, and we paid them. Faculty deserve raises that are considerable because of the extreme amount of effort that they've put forth in transitioning the classrooms and the amount of effort that they have to put in while also managing their families.

I wish that was something that right now we were able to do. But the simple fact of the matter is, we have an extraordinary financial commitment to everyone. We've had a lot of concerns about areas like childcare. And despite some really unfortunate circumstances, have worked really hard to have our child care facilities open in order to be able to manage the simple fact that faculty have so very different household situations in terms of how their work and family life coincide.

The notion of, how would you like to teach, is an effort to overcome all sorts of things from a personal health concern, a health concern of a faculty member, an ability to have child care, or depending on where their students were or how they had to handle those things, all those things are designed to address the fact that everybody's personal circumstances are very different. And even the policies on tenure, I think you'll hear a little bit more about that later, and grading as a part of the tenure process, SRTEs as part of the tenure process, are all designed to minimize some of those impacts.

I will say, however we're in the midst of a pandemic. And we're watching all of our fellow universities out their struggle with the ups and downs of how to manage this and how to manage student behavior and adult behavior in our communities. And so, there is no way to make this smooth and perfect in the midst of the pandemic. But we can do those things that I just described to you to make sure that we're doing our best to take care of our faculty.

I know there are institutions out there that have decided to do layoffs of faculty, particularly non tenure track faculty. And personally, I have absolutely no interest in doing that. We will be back to normal. And we need all these hardworking folks to be there with us.

Chair Seymour: I want to recognize Sarah Townsend.

Sarah Townsend, Liberal Arts: Hi, thank you. I'm Sarah Townsend from the College of Liberal Arts at UP. And my question has to do with pre-arrival testing. Many other public universities, including the University of Illinois, West Virginia University, the University of Maryland, have done 100% comprehensive pre-arrival or post-arrival testing of students. And in the health resources task group executive summary that Nick Jones sent out last Friday afternoon, it was clear that the University's own task group recognized the importance of comprehensive pre-arrival testing as the best way to keep infected students from arriving on campus and start with a low infection rate. However, the report also made clear that the University decided not to go with that option and instead do a much lower rate of pre-arrival testing, primarily as a cost saving measure. It seems that this saved about $5 million.

So given that, for instance, our football coach earns over $5 million a year, and given that Centre County now has a record number of cases again today-- in fact, in the past 24 hours Centre County has been responsible for about one fifth of all new cases in the state of Pennsylvania-- I'm wondering if you still think that that was a good measure, if those $5 million were should have been spent or if that was a wise move on the part of the University.
President Barron: Well, Sarah, I know you've made a big deal about comparisons with Illinois and testing everybody every other day, and about institutions, many of them who were doing everyone a pre-arrival testing. And of course, these really are apples and oranges comparisons. And despite the fact that one factor, probably more than thinking about the cost, because I'd spend $5 million in a minute. I don't know what it has to do with the coaches' salaries, but I'd spend $5 million in a minute to be able to do anything that would protect health and safety. And as a matter of fact, we've frequently had conversations in old main where the comment was, well, that's going to cause such and such a million dollars. And we said, well, so be it, let's keep going.

There were certainly other challenges to doing everyone. But the key part of what the recommendation was, that came from that task force which included our faculty expert, was this multi-layered approach. And literally, they made a prediction on the caseload coming into State College or elsewhere, based on the counties and the prevalence of positivity for where our students were coming from. And if you were in a very high prevalence case, we tested everyone. And if there was zero prevalence, then that didn't seem to be necessary in terms of a strategy for how it is that you would go forward.

And so actually looked to see whether or not those predictions were right. And we saw a couple of places where the testing that we did suggested a higher prevalence rate than the statistics in those counties. And so, we upped our game. Part of our focus is on the very flexibility that we have to change what we're doing.

And so, I got a great deal of confidence that we were very aware of what the potential caseloads were coming into State College. And it was a very small number, and from the viewpoint of the experts, a manageable number. Now of course, particularly at that time, with turnaround times that you hoped were 48 hours and often were five, or six, or seven days, you could have tested everyone and that test was only good as that day and didn't tell you what they did for the next seven days. And that's why I think this multi-layered focus of surveillance testing, pop up testing, testing for people that are symptomatic, contact tracing, testing and isolation for those who have been in close contact, or isolation if they were symptomatic and tested positive, that this has worked as well as it has, and why our numbers-- although growing, and in my opinion growing too high-- grew much more slowly than the other institutions.

And I would argue that the high numbers in places like Madison and Illinois are not just because of testing, because our statistical analysis of this, particularly in surveillance and seen low surveillance numbers but very high prevalence of students that have come in contact or a positive coming in to be tested, that this suggests some level of control. We're also watching our quarantine and isolation flatten as the large numbers this week, close to 400 students aging out of our caseload. So now, is this everything that we might be able to do?

Well, no, if we didn't have supply chain issues, if we could get the costs down, if we could get a lot of these other factors going, we could do even more and more. But if we look at the key things that are making a decision about what it is that we should be doing, I think those metrics look good. But we have a significant number of students that have symptoms or positive tests that are relatively mild cases. If we are right in this, we're going to see this flatten out and perhaps decline. If it doesn't, as an institution we have multiple off ramps.

I think one of the other things is, a lot of people said, well, when you're sending everybody home? Well of course, we cannot do that. But we have multiple off ramps. And again, I think this is a part of this system thought that goes, we could take a program which has too high a positivity, a cohort, say, of
nursing students, and we can put them in isolation. We can do that for a building. We could pause a residence hall for two weeks and work at a quarantine strategy if we saw that there were issues that were associated with that.

We could do this for a campus. We could do it for the entire set of campuses. So we're quite willing and able that if the key metrics that we're looking at every single day are ones that give us concern about hospitalizations, or about transfer to faculty, then we're ready and able to take a variety of different actions. But to tell you the truth, there are lots and lots of people looking at other institutions and their numbers and thinking that we're doing reasonably well given the number of weeks we already have under our belt.

Bonj Szczygiel: Dr. Barron, we have two more questions. The first is from Chris Byrne, and it's a short one. Any question on the availability of the $1 tests that give virtually instant feedback?

President Barron: Yeah. I would love to have a $1 test. And I think if Nick were standing up there, he would tell you that we're already going back to look at what other strategies and capabilities are out there. So, the cost is changing, the type of tests are changing.

We're seeing the emergence of antigen test that are order of $30, $40 a day versus some of the early tests that we were doing that were closer to $120 a test-- day? Test. And so if there are options to do that, we will jump all over them, not just because of the cost difference but because whatever we can do to do better makes more sense. So, I wish it was ready, but not yet.

Bonj Szczygiel: OK. And the last question I've got, at least, is from Tim Robicheaux, Liberal Arts. President Barron, I speak both as a faculty member and currently a homeschool teacher, principal, cafeteria worker, and custodian, in a discussion with a member of the State College area school district board. It would greatly benefit them if COVID posts could occur on Thursday so that they can make decisions about the following Monday. I know you've got a lot of other questions, so just wanted to bring it up.

President Barron: Well, I appreciate you bringing that up. We've had quite a bit of discussion on how to keep a large number of staff from working on Sunday and demanding that they do so in order to get things out on Monday. And then we were spacing that dashboard information out so that you would have a robust sense of the numbers. People have said to me, well, a lot of hospitals report exactly their numbers. But we're a really complex beast and there is a huge amount of manual effort here to be able to include data.

But it's certainly something that we can think about and look at, because we've worked to create a lot of good partnerships with the community here around University Park to be able to be helpful when we can. We have very frequent meetings with the hospital leadership, for example, to understand their caseload which has been quite flat despite the fact that our students have been here for three weeks and so on. But we've been looking at what information we can exchange that would give anybody early warning, if they're seeing something for us to know it. So probably-- I don't know whether the dashboard results on Thursday is the difference, but perhaps if there's key information and it's not part of this manual entry process that we have to go through, we can find a way to be a good partner with the school district.

Chair Seymour: Raymond Najjar, you have the floor.
Raymond Najjar, Earth and Mineral Science: Hi, I'm Ray Najjar from Earth and Mineral Sciences. And I want to—well, when I was first introduced to the Senate we were told about this notion of shared governance which I took, maybe naively, to assume that the Senate played a maybe coequal job in making important decisions about what the University does. And yet it seems to me like the Senate, particularly as a whole body, really has not been engaged very much, if at all, about really important decisions that the University has had to make over the past six months. I know there have been some issues that we've weighed in on. But I would think that since we've been elected by our peers, the body of the Senate would have been engaged to help make some important decisions. And I've been honestly disappointed by the fact that I feel like we've been largely overlooked.

I know that some of our members and our committee Chairs have served on some committees. But it seems to me that an opportunity has been lost to take advantage of the knowledge that the Faculty Senate, again as a body, has.

President Barron: Well, Ray, I'm sorry that you feel that way. It would be interesting to look at some of the specific issues that are high on your thought process there. I know that there are many different things related to tenure clock, and SRTEs, and other things for which there was a very close interaction. And I know that a lot of the other things that were feeding into the decisions were ones for which faculty members were extremely active—

Raymond Najjar: Well, let me be specific. How about, I mean, over the summer there was certainly a lot a lot going on. This could be a question more for Faculty Senate leadership. But I'm surprised that the Faculty Senate didn't have an emergency session, since the University was going through really the biggest crisis, as far as I could tell, it's ever gone through. You would think that the body would have been called on to weigh in on important issues regarding whether we were opening or not, how we would open, and even with regard to the coming spring semester.

It seems to me that the body of the Senate has not been engaged in questions like that. And I may be naive about what the role of the Senate is. But when I'm told that we're part of shared governance, I took that seriously. And I thought that like the Senate of the United States is quite powerful, and now maybe I'm making a false equivalency here, but I would think that we would have had input at a much higher level.

President Barron: Well, I think it would probably be worth exploring on a decision of how we're reopening, what that level of input and interaction was like. And of course, we get input from a lot of different people, including members of the Senate. And I think one of the really more difficult things about this whole process is the degree to which people are so incredibly polarized about what they should do. It is either full closure and remote, or it is, how dare you interrupt my livelihood, and what are you doing anyway? This is nothing worse than the flu.

And so as an administration, we are walking through that landscape, which I guarantee you no matter what we do, unless we go to either pole, of which I believe both poles are incorrect, we'll get a substantial number of people that disagree with us. That has not necessarily anything to do with the notion of shared governance, because I think shared governance is one of the hallmarks of Penn State. And in being at multiple other institutions I don't think I've ever seen it done at the degree here. But there are a lot of different people that are weighing in that have authority on this particular issue.
But I think it would be good to step back, because it's hard to do it in the midst of a pandemic when the
decisions you're making are flooded with information and data. It would be good to step back and say,
are there points here for which we should have done this differently in terms of the interaction? You do
town halls to communicate and you get feedback that way, and you get lots and lots of input from
different people, and you have faculty members on the committee. But is that the same thing? Should
there have been some type of collective voice in there presented?

And at some point, I wouldn't mind going back and saying, where were the shared governance points that
we missed? And where were the communication points that we missed? And did we have any choice at
some of those particular junctions? But I'm not going to minimize your comment.

**Raymond Najjar:** OK, thanks.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Dr. Barron, the questions are rolling in. And we have another one from Deirdre Fulgers,
York. When the HR transformation was initiated, we were told that the new centralized system would
save money, would introduce efficiencies, and would improve serVice. We have added a significant
number of new employees, including strategic consultants, data onboarding specialists, recruiting
specialists, et cetera.

At the same time, the workload for those of us with an HR component to our work has increased
substantially and requests for information often result in responses that are either too general to be of use
or just flat out incorrect. Is there any plan by the University to assess the overall functioning of the new
workday system and attendant administrative employee layers?

**President Barron:** I'm probably not the best person to answer this. I think we knew that there were going
to be hires in there, despite the fact that there was a potential for saving dollars. We've certainly had so
many different employees for which HR was 5%, 10%, 15% of their activities, and it was not a very
efficient process.

And I can certainly go back, especially with the specific circumstances mentioned, on what that workload
might be. There is also certainly a great deal of transition in this particular process that may be a factor.
But otherwise, it's really hard for me to address this specific circumstance like that.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Do we have time for another one, Beth? This one is from Saurabh Bansal from Smeal.
We are seeing two changes in the contracts being offered to fixed term faculty in my unit. One, all faculty
is being transferred to a standing rank. Second, new contracts now have language stating that their
contract can be terminated with a 12-week notice.

The concurrent timing of these changes has elicited a number of concerns in my unit. Is the second
change a response to COVID-- that would be the 12-week notice-- or is it a-- Sorry, we're having
technical difficulties. There we go.

So, the concurrent timing of these changes has elicited a number of concerns. Is the second change A
response to COVID or is it a part of the standard contract that will be offered to all standing fixture and
faculty?

**President Barron:** Yeah. So, maybe Nick wants to weigh in with this question later. But if you
remember, the scenarios that we developed on the potential financial impact of COVID in one particular
case, which was the options on how it is we could proceed. And the ENG budget alone had the potential deficit of about $450 million for the year, continuing into other years. That was hopefully a worst-case scenario.

We haven't been following that scenario. We have done much better than that. But in a circumstance by which you have that type of loss, then it makes sense to include such language. But you will also notice that as a University, we asked the board of trustee’s permission to have a line of credit. I mean, it would be illegal to tap our endowments which are set for a particular purpose, or our research budgets which are set for a particular purpose. So, for ENG, that revenue for tuition is basically, other than what the state gives us, what it is that we can spend.

And so, we asked for a line of credit from the board in order to make sure that we could weather what will occur. So, I can tell you that when we go to the board, we will not be recommending any use of that line of credit because we believe we can manage the expenses. So, in an abundance of caution, we placed language in there because of the potential of something catastrophic. And some people believe we're not out of the woods yet in terms of what's happening with this pandemic and how universities across the country will respond.

So that's why it's there. But I think people should take comfort in the fact that we will not be asking to use that line of credit at this time, because we're managing the finances of the University well. And unfortunately, I do have to exit now. Beth, I apologize for having to do so, to go take a call with the governor's office.

Chair Seymour: Well thank you, President Barron. If there are any other questions in Q&A, we will handle them and try to get answers for those. So, let's resume back to the agenda. The first item is item A, minutes of the preceding meeting. The April 23 Senate record providing a full transcription of the proceedings of the meeting was sent to the University archives and is posted on the Faculty Senate website.

If there are any corrections or additions to these minutes, please send them to Dawn Blasko at dgb6 at your soonest convenience. But for now, I want us to vote on these. And it's a tentative vote. Any changes that will be made, we'll make.

May I hear a motion to tentatively accept the minutes? Do I have a second? Please vote on Poll Everywhere, so cast your vote. To accept the motion, press A-- and this is just the minutes. To reject the motion, please press B.

And I'll take a poll in the room as well. Room, accept raise your hand. Any rejects? Seven accepts, Zero rejects.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Seymour May I hear a motion to tentatively accept the minutes? I have a second? Please vote on Poll Everywhere, so cast your vote. To accept the motion, press A-- and this is just the minutes. To reject the motion, please press B.

And I'll take a poll in the room as well. Room accept raise your hand. Any rejects? Zero rejects.
COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Seymour: It looks like the minutes are accepted so let's move on with our business. Next, item B, communications to the Senate. The Senate curriculum report of September 1st, 2020, is posted on the University Faculty website. Editorial changes, we have two editorial changes to the Senate governing documents from CC&R that were approved at the June 23rd, 2020 Senate Council meetings. The changes reflect new names.

The Committee on Institutional Cooperation, formerly CIC, is now the Big Ten Academic Alliance, or the BTAA, and the Office of Planning and Assessment, OPA, is now the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research, OPAIR. These changes will appear for comment on the Senate website until five days after the Senate meeting. And if we receive no objections, the changes will be made throughout our governance documents.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Seymour: Moving on, Item C, Report of Senate Council-- minutes from the June 23 and September 1, 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 Provost at the June and September meetings.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Seymour: Item D, Announcements by the Chair, today I have the privilege of introducing the 2020-2021 administrative fellows.

The administrative fellows program offers Penn State faculty and staff the opportunity to work with senior University officers to gain knowledge and experiences pertained to the challenges of leadership in the academic community. We have Andrea Tapia, Professor of information sciences and technology. Her mentor is Nicholas Jones, Penn State Executive Vice Provost and Provost. We have Linghao Zhong, Professor of Chemistry and Assistant Director of Academic Affairs, Penn State Mont Alto. His mentor is Madeline Haynes, Vice Provost for Commonwealth campuses and Executive Chancellor.

We also have Moradeyo Olorunnisola, Director of Admissions at Schreyers Honors College. Her mentor is Tracy Houston, Vice Provost for outreach. Welcome to the meeting and congratulations. As I want to give us time for more vigorous discussion during the meeting, I'll keep my remarks fairly short. We're all living and working during a time of intense stress due to a variety of factors-- the global pandemic, ongoing social and racial inequality, and a contentious election cycle.

Unfortunately, the pandemic has been politicized at the local, state, and national levels. As a result of this, we have not addressed our public health crisis adequately as a nation. Therefore, after decades of defunding education across the US, educational institutions at all levels, K through 12 and tertiary education, are all being asked to fix the problem of an inadequate public health response to a global
pandemic as well as focusing on our main mission, education. So, we're all being asked to work together to provide education under extraordinary circumstances.

I commend all of you for working your hardest to do just that whatever mode of instruction you are providing. Our continued work as educators, researchers, and creators is our mission. I also want to thank the staff and administration for the hard work that they provide in supporting our mission across our campuses. I know this has been and continues to be a huge ask and I want to personally thank you all for your efforts.

At the same time, we're going through a necessary and long overdue societal conversation and hopefully real change about systemic racism and injustice in all aspects of American society. The United States has a long and ugly history of systemic racism and violence. Our institutions have been created in this framework and so are deeply marked by inequality. Having said that, I am optimistic as this is the first time in my life, and I'm not very young, where I have felt that there might be a real opportunity for us to make fundamental change if we act and act with purpose. There is much work that we have to do but I'm eager to take up that work and I ask you to join me in this effort.

I'll speak directly to the work that we are doing in the Senate later in the meeting. Finally, I want to announce that I am charging a special committee this week to examine the workings of the Senate, which will be Chaired by Keith Shapiro. The committee is a Senate self-study and I'm asking it to explore the question, what are the main missions and functions of the University Faculty Senate? And how are our own structures and procedures fulfilling these mandates? You should hear more for them as their work proceeds during the year.

Now let's move on to our guests and let me make sure that we have them. Today we're pleased to have, I think, two visitors. David Han and Mark Dambly, but let's start with Mark Dambly They're all from the Board of Trustees.

Mark Dambly is the Chairman of the Penn State Board of Trustees. He was appointed to the Board of Trustees by Governor Ed Rendell effective October 2010. He earned his BS in real estate and insurance from Penn State and he is the Provost of Pennrose Properties, LLC, a Philadelphia based real estate group. He also serves on the Boards of Directors of the Crozer-Keystone health system and the Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center. So, Chair Dambly, the floor is yours.

Mark Dambly, Chair, Board of Trustees: Well, thank you, Beth, and good afternoon, everybody. And certainly, didn't mind being preempted by the Provost and enjoyed the dialogue, as a side note before I begin with my prepared remarks. I just want to commend Eric, and Nick, and the rest of the administration, and our faculty, and students, for all the hard work that they're putting forth in these trying times. And Eric's given 110%. And I think he's trying his very, very best to manage under some very, very challenging circumstances.

So, I enjoyed hearing some of the dialogue and just wanted open up with that, Beth. And thank you for the opportunity to share some thoughts about the board of trustees. Unfortunately, Matt had to jump off but Dave is with me. And I'm certainly very pleased to be with all of you. I've had the honor to serve as Chair of the board since 2017, as a trustee since 2010. Matt joined the board in 2015 and has served as Vice Chair since 2017.
David also joined the board in 2015 after being nominated by his peers there on the Faculty Senate. And David's been an awesome partner and a great voice for your Senate. Although that's a good bit of experience in the board room, I recognize that many of you have decades more experience in the classroom and the larger University. This is one of the reasons we appreciate hearing from you directly in meetings like this one. And Matt and I meet annually, or at every board cycle, with Beth and the balance of the Senate Faculty Leadership Team.

I'll keep my remarks brief so in the event you have any questions for me, I'd be happy to answer them. Since I joined the board, our top priority has been to make an outstanding Penn State education accessible and affordable for all students with the ability and ambition to attend our University. We were making excellent progress to that end with open doors programs and keeping tuition increases to a minimum. In fact, all undergraduate and graduate tuition rates remain flat for 2021.

For Pennsylvania resident undergraduate students, this is the third year in a row in which tuition rates have remained flat. Once COVID-19 became a full blown pandemic, we added the priority of safety for our students, faculty, and staff in addition to the commitment to help our students make academic progress and to maintain the financial stability of the institution. The Black Lives Matter movement made clear that we also need to ramp up our energy and efforts to make Penn State more equitable, diverse, and inclusive. It's been a busy six months and there's no sign that the pace will let up soon.

I want to sincerely thank you for your extraordinary efforts during these extraordinarily difficult times. Our faculty has been at the front lines. You didn't sign up for Zoom University, but within days last spring you shifted to teaching, conducting research, and serving the larger community. Over the summer you made even more improvements to your classes and delivery method. We're so proud to be part of this effort and to know that Penn State continues to serve our state and the world. On behalf of the Board of Trustees, thank you for your good work and goodwill as you move forward in this uncharted territory.

Before we move on to questions, I'd like to give you a brief update on a few of the board's key initiatives in recent months. First, as I mentioned, the board is committed to doing our part in the University's diversity, inclusion, and equity effort. As President Barron noted in his original communications, we have an obligation to fight ignorance and intolerance, model inclusively, and embrace the power that diversity represents. To that end, the board formed an oversight task force on racism, bias, and community safety, to provide support and oversight to President Barron to achieve the University goals to address racism.

We've also rethought the board's committee structure and are going to, in our next board meeting, have the formation of an equity and human resources standing committee. These efforts reflect the board's governance responsibilities for creating a campus environment which values equality of opportunity, respects the diversity, inclusion, and dignity of all people, is free from discrimination and harassment, and which embraces steps to support and advance these values consistent with the University's mission. We also have upcoming bylaw amendments to add research to the Academic Affairs and Student Life Committee.

And I got a note from Eric, I think we just broke into one-billion-dollar annual amount of research grants. This isn't about the oversight but simply to recognize the vital role of research at the University. Bylaw amendments also include the addition of a long-range planning subcommittee. And it's worth noting that the long-range planning subcommittee's key initiatives within the strategic plan are being accelerated due to COVID-19 with specific focus on teaching and learning technologies and new opportunities for
leveraging technology. For example, the new Big Ten core sharing initiative is an exciting opportunity for faculty and students to engage with the renowned academic leaders in the Big Ten.

I'm pleased that Penn State is also offering more than a dozen courses that cover a wide range of areas, from material science to theater. It will be interesting to see where this initiative leads. Finally, I want to conclude my remarks by recognizing Beth Seymour, who is co-Chair of the select Penn State Provost’s Commission on Racism, Bias, and Community Safety. This is an important, high profile role that has been added to Beth's already busy schedule as Chair of the Faculty Senate and her academic responsibilities. So please join me in thanking Beth for her work.

Again, thank you for the time. And now David and I would be happy to answer any questions you may have. So, thank you, Beth. Was that applause I heard?

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Chair Dambly. Do we have any questions? You can raise your hand, or you can put a question in the Q&A for Chair Dambly. Hearing no questions, I'm going to ask David to say a few words too. So, I'm moving to you, David.

David Han, Hershey Medical Center, College of Medicine: Thank you, Beth.

Chair Seymour: Next, I'm pleased to welcome our fellow Senator and Academic Trustee, David Han. He's a Professor of surgery and radiology at the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center and the College of Medicine. He's agreed to give some remarks and take some questions about how he sees the University's prospects from the perspective of the board of trustees. David, the floor is yours.

David Han: Well thanks, Beth. I think Mark really covered it all. I don't really have a whole lot to add to those encompassing remarks. I guess I would really just reflect, actually, on our curricular affairs committee meeting this morning, talking a little bit about social justice and cultural competency. And I think one of the things that came out of the special committee on University governance reports that John Nichols worked so hard to craft together was that it's important for us to create, maintain, and do everything we can to promote the connectivity between the board and its constituents.

And I think part of that came out in our discussion this morning, which is, as the board is very focused on campus climate as it relates to bias, racism, and community safety, the curricular elements around cultural competency clearly rest in the faculty. And so, I think that it was just a useful discussion to highlight the fact that a lot of these things need to move in sync, but that they do need to stay in the appropriate realms of oversight. And I think that those are the kinds of things that have really started to mature, evolve, and really benefit from having broader representation on the board. And anybody who's-- and I know many people are interested, I can certainly go through the minutes and the agendas for the meeting and the board's commitment to the issues around diversity, inclusivity, and equity, I think are not just words but actions.

And so, I've been really pleased to be a part of that. And thank the board, and Mark Dambly, and Matt Schuyler for their leadership in that regard.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, David. Do we have any questions for David? You can raise your hand, or you can put remarks in the Q&A. Just remember to put your name and your unit. Hearing no questions, we'll move on. But thank you, David, and thank you, Mark. I really appreciated your being here.
And I appreciate both of you waiting. I'm sorry we missed Matt. I realize he had to step off for different meeting.

**Mark Dambly:** No worries. Thanks, Beth. Bye everyone.

**David Han:** Thank you.

**Chair Seymour:** All right, next we have item E, which is comments by the Provost of the University. We've already had those. We've reorganized the agenda. Item F is the Provost spot. He's not with us, but he will return, and we will-- this is going to sound odd but insert him in the agenda appropriately. So, let's move on to the rest of the agenda.

**FORENSIC BUSINESS**

**Chair Seymour:** Item G is forensic business. There is none.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

*Revision to Bylaws, Article IV, Committees, Sections 1 and 2*

**Chair Seymour:** Item H is unfinished business. The Senate Committee on Committee and Rules, CC&R for those of you new to the Senate, has a legislative report that was introduced at the April meeting and will be discussed and voted on today. The report is titled Revisions to Bylaws, Article IV, Committee Section 1A, appendix Q. This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. CC&R Chair, Victor Brunsden will present the report. Victor, the floor is yours.

**LEGISLATIVE REPORTS**

**Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6 (m) Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (sustainability)**

**Victor Brunsden, Altoona:** Thank you, Chair Seymour. So, this was brought to the floor for an initial viewing in April. I would also like to thank Anne Clements for her work in making the feedback system that people have employed to give feedback on the various reports. I would also like to thank those who used it to get the feedback to the various reports, including the anonymous person who provided feedback on this report to the committee. It was brief, somewhat to the point, consisted only of 24 characters including whitespace. And it was, and I quote, I hate this, these sucks.

So, thank you so much for your comment on the great sucketude that continues to be this year of 2020. While I would like to further investigate the degree to which this particular report sucks, it is, however, not that greatly sucky, in my opinion. What it does is, it introduces sustainability into the standing charges of the Senate committee on research, and scholarship, and creative activity. So being that it does not really suck, so I do have to disagree with the feedback here, I would very much like if you would vote in favor of it. Thank you.

**Victor Brunsden:** Yes. Wait a minute. Which one is this? Oh, I don't have that in my agenda. Yes. Keith, could you do that? Somebody gives me the-- There we go. All right, so this is why-- yes, my apologies. My agenda does not have this. So, this is unfinished business. There's been a great deal of
confusion as to which administrative members or appointed members are actually voting members of a committee.

There are several committees where there are members appointed for various reasons. And their input is valuable, but it is not always clear whether they have voting rights. This is to make voting-- the rights of those members clear and is either elected Faculty Senators or appointed administrators. So, if you are not one of those but are still on the committees, then you are a committee member, but you are not a voting member.

Chair Seymour: Do we have any questions for Chair Brunsden? Remember you can ask questions by raising your hand to be recognized and take the floor or put a question into Q&A. Seeing no questions, I say let's go on and vote. One of the things I should say is, we're going to compile all the votes to read off at the end so we can move through this pretty quickly.

Anna Butler in the Senate office is managing the Poll Everywhere for us and adding the in room votes to that. So please go to Poll Everywhere if you're not in the room and press A to accept, B to reject. And this is a revision to bylaws Article IV, committees, section 1.

So, everyone who accepts it, raise your hand. All that reject, raise your hand. I have eight accepts, zero rejects.

I see that someone raised their hands. Do you wish to be recognized? Linda Rhen, you have the floor. Tell us your unit.

Linda Rhen, Harrisburg: Oh, I'm so sorry. I didn't want the floor. I've been having trouble at accessing Poll Everywhere. And I sent Anna an email, so I wasn't requesting to speak. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: That's OK. No problem, Linda. I just wanted to make sure that you got the floor like you would have if you were in the room. So, thank you. As we're going to wait for the tallies going ahead and vote, but let's move on to the next legislative report. We have two more reports from CC&R, so Victor, please stay. The Senate committee and committee and rules has two more reports today of revisions to the Senate rules. Both will be voted on.

First, we have revisions to the standing rules, article 2, section 6m, committee on research, scholarship, and creative activity, sustainability, appendix C-- so we're now on cue. The report is brought to the floor by committee and needs a second. CC&R Chair Victor Brunsden will present the report. Victor, the floor is still yours.

Victor Brunsden: As I indicated in my prior senior moment, the change to the standing rules, article 2, section 6m, committee on research, scholarship, and creative activity, is to add sustainability to its standing charges. There are some minor additions adding the chief sustainability officer to the membership of the committee, and to also mandate a biannual summary of research, scholarship, and creative activity on sustainability. The change is minimal and is entirely consistent with the changes that have been made to other committee charges over the last year.

Chair Seymour: Are there any questions for Chair Brunsden? Just raise your hand or put a question in Q&A. Seeing no questions, are we ready to vote? So, let's go on ahead and vote. For those of you on remotely, please use Poll Everywhere.
Chair Seymour: To accept, press A, to reject, press B. You're voting on the revisions to the Standing Rules, Article 3, Section 6m, Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity sustainability. In the room, all those who accept raise your hand.

All those who reject, raise your hand. The room is 8-0. I'll give everybody a few minutes to vote and then we'll move on. Again, we're going to tally the votes at the end of the meeting and basically display them so everyone knows what the votes were.

This just helps us to move us a little bit. But I want to give you all a couple of seconds to manage the voting before we move on to the next item to vote on. Well, thank you, Victor. Our final report from CC&R is titled revisions to standing rules article III, other functions of the Senate, section 6, Senate committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities in appendix D.

This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Again, Victor will present the report.

Revisions to Standing Rules, Article III- Other Functions of the Senate, Section 6: Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

Victor Brunsden: Thank you, Chair Seymour. So, this report is the first part of two reports on today's agenda. And both reports are designed to solve a specific problem of available person power. The committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities is the committee that is charged with examining the process of both tenure and promotion cases. Since in the last few years we have instituted promotion for faculty on fixed term contracts, this has meant two things.

First of all, the number of cases coming before faculty rights and responsibility has increased. So, there is an increased need for people to staff this committee. There is more work to be done. That is one of the major changes that we have made in this report. The other part is that since some of these cases, and an increasing number, involve faculty on fixed term contracts and the committee up till this point had been for some years, the faculty membership had been limited to those with tenured appointments only, it was realized that we were boxing ourselves into a corner.

We are attempting to unpainted ourselves out of that corner by changing the language. We are increasing the number of members of this committee by two elected faculty and one member of the academic leadership Council. And we are removing-- we are making the membership more flexible.

So, there will be a second report coming because the committee on faculty rights and responsibilities is specified in two places. There is policy AC76, which will be the subject of the further report, and then there is the standing rules of the Senate, which this report takes care of. Are there any questions?

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Victor. Just to remind everyone, if you have any questions, please either post them in Q&A or raise your hand. Do we have any questions in Q&A, or anyone raised their hand? Are we ready to vote?

To vote, so let's move ahead to vote. If you're on zoom and voting remotely, to accept please press A on Poll Everywhere, to reject please press B. You're voting on the revisions to the standing rules, article III, other functions of the Senate, section 6, Senate committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. In the room, if you accept please raise your hand. If you want to reject, please raise your hand.
General Education Requirements for Associate Degree Programs

Chair Seymour: As a reminder, we'll put the tally of these votes up at the end of the meeting. Our next report is from the Senate committee on Curricular Affairs and is titled General Education Requirements for Associate Degree Programs in Appendix E. This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. It will be presented by the committee Chair, Mary Beth Williams. Mary Beth, the floor is yours.

Mary Beth Williams, College of Science: Thank you, Chair Seymour. This afternoon I'm bringing to you a request for revision of the general education requirement for associates degree candidates at Penn State. The general education curriculum was passed more than five years ago now. And based on our observations over the last five years, this is the first recommendation to make an adjustment to it. Our observation is that the curriculum has not been evenly accessible by students in our associate degree programs.

Therefore, we are recommending-- the committee on curricular affairs is recommending two adjustments for associate degree students. First, by allowing students to take up to six credits of courses that faculty have designed to be interdomain and allowing these to satisfy any of the knowledge domain requirements. This does not mean that the credits will be double counted but rather that they will be counted only once and could be used to satisfy their domain requirements in their degrees. We also want to open the GHW courses for an extra three credits of knowledge domains within associate degree candidates. This is not currently available to associate degree students.

So, with that, we put forward this report and request your support for making this update to the general education curriculum. I'd be happy to take any questions.

Chair Seymour: Do I have any questions for the report? If you have questions, please raise your hand or write your question in the Q&A. Make sure to list your name and unit. Are there any questions on? I think we have one question from Christopher Byrne. Is this a written question? It's a hand? OK. So, Chris, the floor is yours.

Chris Byrne, College of Science: Chris Byrne from College of Science, U. Park. OK, Mary Beth, could you just give a simple example, not to belabor it but just so-- it's hard to imagine, what does this mean? Can you just give a simple example?

Mary Beth Williams: Yeah, Chris, thanks for the question. So, what it means is, there isn't a whole lot of change to associate degree programs right now because frankly, most of them are fairly prescribed for our students. There are 21 different associate degree programs at the University. And 19 of them have very specific ways that students already fulfill their Gen Ed requirements. But what this change is doing is opening up the Gen Ed requirement for additional flexibility, should those associate degree programs allow students to do so.

So, all we're saying is, we're trying to make it even for associates and baccalaureate degree candidates to have access to the full range of GenEd courses that our faculty have developed. Does that make sense?

Chris Byrne: It does make sense. I'm trying to make up my own example. Like, I don't know, say-- you're saying their GenEds were all basically totally prescribed before.
**Mary Beth Williams:** Most of them are totally prescribed. This change will not change the program requirements. This change will make it possible for there to be a little bit of flexibility in those associate degree programs that allow students to have choice in what courses that the students can take.

**Chris Byrne:** So, if they--

**Mary Beth Williams:** At University park, Chris, we don't really have any associate degree programs. This is more specifically an issue for campuses that have associate degrees, that have limited numbers of courses that they can offer at any one time. If at those campuses, faculty have to choose between offering a course that all students can take versus a course that only some students can take and count toward their degree, faculty are having to decide to offer courses that the most students can have access to, right? At campuses where they'd like to offer these interdomain courses, giving associates degree students a chance to take them and have them count toward their degree gives our smaller campuses faculty greater opportunity to develop new courses that expand the curricular offerings and thus flexibility.

**Chris Byrne:** OK. Thank you very much.

**Chair Seymour:** I've got a hand up. I want to recognize Renee. Renee, put your hand down. Do you wish to raise your hand or not? If you want to, reraise your hand. That's the easiest way.

Are there any other questions? Anything in Q&A?

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Nothing in Q&A.

**Chair Seymour:** All right, are we ready to vote? I'm sensing yes. So, let's go ahead and vote. If you are attending remotely from the group, the go to Poll Everywhere. This is changes to general education requirements for associate degree programs, presented by curricular affairs. To accept, press A, to reject press B.

In the room, everybody who accepts raise your hand. All right, any rejections?

**Chair: Seymour:** Thank you Mary Beth, again we will be posting the totals at the end of the meeting.

**Including Election Day Absences in Policy 42-27-Class Attendance**

**Chair Seymour:** Our next report is from the Committee on Education titled, Including Education Day Absences in Policy 4227, class attendance, found in appendix F. This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Committee Chair Shelley Stein is present to report. Shelley, the floor is yours as soon as you're ready.

**Michele Stein, College of Health and Human Development:** There we go. Hi. Thank you, Beth. So, 4227 is the policy on class attendance. And this policy already directs faculty to, within reason, be flexible about allowing for absences for students who have conflicts with other circumstances, including extracurricular activities, cocurricular activities, family emergencies, illnesses, and so on-- athletic competitions.

What we are proposing is to add two sentences to this policy that will allow for election day to be considered an excused absence. All we are asking is to add these two sentences to this policy to help
encourage students to participate in democracy. We want them to be able to vote. We want to encourage them to vote. We want them to take that seriously.

And we want to give a signal that we take their participation seriously. And so, the two sentences added to this policy ask faculty to, within reason, be flexible and accommodating for student absences for students who are participating in an election, students who are voting. That's it. That's all we are asking. It just allows for some flexibility on that one day a year, if students were to miss class for that, for them to have some opportunity to make up any work that they've missed in class.

Chair Seymour: any questions?

Bonj Szczygiel: We have one question in Q&A, from Jonathan Matthews, Earth and Mineral Sciences. Perhaps we should add the term governmental to prevent abuse for all voting activities, such as social clubs.

Michele Stein: The sentence actually reads, students who miss class on an election day due to participation in local, state, and federal elections. So, it does specify that these are government elections.

Ann Taylor, Earth and Mineral Sciences: Just since I'm here, to help Jonathan's point, we went over this and over this in our EMS caucus and we didn't feel it was-- it could be read to not be governmental. Local could mean some local club, a social event, what have you. So, we just thought at the end of that sentence that you just read, if you inserted the word governmental elections-- so it's just a friendly amendment to insert the word governmental.

Michele Stein: Yeah. I think that's an appropriate addition to clarify.

Chair Seymour: Yeah. Are you making a motion? So, Annie's making a motion. Do I have a second? of So they all require the same sorts of discussion and. So, we need some time to discuss this. Are there any other questions either in Q&A or hands raised.

Bonj Szczygiel: We have Bob Zambanini. Sounds like it's part of a discussion. He writes, would this change also apply to students who are volunteering as poll workers?

Michele Stein: I would say that it would, that students are participating in election, including volunteering as poll workers. I would hope that they would be covered by this as well and that faculty would give them some allowance, as much as is reasonable for an absence for that day. And I did notice that there was a comment about two elections. And you're absolutely right, thank you for pointing that out, I misspoke. It's one day a semester, not one day a year.

Chair Seymour: All right. So, we're actually discussing the amendment, which is if we need to use the word governmental. We're not discussing the legislation in its original form because we need to determine the motion first. So are there any questions to the motion about whether to add the word governmental. Any questions about adding it?

Lisa Mangel, Eire: OK, this is by Karen McKinney. Couldn't governmental still be read to be student governmental?
Chair Seymour: Maybe at this point I'll ask Anne to speak to it, since it's her amendment and not Shelley's.

Michele Stein: Thank you.

Ann Taylor: Yeah. If there is a better alternative, that would be great to be suggested. I know it could still mean that as well. We just thought it narrowed the loophole a bit.

Chair Seymour: Any other questions?

Lisa Mangel: Municipal was just brought up as a question to whether that would be a good fit.

Ann Taylor: I think that would be fine. The essence, I think, of Jonathan's concern was just to add some better clarification so there wasn't such a big potential loophole. So, I think municipal-- municipal be fine.

Chair Seymour: It sounds like municipal is the preferred word to add in this amendment.

Ann Taylor: Where does municipal go?

Ann Taylor: I know. If Jonathan has another suggestion, perhaps he could put in the Q&A. I'm just trying to. The original suggestion was local-- to keep everything the same, local, state, and federal governmental elections.

Chair Seymour: It'd be local, state, and federal municipal elections? Is that we're suggesting?

Ann Taylor: That's how I had interpreted this suggestion and it seemed fine to me.

Bonj Szczygiel: There's a suggestion from Renaud, national and municipal, and Rosemary Jolly is asking, international students also? Sorry.

Chair Seymour: Yeah. So for those of you who might not be able to hear what we're talking about in the room, Keith Shapiro, the parliamentarian, is trying to lead us through how to handle writing an amendment on the floor, which is what basically we're doing.

Ann Taylor: So, Keith is-- this is Taylor, earth the mineral sciences. Keith has asked me, what do I want to propose for this motion to amend this legislation?

And my answer is simply to go back to the original recommendation that Jonathan Matthews made of adding the word governmental. So, local, state, and federal governmental elections, so it's one word inserted at the end of that sentence. And we recognize-- I will just, to support Jonathan's suggestion, I think we're never going to close every loophole. But we felt it gave a bit more of the spirit of what was intended by this legislation, which you get if you read the introduction rationale but you wouldn't get if you read the policy.

Chair Seymour: Any other comments or questions to the motion, adding governmental.

Lisa Mangel: Bob has a question. I'm not sure. His hand's up. I'm not sure.
Robert A. Zambanini, Berks: No, that was just for the question I had in the Q&A.

Chair Seymour: I say, are we ready on the amendment adding the word governmental All right, go to Poll Everywhere and to accept press A, to reject press B. And we're adding the word governmental after local, state governmental elections. All those in the room, please raise your hand.

We are going to have to wait on the results of this vote because we can't move on with this legislation without it. So, this is an exception to what I said earlier, that were waiting till the end. Clearly if we're amending legislation we have to wait through the vote. The amendment passed. We'll have a record of that vote in its totality at the end as well, but the amendment did pass.

So now we go back to the original piece of legislation with the new word added, governmental, before elections. Is there any more discussion on this modified legislation?

Bonj Szczygiel: There are a few people lining up who would like to say something. So, Chris Byrne, poll workers is good but so is any forum to get out the vote activity, even driving seniors and disabled people to polls. So that's in response to the earlier question of, what if students are volunteering to act as poll workers? Does this apply to them?

Chair Seymour: So, Shelley, that's back to you.

Michele Stein: So as the policy reads, participation in an election could be interpreted to mean those things. And the policy is written intentionally to be flexible enough that faculty certainly could extend that flexibility, but it is not specifically directing that unreasonable measures have to be taken. So, I know it sounds like I'm not answering your question. I would say that participation in an election could include efforts to get out the vote. And I would certainly hope that faculty would extend reasonable allowances for students to do that, yes.

Chair Seymour: Are there any other questions?

Bonj Szczygiel: Yes. Gary Thomas from communications, could this excuse be used to miss a midterm exam on that day?

Michele Stein: Not necessarily, because the policy says reasonable accommodations. Personally, I would hope that faculty would not schedule exams on election day. But there is nothing that directs faculty to have to allow students to miss exams if they are scheduled on that day. The policy is just asking for faculty to make reasonable allowances for a class absence for that day and a reasonable opportunity to make up any in-class work that is done on that day.

Chair Seymour: Any other question?

Bonj Szczygiel: Karyn McKinney Marvasti is suggesting perhaps non University, as a phrase, could be added to all the other words. Governmental could still be there as well.

Michele Stein: I believe that the local, state, and federal, before governmental makes it clear that this is outside of the University.
Bonj Szczygiel: Another question from Rosemary Jolly, are we stating it's US? Or how should our globally based students read this?

Michele Stein: The policy was intended to cover US elections, recognizing that our international students are unlikely to be voting in person. Now certainly, faculty could extend—faculty always have the right to extend allowances if students are missing multiple days for voting in person in an international election. But the policy is not meant to cover that. It's specifically focused at US elections. But it doesn't specifically exclude international elections.

Chair Seymour: I just want to remind everybody that we are not using chat to move the business of the Senate. If you wish to move the business of the Senate and you don't wish to be recognized to speak from the floor, then use the Q&A. Any other questions, Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel: They seem to be related more to the governmental. So, someone was suggesting using the words national and municipal.

Chair Seymour: Yeah, we've kind of moved away that. We voted that one.

Bonj Szczygiel: We have one from Cindy Simmons, is that right? In some places it is illegal to provide anything of value for voting. I'm not familiar with PA law on this question but being able to take an exam late might fall into the category of inducement to vote. Has anyone looked into this?

Michele Stein: The policy is written so that, again, an instructor may not necessarily allow students to make up an exam. It's allowing for reasonable accommodations. We don't believe that we're giving anything of value. What we're asking is for students to have some flexibility in scheduling, which they would have for other activities. So, it's not necessarily giving them an extra day to study for an exam or anything that might be interpreted as something of value but encouraging instructors to have some flexibility.

And it's not tied to—I've lost the thread of where the end of that sentence was going. I apologize. But I hope that answers the question.

Chair Seymour: No worries, Shelley. We have a hand raised, Linda Rhen.

Linda Rhen: Hi. Yeah, this time I am raising my hand. My question was regarding when we get into the Pennsylvania primary election, typically in early May but sometimes different. That's also typically a time when we may have finals, or the final week of class. So how would this policy address final exams being scheduled on that date? And faculty have no control over the scheduling of final exams.

Michele Stein: Right. This policy specifically covers class attendance and so it wouldn't address final exams at all, which are scheduled by the registrar and outside the purview of the faculty. This is strictly about class attendance—which could be the final week of class. And that could happen, where a faculty member might be asked to give some allowance for attendance during that final week of class. But it wouldn't apply to final exams.

Linda Rhen: Just to follow up then, is there a recommendation that the registrar not schedule finals on election day?
Michele Stein: I don't know that the registrar necessarily has that flexibility. My understanding is that the final exam schedule is pretty tight as it is. I would hope that there might be some flexibility, but I don't know that that's feasible, practically.

Chair Seymour: I want to recognize Victor Brunsden in the room.

Victor Brunsden: I call the question.

Chair Seymour: Dr. Brunsden has called the question. Do I have a second?

Linda Rhen: I second.

Chair Seymour: All right. So now we will vote on the amended motion that is the legislative report. So, it's from the Senate committee on election, including election day absences-- well, I guess I should vote on the calling of the question first. Sorry about that. I got the hairy eyeball from my parliamentarian.

So--

Keith Shapiro: I was looking down, actually.

Chair Seymour: Well, I could feel the hairy eyeball for my part. So, what we're doing, for those of you new and clearly for our Chair that forgot, is that the calling of the question means we're just shutting down conversation. We have to vote on that first. And again, we're going to have to count this vote.

So, all those in favor of ending debate on the motion-- we're not voting on the motion yet. We're just voting on ending debate on the motion, please go to Poll Everywhere. And to accept, press A. And you're not voting on the motion. You're going to a different Poll Everywhere, hopefully, and voting for one that Anna's created.

And we should all thank Anna for making all these extra polls for us. Press A if you wish conversation to end, press B if you wish us to continue conversing on this topic. In the room, raise your hand if you want conversation to end, if you want conversation continue, raise your hand.

So, if you are unmuted out there, could you please mute yourself. All right, we accepted the ending of discussion. So now we move to voting for the amended piece of legislation from the education committee. So now we're voting on the Election Day Absences in Policy 4227, Class Attendance.

To accept press A, to reject press B. To accept, raise your hand. To reject, raise your hand.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Chair Seymour: Well, you never know what's going to get people all riled up at a Senate meeting. Today it was election day. We'll have the vote at the end, so let's move on. Item J, advisory and consultative report, Senate committee on Faculty Affairs, revisions to AC76 Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, appendix G. The report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Committee Chair Renee Bishop-Pierce will present the report. Renee, the floor is yours.
Revisions to AC-76- “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities”

Renee Bishop-Pierce, Scranton: Good afternoon. So, as it was brought to the floor earlier, this is a complimentary report to the one that was previous with the changes from CC&R to the standing rules, article three. It addresses, as you know, two issues that were brought to the floor by Senator Brunsden. And essentially, it increases the size of FR&R, and also adds the non-tenure track faculty representation to FR&R. Do you have any questions for me?

Chair Seymour: You've got a cute dog.

Renee Bishop-Pierce: I know, just popped in the room.

Chair Seymour: So, kudos for good distraction. So, lets-- does anyone have any questions? If you do, go to Q&A or raise your hand.

Bonj Szczygiel: You have a question from Susan Fredericks of Brandywine. Does the committee have any concern for overburdening the non-tenured faculty with a limited number of non-tenured elect? Want them to be taking care of.

Renee Bishop-Pierce: Good point. Again, they don't have to run if that's a concern, because again this is an election. Also, if it is an issue that they feel is something that they do not wish to-- it's too close to them in their unit, they can also decline for serving on that particular committee. Anything else?

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Renee. Any other questions in Q&A or raising of the hand? I don't think we have any more questions. Thank you, Renee. Let's go ahead and move to vote. I think we're ready to vote, yeah?

This is an advisory consultative report. So just to remind new people, this is not direct legislation we control. We're giving advice and consultation to the administrative office that controls AC76, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. As both Renee and Victor explained, our legislative purview in our governance documents overlaps with administrative policy on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. To accept, press A, to reject press B.

In the room, all those in favor raise your hand. Opposed? The ayes have it. Thank you, Renee.

Moving to the next report, Senate committee on University planning, Climate Action Task Force recommendation, appendix H. This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Committee Vice Chair Frank Marko will present the report. Frank, the floor is yours.

Climate Action Task Force Recommendation

Frantisek Marko, Hazelton: Good afternoon. I'd like to introduce the report. On April 28, the University Faculty Senate adopted a climate action resolution that calls for developing a University wide climate action adaptation plan. It also included entering long term range targets with respect to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

This advisory and consultative report presented by University planning is a logical continuation of this process. We ask the administration to form a task force on climate action, with representation from
faculty experts and Senate to explore a wide range of approaches to reach the goals described in the previous resolution. We also ask to present a specific plan within one year.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, Frank. Are there any questions for Frank? You have two ways to ask questions. One is to raise your hand and take the floor, the other is to ask questions in Q&A. Seeing no questions, are we ready to take a vote? OK.

If you're going to vote from Poll Everywhere, to accept the motion press A, to reject press B. And just a reminder, it's from University Planning, Climate Action Task Force recommendations. In the room, to accept raise your hand. To reject, raise your hand.

Thank you, Frank. I appreciate everybody's help working through the voting. I know it can be a bit tedious. Anne is going to spend her time now getting it together for us. And we just had the Provost come back in the room. And of course, I'm not going to give him any opportunity to catch his breath.

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

**Chair Seymour:** It's time. He had perfect timing from our perspective. I'm not sure it's perfect timing from his perspective. But we just finished the advisory and consultative report, so we're about to move into the informational reports.

So now is a good time if you're willing to catch your breath a second and present some remarks, please. Thank you. Thank you, Provost Jones.

**Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost:** Thanks very much, Beth, and thanks everybody. Can you hear me OK? Yeah? OK. Not quite sure how close I should be to the mic. I'm not used to this business yet.

OK, so I actually just wanted to go through a few of the things, just for context, that Eric touched on, maybe put my color on it a little bit, and then add a few other, I guess I would say embellishments, or additional details, that are worth, I think, mentioning. And I do acknowledge that while over the summer I met with Beth on a regular basis, with Senate leadership several times, I haven't really had an opportunity to address the full Senate for some time. So, I should share some of these issues with you.

As you heard in Eric's presentation, our approach to managing the return to state plan, the thinking behind it, the modeling that we did, was shared last Friday. I know there was some suggestion that we did it Friday afternoon because that's when you post news that you don't want people to read.

And I can assure you, it wasn't that at all. We were just scrambling with a lot of things and making sure that we had the final copy of the report, and it was the right one and the accurate one. Just took a little longer than expected. That's why it happened when it happened. I'd been pushing for it earlier in the week, actually.

The key elements in that part of the return to state plan were pre-arrival testing, on arrival testing, and then ongoing both symptomatic testing and surveillance testing. The pre-arrival testing, honestly as we went into the summer, was not something that we had really thought about. But the modeling team really came to us and said, this is something that you must do if you want to have a shot at this. And we listened and we heard.
The modeling was comprehensive. We looked obviously at University Park as the big challenge in terms of numbers, but we looked at all campuses. I'll say that now just to be clear, in everything that we have done University Park gets mentioned a lot because we are the biggest campus here. And the challenges here are probably greater than they are at other locations. But every location has been considered in all of our planning from day one. I would incur the wrath of Madeline Haines if that were not the case, and that's not wrath I'd like to incur, thank you very much.

They suggested pre-arrival testing, as you will see in the report. It's not in the executive summary. It is in the report proper. There was a strategy developed that selectively sampled high prevalence counties across the entire United States. So, we looked at every county, prevalence in every county at the time the analysis was done, and whether or not that county was sourcing students who were returning to Penn State. And so, we selectively sampled from those counties.

There were some counties that had little or no prevalence, and we just didn't think it was worth our while to sample there. The goal was to begin-- and again, I'll talk about University Park, but similar thinking went in everywhere. The goal was to have 50 or fewer students, estimated because we, of course, never know exactly, but estimated, showing up on campus who may be COVID positive. Fast forward a little bit, we went back and did a post facto analysis. And our best estimate was, the number that we got was 38.

So, we did pretty well in terms of that analysis. One of the things we learned as we transitioned from modeling to the actual implementation of pre-arrival testing with Vault, company Vault, was that there were some counties that had been high prevalence that had become very high prevalence. And there were a number of those counties in Pennsylvania. So we supplemented the pre-arrival testing as we learned in real time from the data coming in, and then reached out to students as they were arriving and said, you were not selected for pre-arrival testing but we're concerned about the county from whence you came so we'd like you to test. And we put them in quarantine, test them, and they were released if they had a negative test, usually within 48 hours.

So that was an additional layer we put in upon arrival. We also, during the arrival period some of you may recall, we had a couple of incidents here at University Park with gatherings. So we began the process of doing standup testing, where if we had a concern about a particular area, for example East Halls, we would stand up testing capacity there and invite students to come and just do a walk up and be tested. So, we did that in a couple of instances as well.

It turns out, the walk-up testing became rather popular. We still do it. Students still show up. And it's a form of crowd sourced contact tracing. Students don't wait to be called by us or by our contact tracers. They figure it out, that they potentially have been in contact with somebody who is positive, and they just show up.

And sometimes they're identified by our contact tracers in advance. But what we're seeing is oftentimes they're just concerned themselves and so they show up. And so that kind of crowd sourcing of contact tracing has worked out well. We are now full in the mode of surveillance testing, using our own facility, the TASC, the Testing and Surveillance Center. And that is using capabilities of our own faculty and laboratories here at University Park.

We complement that with Vault on an as needed basis. And we use Vault for surveillance testing across all campus locations. In addition, we do symptomatic testing for students who are not feeling well. They
go through a screening process and are routed to University Health Services here at UP, a parallel process at the campuses. And they are tested either in-house, with the in-house capacity that we have that can-do rapid testing. We've had some supply chain challenges there.

But we've also learned that in almost everything we do, redundancy is important because the supply chain has been so unpredictable, even when we have signed contracts. So that is complemented by a contract with Quest Diagnostics, who guarantee us a 48-hour turnaround. But the more we can do locally, of course, the better, because we get test results more quickly. Then as I said, complementary to that we can do the stand-up testing.

And we always stand ready to do that. We are looking at data every day as it comes in, and always looking for potential warm spots, hot spots, where we feel some targeted testing may be necessary. I give a huge amount of credit to Kelly Wolgast, who is the Director of the coronavirus, or COVID, operations and control center. Kelly is an assistant dean in the College of Nursing here at University Park and has really done an amazing job of keeping all these balls in the air—riding herd on the suppliers, the testing companies, keeping all of the wheels and skids greased so that this process works as well as it possibly can.

And I am just extremely thankful that we had somebody with Kelly's experience and skill set at the University that we could tap. And I make a point of sharing that with my Big Ten colleagues whenever I can, just how lucky we were. We are posting dashboards twice a week, I think as you all know. You had some discussion with Eric.

Actually, at some point in the near future I hope that we can increase the frequency. One of the challenges we have right now is that every time we put out dashboard data, because we really started from zero just a few weeks ago, there is intense interest in every data point that is being reported. And the onslaught of questions and queries that we get are kind of overwhelming for the communications team. So that's part of the reason we're limiting the release to twice a week right now, because we have to stand by for that. And all of those people are stressed in a lot of other areas as well.

But I think as we get the process more smooth and automated— and why is it not automated now? Because we're drawing data from multiple disparate data streams. The data are coming in at different times. We've got to be careful about mixing the wrong numerators and denominators because you will get the wrong impression about, for example, incidence rates, either thinking that they're too high or thinking that they're too low. So, there's a lot of hand work that goes on here to make sure that these data are properly screened.

We're getting better at that, though. And the data streams are becoming a little bit more stable and predictable. And I'm hoping that we will get to a higher frequency. We're also finalizing, almost in real time, the design of the dashboard because we've gotten a lot of suggestions since the first few iterations have gone up about things that we should have on there or not have on there. For example, we've been reporting total positive cases. And a number of people have pointed out-- sorry, I'm just doing this so that my glasses stops falling off my nose.

A number of people have pointed out that we should also be talking about the number of active cases because after a 10-day period somebody who was positive rolls off. And the number of active cases is, in many ways, a more informative number. So, we're looking to make sure that that number is provided. So as the design stabilizes, our ability to automate these processes will improve.
Every day, every day, we look at the data in detail. We may not be putting it all on the dashboard but the executive leadership team, every day, looks at all of these data coming in. And we do get it on a daily basis. And we keep a very, very close eye on those data. And that is informing any actions we take or don't take on a pretty consistent basis.

One of the important numbers that we are watching, and it's on the dashboard, you can see it, is the number of students we have in on campus isolation. That's a critical number for us because if that number starts to get too high, then our ability to properly care for students, meet their needs, and also ensure that the virus is not spreading too broadly within, certainly initially our student community, then our broader institutional community, and then the broader state college community, is-- there would be indications that that was being challenged. And we're keeping a very close eye on that number.

And I encourage you, as you look at the dashboard every Tuesday and Friday, to look at that number too and see how that number is evolving over time. Because it's been actually fairly stable for the past number of days. And we're optimistic that that will remain the case. Maybe we'll even see a slight decline. But we are watching carefully. I don't want to speculate.

At the end of the day, it doesn't matter how much testing we do. It doesn't matter whether we do surveillance testing or test the entire population. It doesn't matter whether we do it twice a week, everybody twice a week, or we take a surveillance and contact tracing approach. We are going to win or lose this battle with COVID-19 based on the behavior of the people in our community-- our students, our faculty, our staff.

And I just have to say that in the time that I spend on campus, when I'm looking out my window, when I'm driving through campus on my way to or from home, when I drive downtown, largely what I am seeing, apart from exceptions, a few notable exceptions, is extraordinary levels of compliance and proper behavior by everybody. And it is really gratifying to see that. It's not just the people in this room, all of whom are here in masks. You all recall-- Kathy can correct me if I'm wrong here.

We spent a lot of time over the summer thinking very carefully about what to do with a student who shows up in class and refuses to wear a mask. And we went round, and round, and round on that issue to come up with protocols, and guidance, and so on. How many have we had, Kathy? Very few, if any, right? I mean, we can't guarantee zero because there may be some that we didn't hear about.

Now, we've had a few complaints about faculty members not wearing masks from students. But those, too, have been very few in number. So, we were prepared, but the adherence to protocols and guidelines has really been extraordinary. That, at the end of the day, not testing or contact tracing, is going to be the thing that makes a difference.

Many of you have questions, I'm sure, about finances. And I know that there will be questions on this. I think as you're all aware, back in the spring we began scenario planning for the University. We have to. That's what we do. That's what you do when you're responsible for the University budget.

You look very hard at projected enrollments, at tuition flows. David Gray does the same thing on the auxiliary side of the house. We scenario plan. On the education and general fund side, which is the one that you are most concerned about, we developed best case, most likely case, and worst-case scenario. The worst-case scenarios is what President Barron spoke about a little earlier this afternoon, projected a potential $450 million revenue shortfall for the University which would be-- I don't want to say
catastrophic because we're a resilient institution. But it would certainly represent a major, major challenge to our operations.

We went with the one that we labeled the most likely case scenario, which projected modest impacts on enrollments, the ability to recover some of those enrollments through remote and online offerings. And then the best-case scenario, of course, said that we would be marginally impacted. We went with the most likely case scenario. I'm pleased to report that we're actually, as far as I can make out-- and we're looking at data on this almost on a daily basis as well. We are doing slightly better than the most likely case scenario, so more towards the best case but not to the best case.

And that is good news. And as the Provost indicated earlier, we have a line of credit available to tap into should we need to. But at this stage, Mary-Lou Ortiz and I have recommended to the Provost that we do not tap that source of funds just yet. Doesn't mean we won't have to in the future as this plays out. But right now, we are not tapping it.

And you should all be very pleased to hear me say that, because if you compare our situation with those of many of your colleagues at other institutions, some universities have stopped making retirement contributions. Others are planning layoffs and furloughs. Other institutions are talking about much bigger quantitative impacts than the ones that I just shared with you. And that is not us.

So, we are actually-- I'm not going to stand here in front of you and say we're in fine shape, because we too have been challenged with many tens of millions of dollars of revenue impact. But as the Provost said, we have made it a priority to support our people. And apart from the very limited case of the Nittany Lion Inn we have not been in a position where, because of COVID challenges, we have had to make personnel decisions because of COVID. So, you should feel good about that and feel positive about that.

In the auxiliary space, even though that is not my area, it's the purview of David Gray and his team, there the impacts have been more profound, and the situation is more difficult for David. When students did not return after spring break, as I think you all recall, we gave refunds of their room and board charges, yet we continued to pay all of the people who were supported by those. So that had a financial impact on auxiliaries. And even now, with reduced occupancy in residents' facilities across the University, we're taking in less revenue than we would ordinarily do so yet we're continuing to keep people on the payroll and support our workforce.

So, David and his team are working very hard to manage through the challenges that they face on the auxiliary side, which are different from what we are facing on the ENG side. Where we are on the ENG side, a little better than most likely case scenario, is due to extraordinary efforts across this institution by so many people, including faculty at every location, in terms of committing to and offering a first rate Penn State education despite the challenges that we face, and the rather-- I mean, we're looking at it in this room, right? The crazy stuff that is going on in our classrooms at every campus in terms of the number of people we can accommodate-- huge, huge efforts.

On the international side, Roger Brindley, our new Vice Provost for global programs, Yvonne Gaudelius Renata Engel, others, came together and stood up almost overnight with a partner, programs in China and South Korea, to accommodate students who are simply unable to travel to Penn State. At Shanghai, the number of students participating in that residential Penn State-- I think it's called Penn State Away program-- it's around 420 or something like that. Just amazing commitment on the part of those students,
and tremendous creativity on the part of Roger, Yvonne, Renata, and their colleagues in standing that program up.

The important thing about that is those students are sticky. They are going to stick to us. They appreciate that we put that program together for them. And they will stick with Penn State. And they would be smart to do so.

Some of you may have seen in Onward State, I think just today there was an article about laboratories in biology, and just how well done those laboratories are. And if you haven't seen it, I encourage you to take a look at it. It is a really very, very positive story about a student experience that our faculty are able to put together with the support of our staff, to provide a first-rate educational experience. I said it a few moments ago. I'll say it again.

Compared to our peers, we're doing OK. I just participated yesterday and today in a meeting of the AAU Provosts. We're doing OK. Every Thursday, I meet with the Big Ten Provosts.

We're doing OK, relative to our peers. And I can kind of tell this because in many of those Zooms, I go into the chat box and every week I'm sending a note to one of my fellow Provosts at another Big Ten institution and saying, hang in there, this is really tough. Nobody is sending me those notes yet, which is good. And I'm happy as long as that continues.

But we're doing OK. But I will say that humility is the order of the day. If ever there was a time where pride can cometh before a fall, this is it. So, I'm not going to stand up here. I'm going to keep saying, we're doing OK. I am not going to be overconfident. We're going to continue to be vigilant.

We have to be, because in the call in yesterday with AAU it was surprising to me just how hard some of the ones who were so confident had fallen, actually, and being challenged. OK, let me wrap up. I would love to stand here and give you guarantees and assurances of where we are and where we're going to be--where we're going to be tomorrow, where we're going to be at the end of this week, beginning of next week. What I can tell you are facts.

Fact one, and probably the most important one, is that we are now in the middle of the fourth week of instruction, so the fifth-- really the fifth week that students have been back if we include the move in transition week. And we are here. And we are managing, so far. Yes, we're seeing increases in numbers and yes, we're paying very close attention to that.

We knew that there would be cases. We weren't that naive to think that there would not be impacts and there would not be positives here. But so far, so good. What I can guarantee is that the effort by huge numbers of people across this institution is going to continue.

The commitment, very best commitment, firmest commitment, to make this work is going to continue. And we are seeing excellence seep out of every pore of this institution-- innovation, creativity, the likes of which-- you know, we've always seen it. But it's like a gusher of it happening now as people respond in all kinds of tremendous ways to try to make this work.

I can't give you assurances. Those were my guarantees. I can't give you assurances, but I can give you reassurance that everybody is doing the very best job they can. Everybody's working very hard on this. We do have an ejector seat button, that if we need to off ramp, we will off ramp.
And you will, if you listen in on the board meeting on Friday, you will hear President Barron, I think, describe what some of those off ramps may be. But as a sign of optimism, we also have on ramps which are opportunities to do a little more, do things a little differently if we are able to continue to manage this in a way that we have so far and things go in a positive trajectory. So, so far, so good. We're in week four.

Thank you all for your commitment to making this work. Thank you for your partnership as a University Faculty Senate. And thanks for listening.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Provost Jones. Do we have any questions? We have the usual ways, I think we're getting used to it, of raising hands. And I have some in the room, too.

Provost Jones: Oh, actually can I say one more thing?

Chair Seymour: I think Provost Jones just got reminded he needed to mention some else, so hold on.

Provost Jones: Yes. I know a lot of-- and actually, this just in, which is why I forgot to mention it. I didn't have a pen so I couldn't write it. I know there's been a lot of concern among faculty about your peers who are in probationary status. So, tenure track faculty member, you recall that back in the spring we basically said that anybody who was tenure line in the spring semester of 2020 could, if they wanted, elect to have a one-year stay. And basically, all they had to do was ask and it would be approved, no questions asked. Well, I am pleased to report that I got a thumbs up from the Provost this morning that we are extending that time period to the calendar year of 2020.

So it will also apply to any people who were not covered in the spring but, for example, newly arrived assistant Professors, for example, who are trying to hit the ground running and just struggling to do so because everything is so different. So very pleased to report that basically, if you are in probationary status at any time during calendar 2020, we will basically automatically upon request grant a one year stay on the tenure clock. Thank you, Kathy.

Chair Seymour: All right. Now for questions, I know there is a hand raised by Palma at Fayette. So, Julio, you have the floor.

Julio Palma Anda: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Julio from Fayette. My question is regarding the dashboard and the data. So, as you mentioned, I think, in your remarks, but I-- as you mentioned, we are already in week four of classes, really week 5. And there are some data in some of the commonwealth campuses, in particular for example I want to speak about Fayette campus where the data that you see on dashboard only shows a total of 1,813 tests.

So, I want to ask-- I understand that all the numbers are being monitored. But I want to ask, is this an issue with the testing? Is this an issue with the way the companies are processing the tests? Is there a delay there? Is this an issue with the data processing and the management?

What is the reason why some commonwealth campuses show so little data? So, I hope it can be understood that some of our campus members are worried about it because it's like not having any real evidence of how the status in our campus is. It's like we are coming to campus based on faith and not real evidence. What are the things that are being done to have more evidence so our campus community can feel better? Thank you.
Provost Jones: Yeah. Great question, thank you. I appreciate you asking that. And that actually was a big issue a couple of weeks ago, where everybody on the campuses knew that the data that were just released on the dashboard was not what they knew was happening on the ground. And so, the challenge there, and it is an ongoing challenge-- it's getting better. But there are bits of the process that we can fix and bits of the process that are out of our control. And a big part of the challenge is that when a student is tested, if they test positive the data come back to the student and us at about the same time.

The student then, very quickly, usually, lets faculty members know so everybody knows that there's a positive. But by the time we get the data along with data coming from 20 other campus locations, verify the data, make sure that it goes into the right bucket, and then get it in the cycle for the next dashboard release, there can be delays just of several days. And obviously if you miss the deadline for the Friday dashboard data release, which is sometime on Thursday, then those numbers that happened the week before are not likely to be reflected until the following Tuesday dashboard.

So, there are some lags in there. We're working to improve the speed of those. But bottom line is, we are trying to make sure that every data point that shows up in the dashboard is verified, validated, and it's something we can count on, even if from a temporal perspective, it's a little bit behind when many of you look at the campus locations, or that we should be. We are doing surveillance testing across all campus locations at the same rate. So, the tests are being done. And that is happening, so you can be assured of that even if the dashboard data lag a little bit.

Bonj Szczygiel: Provost Jones, there's a question from Rosemary Jolly, Liberal Arts. It's about censorship and surveillance in a global teaching venue, not just China, but online too, and elsewhere. For example, I have students in literature and human rights globally positioned who fear surveillance and I see it. Do we have a strategy for not inadvertently or consciously offering a censored education?

Provost Jones: Rose, I'm not quite sure how to answer that. We are trying to-- sorry, Bonj, was the question about the students who are in the program in China?

Bonj Szczygiel: Not just China, but everywhere, I think, is the idea. And so, there are certain students that are globally positioned to fear surveillance from their respective nations.

Provost Jones: OK. So bad word for me to use. I use surveillance testing because it just happens to be the way that we thought about it early on. But I think if you look at the dashboard and the way that this is generally presented, we're talking about it just being random testing. And hopefully the-- I know it's not as simple as the choice of word, but hopefully the use of the phrase random testing rather than the phrase surveillance testing will be helpful.

But we do our best to explain to students what the nature of this program is. These are confidential health data. Nothing is shared with anybody. And we don't look at the numbers, other than really in aggregate format.

And Rose, if you think that there are communications that we should push out to just reaffirm that so that people do not become nervous, happy to think about doing that. It's a little bit tricky because we have to balance those concerns against the challenges, we have of managing a global pandemic that is hitting us where we said, basically. OK.
Bonj Szczygiel: These are students who fear surveillance. The question is, do we have a strategy for not inadvertently or consciously offering a censored education?

Provost Jones: OK. So I think that probably the best thing that I can say there is, in the Penn State Away program, we are offering those programs at a Chinese University but with a partner that is experienced in the offering of international programs, and in particular study abroad experiences. And so, our expectation would be that they would be keeping an eye on it. But it's a good question, Rose, and I'm happy to take that up with Roger Brindley just to make sure that we've got eyes and ears on that. So, thank you.

Chair Seymour: I have a few people that raise their hands. First is Saurabh Bansal.

Saurabh Bansal, Smeal College of Business: This is Saurabh Bansal. I am a representative of the Smeal College of Business at the University Park. I'm following up on a question that I asked earlier to the Provost. That was the last question that he answered and so he may have been in a hurry. My question was that a lot of individuals in my unit, a lot of faculty colleagues, are fixed term. And they are seeing a new language in the contract that says that their contract can be terminated within twelve weeks. Now the Provost suggested that that language may have been included as a way to prepare for the pandemic, the financial repercussions of the pandemic. So first, is my understanding correct? And if it is that that was the reason why the language was being tooted, is there a timeline in which one can anticipate that language to be removed down the line, so two years down the line or three years down the line?

Provost Jones: Yeah. Yeah, so thank you. And yes, I think the Provost did promise that I would follow up on that. So, I appreciate you reminding me. So I would actually say that that language was added to the contracts, sincerely, to protect our fixed term faculty and try to preserve their positions even though it sort of appears that it may be protecting the University and the University's position. And let me try to explain that. And I'm not sure that the communications that went out around that time were sufficiently clear on this issue.

As our deans and chancellors were preparing, or starting to think toward the 2021 academic year, they were faced, in sort of April, May, June time frame, with having to make decisions about commitments for the 2021 fiscal year. They were making those decisions with huge uncertainty, probably greater uncertainty, financial uncertainty, than we have seen at the University ever before. What we sensed emerging was a reluctance on the part of some of the deans and chancellors because of concerns about the certainty of their budget, which certainly back in that time frame we had.

There was a reluctance to extend fixed term one contracts, for example. Why? Because they didn't know whether or not they would have the money to pay. We did not know what enrollments would look like in the fall. We still don't know what enrollments are going to look like in the spring. So, deans and chancellors were nervous about making full year commitments when we had no idea, they had no idea, what enrollments would look like and what financial capacity they were going to have.

So, we sensed a pullback from renewing contracts that was troubling to us, because as I've said in my remarks and the Provost said in his, our people are our greatest asset. And we did not want to be losing potential, or not supporting our fixed term one faculty members, or our fixed term for that reason. And we did not want deans and chancellors being put in a position where they had no choice but to not extend an offer or contract at all, and just sort of wait and see what was going to happen for the fall and for the
spring, and then maybe go out and hire a fixed term two, but having lost and been unable to support one of our fixed term ones, or being prepared to make that commitment.

So that clause was added for the reason that it then gave deans and chancellors, budget executives, a little bit more flexibility. And what we saw happen as a result of that was, we believe, more fixed term contracts, fixed term one contracts, being offered than would have otherwise been offered. So even though it may look as though it's actually-- it's a pullback in commitment, or a hedging on our commitment, it's actually the opposite. We didn't do a good job, I think, of explaining that as clearly as we should have at the time.

But it is rarely done with all intent of protecting fixed term one and fixed term multi-year faculty members from the uncertainties that we are facing budgetarily-- to protect them. Not to protect the University but to protect them.

Right, yes. And in addition Kathy has just reminded me, complementary to that, any fixed term contract that was a dean or chancellor plan to not renew, had to be reviewed either by Madeleine Haines if it was at one of the campuses, or by Kathy if it was at University Park. So those two changes, in a complimentary manner, were designed-- even though on the surface they might not look that way. But they were both designed, really, to protect our non-tenure line faculty and their positions in an era of unprecedented financial uncertainty.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I have a question from Julie Gallagher. Julie, you can unmute yourself. You have the floor.

Julie Gallagher, Brandywine: Hi. Thank you, Provost Jones. You basically just addressed the question that I was going to ask. Recognizing the significant amount of great work that was done in the last few years to create that stability for the teaching line faculty. We'd like to make sure that it doesn't get undone. I think my only addition was a related question that, should there comes a time when there's a need for financial cuts, the hope is and my ask is that those cuts be shared across the board and that they don't fall disproportionately on the shoulders of our more vulnerable teaching line faculty and our staff.

And so, let's hope for that worst-case scenario not coming. I was working with others who were teaching line faculty during the summer when the contract language changed all of a sudden, and there was a huge degree of worry and instability that that change made in our colleagues' lives. And so to create stability, the messaging can go out-- I hope can go out more clearly that we're all in this together and that one group of the faculty should not bear their financial burdens to solve budget crises. Thank you.

Provost Jones: Yes, thank you. I appreciate that comment and agree with you in principle and in action, actually. And I hope that you all have observed what was done in the waning months of the 19-20 academic year. And that was that even people who were unable to work were supported on payroll even though they were basically at home not working. Why? Because the large proportion of those individuals were among our more vulnerable. And that, I think, represents the commitment of the University to our workforce, and in fact to the entire spectrum of our workforce.

So, thank you for that comment. And yes, it remains a priority, absolutely.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I have a question, so I'd like to recognize Sarah Townsend.
Sarah Townsend, College of Liberal Arts: Hi. I think-- sorry, am I coming through?

Chair Seymour: Yes, I can hear you.

Sarah Townsend: OK. Sarah Townsend, College of Liberal Arts at UP. So, I have a couple of questions. The first one is, the health resources task group executive summary that was released on Friday indicates that the tolerable threshold of one hospitalization per day at Mt. Nittany Hospital may be exceeded when the number of symptomatic infections at UP exceeds 10 per day or 70 per week. And we've now gone two weeks in a row when this number has been exceeded.

Actually, in the third week of classes last week, the number of symptomatic cases exceeded this threshold by more than three times. So, keeping in mind that there is typically a two to three-week delay between a surge in symptomatic and a surge in hospitalizations, why is the administration not following the recommendation of its own report? And if this is not the threshold that it's following, then what is?

The second question has to do with the spring. There is no public health experts that I've seen who expects the pandemic to be over by January. In fact, many have warned that it will likely become worse in the winter. So does Penn State really plan to send tens of thousands of students, many of whom will likely have asymptomatic infections, home to their local communities at Thanksgiving to spread the infection there, and then bring them all back again in January? This is especially worrying given the many problems with pre-arrival testing.

So far as I know we're still waiting for 1,100 missing test results that have never appeared on the dashboard from pre-arrival testing. Thank you.

Provost Jones: Let me address the second one first, and then back to the first if I remember it. So frankly, I'm not that concerned about the pre-arrival testing data that we don't have, partly because that's four weeks ago now it's kind of old news. What we found in the vast majority of cases that did not come back, was that students and their families, for personal reasons, had decided at the last moment, which they are certainly entitled to do, to not return to campus and to stay at home and study remote. Why? Because you all as faculty created an infrastructure that enabled them to do that. And for personal reasons, that is what they felt was best to them.

So many of those students, the ones that we followed up with, have indicated really a change in status. So, we're really not concerned about that. We don't intend to send students anywhere. Students are young adults. Students make their own decisions about what they will do and when.

If things continue through until November 20th, the week before Thanksgiving, we are working on a strategy now to ensure that we don't just throw the switch on November 20th and have all the students leave. But we will do a strategic and a metered testing protocol, fully leveraging the resources that we have in the couple of weeks leading up to November 20th. And we will work with students to schedule testing.

So, for the ones that are leaving, we will really only clear them to leave, if you will, if they test negative or have been through a period of isolation if they test positive. We have limited ability to control what students do. But the notion that we are sending students away, we don't do that. We have limited control.
We are also having conversations about what the return to spring semester will look like. We have not made any decisions yet about how our spring will be conducted. It depends on many things and many considerations that are still emergent. We haven't even decided on the dates of the spring semester.

The one thing we have done was, last week asked faculty to use the same course codes that we are using this semester. That does not represent at all any decision, in any way, about anything for the spring semester. It just affords us maximum flexibility, and our faculty and students maximum flexibility, in terms of beginning the process of constructing their spring semester. Should it be-- should it be, and this is not a decision that has been made yet, that we continue in the mode that we're in, or something similar, we are thinking already about what pre-arrival testing will look like.

We did have some challenges with the pre-arrival testing process, as you pointed out. Probably the biggest impact was a tropical storm that we hadn't planned on that impacted the eastern seaboard. We learned a lot about what worked and what didn't work, even with the presence of a tropical storm. And we will certainly be putting all of those best practices into place before we bring students back, if that's what we actually indeed end up doing.

But again, no decisions have been made about the spring yet. We're simply not ready to do that. There are many other considerations. What was the first question?

**Sarah Townsend:** The first question had to do with the threshold for going remote. According to the information in the executive summary, we have already passed that threshold, which was supposedly 10 symptomatic infections per day. So, if that is not the threshold, then what is?

**Provost Jones:** We are, as a faculty member, as a modeler, but as a modeler who always depended on actual data to really stress test and evaluate the efficacy and robustness of the modeling that I was doing, I really enjoyed modeling and making predictions. But if those predictions didn't match reality, it wasn't reality that was wrong. It was my models that were wrong, and I needed to adjust. The modeling that was done back in the end of the spring and early summer reflected our best knowledge at the time and the best efforts of our infectious disease experts to come up with robust predictions about what they thought could happen in State College.

What we're seeing, as we look at the data every day, is that they got it basically right but there are some areas where we're just not seeing data that are consistent. For example, there's been very few hospitalizations. And we're well aware of the time lags. Those time lags have all been modeled. We keep an eye on the number of students in isolation. We keep an eye on the number of students in quarantine on a daily basis.

And yes, we keep an eye on the number of hospitalizations. I actually had a call this morning with the leadership of Mt. Nittany Medical Center just to make sure there's nothing that we are missing, and everything is looking pretty good there. We anticipate that there can be hospitalizations, but we are watching that very closely. And we're not only watching the number, or the potential number of hospitalizations, but the acuity of the care that is required.

Are these impacts that require somebody to be in the ICU, or not? That's very important for us as well. And so, we are watching all those numbers. We don't want to be held to the predictions of a model. This is not an exercise to prove how good our model was. That was an exercise to help us manage and protect
the health and well-being of our community. And that's what we're really committed to, and the model provided guidance.

Chair Seymour: I have two more questions, raised hands. So, Ray Najjar, if you could take the floor.

Raymond Najjar: Hi. Ray Najjar, from the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences. While I agree the low number of hospitalizations is a positive thing, still when you look at the number of added cases it's pretty shocking. In the past two weeks the county has added almost 1,000 new cases, and they're mostly in the State College area. And my guess is that it's mostly students. I don't think there is much of a doubt about that.

That's about twice as many cases as we had for the months from March through August. So, I do wonder - you said you knew there would be cases, by which I assume you meant that you knew that going in person would increase the number of cases. And I wonder if you thought that if it increased it by 1,000, that that would be acceptable. And it's really not clear what is acceptable.

With 1,000 cases, it seems like it's pretty likely that there's going to be a death. And if that's the case, was this all worth it? Is this the cost of doing business? We're willing to sacrifice a life, because we're certainly putting lives on the line.

And we may be lucky and someone's not going to die. And God, I hope that's the case. Of course we've already had a death, but it wasn't-- of one of our students, but it wasn't as a result of us opening up in the fall. So, I don't think things are going very well. And you say they're going well compared to the Big Ten. I guess I'll take your word for that.

But we're nationally ranked now. State College, Pennsylvania is nationally ranked. The New York Times ranked it fifth in the metro areas where new cases are rising fastest on a population adjusted basis. So that seems really bad to me. And I'm not getting really bad at all from anything that you're saying, Provost Jones.

And I am hearing some humility. You don't want to take too much pride now. I really appreciate that. But I'm thinking we may be on the cusp of something really, really awful. And it seems to me that this was all in an effort to save the University from some financial crisis.

And I realize that could take a human toll, and people would be losing their jobs. And it was pointed out earlier as a point of pride that we've had no pay cuts, no furloughs, or anything like that. And on the one hand, I think that's positive. But on the other hand, I love Penn State. I've been working here for more than 25 years.

And I would be willing to sacrifice some of my salary to keep the institution going. And I know that a number of my colleagues would be as well. And in fact, that's probably why the petition that went around didn't get more signatures, because it said no salary cuts. And if it was done in a way that was scaled, so that those who were making the least money and have the least job security had little to no pay cut, and those of us that make-- you know, like me and you, that have been here for a while are are more senior, are willing to take a pay cut so that we can get through this together, without getting people sick.

Because people are getting sick. And they may have-- there's a lot of uncertainty here. People do get sick and recover but they may have long lasting consequences. So that's an unknown about this virus. And
we're playing with people's health and we're playing with people's lives here. And I just-- as you can tell by the tone of my voice, I don't like the way this has gone.

And I fear that it's only going to get worse very quickly. And I'll get back to the point that I made-- I'll finish quickly-- the point that I made to President Barron earlier. The Faculty Senate, as a body, should have been engaged more actively in decision making. This notion of shared governance is coming off like a bit of a farce here. We as a faculty, as a body, holds a lot of knowledge about how things work in this University, and we're on the front lines.

And yet we weren't consulted. And I think it's time that we do get consultation, we do get asked for our input, and not just reported to about, we're going to make this decision. We're going to make that decision. We haven't made a decision yet. How about engaging us in the decision-making process? Thank you.

Provost Jones: OK, so Ray, I'll address the second part first, and just share with you that Beth and I met every week over the summer. And Beth gave me updates on things that she thought I should hear from the Senate and I gave her updates on what I thought were critical things. In addition, I had--

Raymond Najjar: The Senate was never engaged.

Provost Jones: I had three meetings with the Senate leadership. And in each of the-- three 90-minute meetings over the course of the summer. And in those meetings, shared as much as I could about every topic that I could. I got a lot of feedback and input from Senate leadership in each of those meetings, both during the meeting and then a lot of follow up afterwards in my inbox with thoughts and feedback from Senate leadership. Now there was not a full Senate meeting over the summer. Those are not mine to call.

But I just want to reassure you that we certainly did our very best to keep at least the Senate leadership engaged throughout this process. And there were many important things that, indeed, are the domain of shared governance for which those conversations were extraordinarily helpful. And that was happening in informal structures like-- well, they were actually kind of informal structures like this, they were ad hoc and stood up fairly quickly with Beth's help. And I really appreciate that.

But I know-- and I'm looking at Kathy-- there were many, many issues that were coming up over the summer and Kathy was constantly engaging with Senate committee Chairs and other members for guidance and counsel on any guidance, and I guess we didn't really push out that much policy, but it was really mainly guidance that we were providing. And so, lots of attempts were made to do that, Ray, and happy to figure out ways that we can do more of it and do it more broadly. I know it's a little hard over the summer to call a full Senate meeting. And I guess the meetings with the leadership were at least an attempt to make sure that Senate was fully engaged with the process.

On your first issue, yes, of course we are concerned. And yes, I am concerned. And yes, I am humble in the face of these numbers. They are scary numbers.

They are cases. That are people who have tested positive for COVID. We knew it was going to happen. We went into this with the full understanding that COVID-19 would come to State College with our students and it was our responsibility to manage it. And yes, there is risk. And yes, there is uncertainty.
And the uncertainty is on a person who has spent his career dealing with uncertainty in an engineering sense and I have never experienced uncertainty like the uncertainty that we are experiencing now. All I can say is that we have done absolutely, as a University, our very best to ensure that we've got layers of protection in place to minimize the spread. 1,000 cases, positives, yes. What's not represented in that number is the number that have rolled off.

Over the last couple of weeks, we've also had 400 individuals roll out of being active cases. The number of active cases that we're looking at right now is in the 600 to 700 range. That's still a big number. And these are still students who are sick with COVID-19. And we acknowledge that.

All I can tell you is that we take that issue very seriously. We take that responsibility very seriously. And we do, as we always do, everything within our power to make our environment as safe and protective of our students, faculty, and staff as we possibly can. It is an awesome responsibility and we take it very seriously.

Raymond Najjar: Well what about considering, to deal with the potential financial stress-- and there's some debate about that in the chat here-- why not--

Chair Seymour: Ray, I need to be able to give other people an opportunity to talk. I don't mean to cut you off, but I have to. We have to give other people the floor. Nathan Tallman.

Nathan Tallman, University Libraries: Hi, thank you. Provost Jones, I was really interested to hear early on the plans to do wastewater testing as an early reading I did about this pandemic showed it was one of the first places positive cases started showing up before there were actual test results to back that up. I notice the dashboard doesn't cover the wastewater results. And I was just wondering where we are with that and if it's been useful for the Penn State community. Thank you.

Provost Jones: Yeah, thanks. That's a great question. And I think as I-- well, I certainly shared it with Senate leadership over the summer, and in other opportunities to discuss more broadly. We're trying a number of experimental means, meaning novel means, to try to generate additional data streams to help us understand and manage the pandemic. You mean waste streams? Right. One of them is-- this came from a faculty member in College of Agricultural Sciences, was around what I would call the scratch and sniff test.

I think most of you are aware that one of the symptoms of COVID is acute loss of smell. So, if you ever wake up in the morning and you can't smell your coffee, then you should enter that on your symptom checker. So, we're actually piloting the project. We made an investment on it to distribute little card samples, like the perfume cards I guess you get at department stores, that have distinct odors, and do that in conjunction with testing to see if there is, indeed, a robust correlation between loss of smell and positivity. And so, we're ready to stand that up.

We've had some supply chain issues there as well, in terms of getting the cards. But we are working on it. In addition, the concept of wastewater testing was another one that we looked at. And we've got a team of folks, and Andrew Reed and Tom Richard, the Directors of the Huck Institutes and PSIEE together, are really championing this effort. We have samplers at multiple locations around the University Park campus.
We're also sampling the total effluent flow out of Penn State into the treatment plant. And actually, we are working with the University area joint authority to monitor the effluent flow out of the State College borough municipality. So, we've been collecting those data since the week, a couple of weeks before move in, and monitoring them with interest. It is an experimental technique. We are watching that very closely.

I can tell you one thing that it tells us right now, and that is that the virus is here in State College because we can see it, and we can track it, and we can measure it in those waste streams. Now, the temporal variation is something that is challenging to interpret. And so, every day-- every day-- I have an email exchange with Andrew and Tom, and a discussion about how to interpret the data from the day before. Should we be raising a flag? Should we be doing some pop-up testing in a particular location to monitor, because there is an increase detected?

I think we are still learning how to interpret these data. So we hesitate to make raw data available for public consumption just because if it's difficult for us to interpret, it is difficult, then, for the public to interpret, and it is difficult for us to explain to the public how they should interpret it. So, we're still-- in fact, I have a meeting-- well, it was supposed to be in five minutes. I guess it's not going to be-- to actually discuss this very issue about, how can we gather these data and package them in a way that they make sense for public consumption?

But we monitor those in conjunction with all of the other test data and data streams that are coming in, and use that to paint really an holistic picture of what is going on at campus. And some days we see little upticks, and then the next day it drops down to where it was before. So, it's all in the interpretation of the data. And I think we don't quite feel that they're necessarily ready for prime time yet. But we're working very hard to get to that point. And we're confident that at some point in the future, we'll be able to share these data more readily.

**Chair Seymour:** I just wanted to let everyone know I'm scrambling because I know we still have some more items on the agenda, and I want to make sure we have time for that. So, I want to take-- I think there's two questions on Q&A, Bonj?

**Bonj Szczygiel:** We have one from Indrit Hoxha-- sorry, Indrit, if I killed that last name, Harrisburg. Do we have an early estimate of enrollment numbers?

**Provost Jones:** For this semester we're looking at enrollment numbers that are down in total by 3% or 4%, I think. That's the good news. Embedded in that, though, is a change of campus assignment, where students who maybe originally were going to be residential students at University Park, for example, are switched to be World campus students or students at another campus location. So, it's not an easy mapping between the 3% to 4% reduction in enrollment and what we are seeing budgetarily.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Well, we have a couple of statements. Just for clarification, from earlier, it was programs in China and South Korea are called Penn State First.

**Provost Jones:** Ah, right, thank you. telling me that, or?

**Bonj Szczygiel:** That is David Smith.

**Provost Jones:** OK. Thank you, David.
Bonj Szczygiel: And Charlene Gross, Arts and Architecture, is pointing out that 11 minutes ago there were 458 new cases added to the COVID dashboard, total now being 1,145.

Provost Jones: That's correct. OK, enrollment is down 1.8%. I stand corrected on that, too.

Chair Seymour: I think there's one person who has their hand up, so I'm going to call on Rose Jolly for the floor. And that'll be the final question, just in the interests of time. I do apologize. But if you have other questions that you want answered, put them in the Q&A. We'll keep track of them, and we'll work on getting them answered.

Provost Jones: I know what that means.

Rosemary Jolly, Liberal Arts: My answer has been answered. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Oh.

Rosemary Jolly: It was a hand left up from when I was trying to talk about surveillance as political surveillance, not viral surveillance.

Chair Seymour: Well, thank you, Rose.

Rosemary Jolly: So, you've got time!

Chair Seymour: Are there any other questions in the Q&A, or hands raised?

Bonj Szczygiel: No, not here.

Chair Seymour: All right. Well, let's move--

Provost Jones: Thank you, everybody.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Provost.

Provost Jones: I appreciate you giving me so much time to share these thoughts. And thank you for all that you're doing. And I can assure you that we are watching very closely every day how things are evolving. So, you have my word on that and the Provost's word. So, thank you.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Provost Jones. So, let's move on to item K, which is informational reports. Early this month, members of Senate Council voted to place the following informational Two informational reports listed on the agenda on web only format as indicated by an asterisk. However, I need to make an announcement that the Education and Faculty Affairs committees have decided to pull the first day complete report back to their committees for further discussion. The second report is from the Senate committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and is entitled, Developing a Better Understanding of Challenges Presented by Widespread Legalized Sports Betting. And you can find it in appendix O.
This report will not be discussed at today's meetings. If you have questions or comments about the informational report from intercollegiate athletics, you can email Senate@psu.edu. Your questions will be forwarded to the committee Chair. The remaining informational reports on the agenda will be discussed today. I might have to ask people to-- mute phones. But besides that--

We kind of needed the levity, so thank you, Josh. I wanted to ask people to, as we present these reports, to bear with us for the reports. But also, if there's any way we can shorten the time a little bit just so people can go to other things, then try to do that if you can. So, we have three reports that are sponsored by Senate counsel. The first report is a report on the More Rivers to Cross task force. And it's in appendix I.

This report has been allocated 20 minutes for presentation and discussion. Before I ask Professors King and Kirby to take the floor, I want to give a brief overview of the work that the Senate committees have started based off of recommendations of these fine reports. I alluded to this it seems like 10 hours ago, but it was during my remarks which were a while ago. Our committees are working on the following items-- rethinking assessment of teaching with a focus on racial bias, recommending quality diversity training and support for faculty and staff, reviewing the impact that COVID-19 is having on our faculty and students, exploring adding or redefining current curricular requirements focusing on racial justice, and reviewing Senate policies with an eye to identifying biases related to social and racial justice.

The standing committees have been asked to read these reports, the initial More Rivers to Cross report and the response by the task force and charged with identifying other possible charges. The Senate is also awaiting the recommendations coming from the Provost’s select commission on racism, bias, and community safety. We also continue our strong support on diversity, equity, and inclusion at the University and the educational equity office. And we plan to have a report on the October agenda on the community survey results that were released Monday.

Today we'll hear from Josh Kirby, who's with us in the Foster auditorium, and Gary King, Karyn McKinney-Marvasti, and Julie Gallagher on Zoom as panelists. I first turn, though, to Professor King to present some remarks to the Senate. He's, of course, part of the original authors of the More Rivers to Cross report. And since it's the original for the conversation for the task force I thought it was appropriate for him to speak first.

A little bio, Professor King is a medical sociologist and Professor in the Department of Biobehavioral Health. He is entering his 22nd year as a member of the University Park faculty. In addition to the More Rivers to Cross project, his primary research interests have focused on health disparities in smoking behavior of African-Americans, tobacco consumption in France, South Africa, and Tanzania, and conceptual and empirical uses of the race concept in health. Dr. King is currently working with colleagues examining the disparate impact of the coronavirus pandemic on African Americans. Dr. King, the floor is yours.

Report from More Rivers to Cross Task Force

Gary King, Human and Health Development: Thank you. Good afternoon. I, on behalf of the coordinating committee of More Rivers to Cross, would first like to thank Chair and Professor Beth Seymour for extending the invitation to share a few remarks about the more More Rivers to Cross report, the status of African-Americans at Penn State, part one. We would also like to express our gratitude to Professor Josh Kirby and the task force members for the report that has been formally submitted to the
Senate Council. Their review of our report represents a thorough and critical assessment and points us to a path forward.

I would also like to thank the former Chair, Professor Nicholas Rowland, who first introduced this topic to the Faculty Senate as a priority consideration. As each of you are aware, the More Rivers to Cross report was prepared by a group of Black Penn State Professors and released on January 20th of this current year and authored by Professor Darryl Thomas and me. It has received considerable attention not only on campus but also throughout the commonwealth and beyond. Most of you are probably unaware that similar reports were issued in 2000 by Dr. James Stewart and by members of the forum on Black Affairs in 2013.

Thus, the 97 pages of the More Rivers to Cross report is not the first document that has been compiled and submitted to the University examining these issues and offering specific recommendations. By way of background, the More Rivers to Cross report evolved from discussions occurring approximately two years ago, among a group of African-American faculty who were becoming increasingly concerned about the diminishing numbers in their ranks, a less than hospitable cultural climate, and the misuse of SRTEs as well as other matters. Formal and informal gatherings led to the idea that something must be done to alert and to inform the University community and others that the paucity of Black Professors at Penn State required the immediate attention of the administration, as well as deans, heads, students, and our fellow colleagues.

To this end, we decided to convene a conference on April 4th, 2019, entitled An Afternoon with African American Professors at Penn State, More Rivers to Cross. During this forum, which was attended by over 75 individuals, we presented and discussed the substantive issues that would eventually become the basis of the part one report. Since that time, the nation has undergone an earth shattering racial reckoning after the horrific murder of George Floyd and the deaths of Breonna Taylor, and the many other African-American men and women who have unjustly perished at the hands of law enforcement.

These recent tragedies have reminded us of the historical injustices and brutality suffered by African Americans since the country's inception some 400 years ago, and the systemic institutional forms of racism that exist today. Not only have these recent events awakened the soul of the nation and ignited protests throughout the country, it has also reverberated globally. And even in the face of the worst public health pandemic that the world has seen in over a century, the unfinished business of racial justice and equity continues to be recognized as a major social dilemma in the hearts and minds of most Americans. Thus it is within this context, and the epic period of racial transformation, that I encourage my fellow colleagues to review carefully and accept a task force report for making long overdue changes to increase the numbers and to enhance the experiences of Black Professors here at one of the nation's most respected institutions of higher learning.

In the forthcoming part two report, we will be making specific demands of the University. With regard to the Faculty Senate, I put forth the following challenges. One, to hold each of the Senate Faculty representatives, colleges, and departments accountable for promoting the implementation of the task force's recommendations. Two, to establish anti-racism goals and measures to eliminate systemic racism that are both short term and long term. Three, to monitor and to assess on an annual basis the progress of the recommendations that you make to the administration. Fourth, to work closely with Black faculty members within and outside of the Faculty Senate, to obtain their advice and assessment.
And perhaps most of all, number five, to stand tall and be counted on these issues. Lastly, I commend you in courageously assuming the professional and moral obligation to address matters of racial inequity, racism, and discrimination here at Penn State in all of its forms. Our country, though seemingly divided on matters of race, must demand transformative changes to be just and for all to be included. Or as the great poet James Langston Hughes emphatically declared for the ages almost 100 years ago, I, too, sing America. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Dr. King. Would you be willing to answer a question or two if there are any?

Gary King: Sure.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Are there any questions in Q&A, any raised hands?

Bonj Szczygiel: None so far.

Chair Seymour: I don't think we have any questions. Thank you so much for attending the Senate today. We really appreciate it, and I appreciate your words. Josh, it's your turn. Sorry. I'm a little befuddled, but as an introduction for Josh, he was the Chair of the task force.

Josh Kirby, College of Education: That's good enough. Well, here we are, at whatever time it is. So, thank you all for your attention because we've worked hard on this issue, even as the pandemic started to unfold. So, I'm really proud of the task force and to introduce this report to you today. I'm a Senator and a counselor from the College of Education. And my role here today is really to introduce and facilitate a discussion that builds upon an informational report that you will see as appendix I in your agenda.

Soon after the More Rivers to Cross report-- More Rivers to Cross, part 1, University Park report was released by the concerned Black faculty of our University, past Chair of the Senate Nicholas Roland charged a Senate task force to internalize the report by reading it deeply, talking with the authors, thinking critically about the functions of the Senate, and developing recommendations for how the Chair should lead the Senate to respond. The Senate year transition from past Chair Rowland to Chair Seymour did not undermine the importance of the recommendations of the task force. Rather, Chair Seymour incorporated the original report and our recommendations for action into her guiding principles for her term as Chair this year.

A watershed moment in our task force's work came early in our first meeting with the attributed authors of the More Rivers to Cross part one report, Professor Gary King and Associate Professor Darryl Thomas. I intentionally used the phrase attributed authors, because Doctors King and Thomas explained to us that there were many more voices, contributors, editors, data analysts, and unnamed authors, who were essential to the preparation of this report. However, those who were unnamed did not feel a sense of security about their professional or personal circumstances to allow their name to be publicly attributed alongside Doctors King and Thomas.

Our task force reflected deeply about this insight. The historical context that our task force gathered, and the Senate actions we recommend, were developed from a keen awareness that we have faculty colleagues who fear performing academic work that would better our community and have their names attached to that work for credit they deserve. Our task force honors everyone who worked with doctors King and Thomas to produce the More Rivers to Cross report. The Senate counsel has sponsored the
informational report that was released for today's meeting and allocated 20 minutes for questions and comments related to the More Rivers to Cross part one report, although I will defer to Chair Seymour about the timing.

The time today can talk about our task force's report, the More Rivers to Cross report, the actions that we recommend, as well as the topics of racism, racial equity, and the faculty of our entire University. Cofacilitating this time with me on Zoom are fellow task force members Associate Professor Karyn McKinney-Marvasti Altoona, and Associate Professor Julie Gallagher of Brandywine. We welcome our fellow Senators' questions and comments. And we'll do our best to call on those who raised their hand or submit their question in a fair order. Who would like to go first?

**Chair Seymour:** Are there any questions? Chris Byrne, you have the floor. Chris Byrne? You might have to unmute if you're in the panelist. Chris, are you there? Does anyone else have a question? I think we keep putting our hands down. Does anyone else have a question? Alok, are you there?

**Alok Sinha, College of Engineering:** Yeah, I'm there, yeah. It's more like a comment rather than a question. I remember Provost Jones' statement in the very first discussion in Senate, he remarked that we have to do always the right things. I think I would like to emphasize that. Doing right things should become our way of doing things, every time, every day, because it is hard to imagine that someone will not do right things in one area and will do everything right in other area.

So, it is certainly, we should have environment that it becomes our character to do the right thing always. So, it's more like a comment. That's it.

**Chair Seymour:** Hi. This is Chair Seymour-- Beth Seymour. I'm supposed to be neutral, but I completely agree with that sentiment. So sometimes I can't stay neutral.

**Alok Sinha:** Thank you.

**Chair Seymour:** Does anyone else have a question? Chris Byrne, are you there? It's always the frustration of technology. It cannot be our friend sometimes. Does anyone else have a question on Q&A or by raising their hand? Greg Shear, you have the floor.

**Greg Shear, Human and Health Development:** Hey, thanks. Greg Shear, HHD. When this first came before the floor last year, I asked a question regarding some of my frustrations when I sit on faculty hiring committees. And I'm trying to peruse quickly through appendix I and see what you came up with. But my frustration in that regard lay specifically in the fact that on committees like that, we're never given any guidance as to what the actual target is.

How do we know that we are participating in fair hiring practices? And frankly from a lot of the diversity folks at the University, they give us very vague answers. And I'm wondering if that is a part of this report? Or maybe that's something you guys are hoping to come up with in response. But I just would like an update on that particular issue.

**Julie Gallagher:** Can I speak to that? Unless, Josh, you want to take it. OK, I'm Julie Gallagher. I was on the task force.
To your point, we actually did address. This is one of our significant concerns and one of the six recommendations that we have. Number five says, establish hiring policies, processes, resources, and incentives designed to substantially increase representation of African American faculty across the University. And it's not just about putting in more explicit and intentional policies, but it's also holding people accountable for how those hiring committees and policies have been implemented over time.

So, the six recommendations we have are intended to be substantive. And ultimately the responsibility is in the hands of the Senate. So, we can only recommend. We can't effectively establish policy. But that was absolutely one of our priorities, was to make sure that the hiring policies and processes are robust, consistent, well resourced, and monitored to ensure that they get to the goal that they are intended to get to.

Josh Kirby: And this is Josh. And I just wanted to say that one of the things that was in progress beforehand that was the first step of addressing a lot of this was revisions to a policy AC13. And so, from the time that our task force was first convened to then, those revisions came to the floor and were voted on by the Senate in April. So those recommendations have begun. They are being heard and we're working toward that.

But we do believe as a task force that we can continue to work with the offices and the administrators of the University to continue to push that further and make sure that we are truly meeting the needs of the population we're trying to hire, and of the programs that are looking for that talent to hire. Make sure everyone has the resources they need to know that Penn State is a place that will benefit from them being here.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Josh. And are there any other-- and Julie. Are there any other questions? Julio Palma, you have the floor.

Julio Palma Anda: Thank you. Thank you both. I was wondering if there has been some-- I know the first report was mainly focused on University Park. But this can be expanded to other campuses. And there are some specific challenges that other campuses face. So, I was wondering if they have looked into those challenges.

I think this is a very important report, a very important topic on how we can address that in the commonwealth campuses. For example, in Fayette campus we only have one African American faculty. I know there are other campuses that they have none.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Julio. If I could ask Dr. King to address that?

Gary King: Yes, sure. I'd be happy to. Thank you for the question. Actually, part two will focus to a great extent on the commonwealth campuses. In fact, we have our most recent data indicating that there are only about 46 African American or Black faculty at the 24 or so campuses. And that is really alarming to us and something that we're giving a good deal of attention to.

And the questioner is quite correct. Their issues are somewhat different and extend in some other ways. And we want to make sure that the report, the part two report, captures the essence of what are some of their major concerns.
Karyn McKinney-Marvasti, Altoona: If I could add something there, too, that is in our report as one of our recommendations, that this kind of exploration go out to all the campuses and that we support Dr. King's work in that area as a Faculty Senate. So that's one of our recommendations.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. King and Karyn. And I also wanted to extend the Senate's cooperation. And any help we can give with the second report, we will gladly do so.

Gary King: Thank you.

Chair Seymour: I think Bonj has a question on Q&A, so she's going to read that off.

Bonj Szczygiel: We finally got in touch with Christopher Byrne. And he writes, I want to point out that the issue is often framed around fairness. And fairness is certainly relevant, but it is also an issue of what the entire community loses when we exclude any community from contributing. It diminishes all of us in our collective synergistic productivity to exclude African Americans who have been stellar contributors time and time again in every field of endeavor. The 800-pound gorilla that makes everyone uncomfortable is to accept our inherited responsibility, that is response ability, for this matter.

Josh Kirby: So I want to echo not only Chair Seymour's sentiments about the support for part two of this report, but our report also offers some concrete recommendations as to how to do that, which is what Chair Seymour was referring to. We know that getting access to data has not necessarily been a challenge. But there's data scattered all throughout the University. And the authors have done their best to get access.

And for those that have data and know that the coordinating committee of More Rivers to Cross is looking for that data, they've received that cooperation. But there's data scattered all over. And so one of the recommendations was that the Faculty Senate, who is also involved in a lot of data, be ready and available to provide whatever we can and to introduce and make connections wherever necessary so that the authors of part two have everything that they need.

We do believe that part two is going to be just as interesting as part one. So, getting to Julio's point, and given that my two co-presenters here are both from campuses other than University Park, we've had this in mind from the beginning of, how do we make this a University wide issue? And we are really looking forward to what will be given to us in part two.

Bonj Szczygiel: We have another question from Kim Blockett. Will the Senate and/or the Provost office contribute any resources to help complete part two of their report?

Josh Kirby: Beth do you want to answer?

Chair Seymour: It's the reality of the resources of the Senate, they do sit with the Provost. So, to a large extent, it's a Provost question. But I definitely will advocate for trying to get the information that we need.

Bonj Szczygiel: We also have a comment, a question from Martha Strickland, Harrisburg. We recognize that our campuses are embedded within communities which also impact the types of faculty who feel welcome to our campus. What are the efforts to connect with the communities and campuses?
Josh Kirby: This is definitely a consideration. And we wrestled with how the Faculty-- because our purview here is the faculty who are elected as Senators and who are part of this body. So how do we use the resource that we have of these Senators who are a part of these communities that Martha is referring to. So, we do recommend that we find those ways to make those connections. How to do it, though, may not be something that you want to be answered centrally.

We may need to just ask the question and help the answers emerge according to the needs of the local communities where our campuses are, and with the populations that are there. I will also offer that the connection of the faculty to the communities and the faculty to any initiative that supports the enrichment of Black faculty in our ranks as faculty across the University, is something that we each need to do our own small part in our own small sphere. And I think that that's also at the heart of Martha's statement is, how can we each do something to support our faculty colleagues who are looking for community, who are looking to be engaged, and to have Penn State be the place that they grow? We can do those parts by being conscious on our own. And I think that that's also where Senate resources can go, is to provide our Senators with those ideas of how to specifically contribute to the needs and the success of Black faculty across the University system.

Karyn McKinney-Marvasti: To follow up on what Josh said, I think we, in our reported recommendations, we recommended that we have liaisons at the various campuses. And of course, we'll defer to Dr. King and his colleagues about exactly how to go about this. But one suggestion was that be sure we have plenty of liaisons on the campuses. And I think that will help us identify particular problems on those campuses, maybe even having some focus groups with Black faculty and others on those campuses as well to identify some of the community campus interaction problems that might be there.

Josh Kirby: An interesting question to Dr. King, for part two do you feel that you are able to make the connections with the campuses that you needed connections with? Or is there an immediate need that Senators could help with?

Gary King: Well, thanks for the question. Actually, we have a group of faculty at these campuses that we've been working with. And they've been very resourceful, giving us information. And that report is coming along, I think, fairly well. But we could always use additional input.

But this is something that we made a dedicated effort to do this, go beyond University Park and to have a chance to ascertain the views of those who are providing service, providing teaching, and then conducting research, on the commonwealth campuses.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Dr. King. Thank you, Dr. McKinney-Marvasti. Also, Bonj, are there any other questions on Q&A?

Bonj Szczygiel: Well, there was a comment from, again, Ken Blockett, but it then has disappeared. I don't know if you can retract. But the observation was that it-- let me paraphrase. The improvement of Penn state's situation should not be placed squarely on the shoulders of Black faculty.

Karyn McKinney-Marvasti: Yeah. That's something we addressed in our report as well, is we had some background literature there that talked about the More Rivers to Cross report, but also what's been found in national level studies that Dr. King and Dr. Thomas reported, about the extra burden that Black faculty end up taking on, ironically, while they're trying to solve some of the problems of being Black faculty
members. So, the double burden of having to serve on extra committees and do extra work to involve themselves in solutions is definitely something that we thought of as a committee. And hopefully other faculty can step up to take some of that burden off of Black faculty that so often is there, I think.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I think Nathan Tallman has his hand up. Nathan, you can have the floor.

Nathan Tallman: Thank you, Tallman, University Libraries-- forgot that last time. I wanted to connect a few dots from comments that have been made and pose a question. It seems that there is a problem in data collection, or a challenge to collect this data to create these reports. And it also seems that there is being a burden placed upon certain faculty members to come up with this data. I'm wondering why the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research does not compile this data already.

And the suggestion in the task force report, the recommendation that University Senate annually compile a report with some of these metrics, again seems like something the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research should be involved in so that everyone has skin in the game to solve this problem. And maybe I'm naive, and I'm still a newbie here, and don't quite understand the processes for this. But seems like they should be involved. Thanks.

Karyn McKinney-Marvasti: They do already gather numbers, if that's the kind of data that you're referring to, Nathan. So, counts of faculty of color on the campuses are there. But Dr. King can elaborate on this, too. I think the kind of data we're talking about is more qualitative data as well that talks about the particular experiences they're having on the campuses, which would be different than just the numbers. Of course, the numbers should be in the report as well, I think. But Dr. King could speak to that.

Gary King: Sure. Actually, we talked to the Office of Planning and Assessment. Actually, quite resourceful for the first part of the report. And some of their numbers actually differed a bit from other parts of the University, but there was some adjustments that we were making with regard to the definitions of who was actually a faculty member. But all in all, I must say we were pleased to get their input. And we're looking forward for the same type of assistance for part two. And I don't expect we'll have any problems with that.

However, there are other bits of information that they do not have. And the issues regarding cultural climate, issues that particularly to Black faculty on campus. And those sorts of things will come about by way of a survey. We're also in the process of doing these sorts of things as well. So, we wanted to also be a robust data collection effort. So, we're going to be looking at both quantitative and qualitative data as we pursue this in part two.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I think Lance Kennedy-Phillips is there to be recognized. So, if he could take the floor.

Lance Kennedy-Phillips, Office of Planning, Assessment and Institutional Research: Thank you. Can you hear me OK?

Chair Seymour: Yes.

Lance Kennedy-Phillips: All right, thank you. Yes, OPAIR, or the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research, will definitely be an active partner here. We do put quite a bit of, as one of the
panelists said, data on counts and information about factually on our data digest, our factbook. But as Dr. King said, we welcome the opportunity to collaborate. And we look forward to actually sharing some of the results of the climate of the community survey at the next meeting as well. So count us in to be active partners in this process.

Josh Kirby: Thank you, Lance. So, Chair Seymour has made note of the time. And we'd like to move on with the remainder of the agenda. So, I just have a small charge for everyone who's still with us. Thank you so much for being here.

One of those is that we really encourage you, as personal peers, as colleagues who are also faculty like you are, we encourage you to read the original More Rivers to Cross report if you have not yet. That work, it characterizes a lot of situations that many we have talked with, many we have found did not even know were possible. They feel that they were unfathomable in their campus community. So please read that report.

Secondly, we encourage you that if any-- if you want to offer any support, especially if you're at a campus but anywhere here, please reach out to Dr. King, Dr. Thomas, and their coordinating committee, because they thrive off of knowing that they have allies and partners, especially those who are not Black. Because we do not want only Black faculty members to be responsible for this, as that comment has been made. And lastly, I just offer to everyone that this can and should be a recurring issue, one that we should see in the charges of the committees of the Senate.

They believe that they have been fairly well reflected for this year. But we don't want it to be a one-year thing. So somewhere on the line, or somewhere in the room, our future Chairs of our committees, please don't forget today. Please don't forget not only the part one report but part two when that comes out. Don't let that fade from memory. I think it's our responsibility as Senators to make sure our community is inclusive, and we can do a better job. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Josh and other Senate colleagues. Thank you, Dr. King. I really appreciate y'all bringing this forward. I agree wholeheartedly. Frankly, I think this work needs to be central to all of our work.

It no longer should be some peripheral add on or addendum. That's part of what deconstructing the anti-racist work really is, is deconstructing that institutional racism so that it is no longer peripheral to our conversation. So, I do hope the Senate takes that up moving forward as well.

So, we are late. So, let's just keep moving. The Senate officers visit one half-- a third of the commonwealth-- I'm getting ahead of myself-- campuses each fall and a third of the colleges at University Park each spring to meet with faculty, students, staff, and administrators. The Senate secretary is tasked with writing a report on these visits for presentation to the Senate. The two reports Report on Senate Officers Campus Visits Fall 2019, A Report on Spring 2020 College Visits, can be found as appendix J and K respectively. Judy Ozment will present the reports. Judy, if you can make it less than 10 minutes that'd be super awesome. Judy, you have the floor.

Report on Senate Officers Campus Visits Fall 2019

Judy Ozment, Abington: Thank you, Chair Seymour. You just read the first paragraph of my intro, so I'll start at the second paragraph. The Senate officers visited seven campuses last fall. I know that feels
like 100 years ago. We visited Behrend, Shenango, and Beaver in northern western Pennsylvania, and Lehigh Valley in eastern Pennsylvania, and Mont Alto and York in southern Pennsylvania.

campuses of Penn State are key assets to our University, and it was our pleasure to be visiting our campuses in these parts of the state. We asked participants two open ended questions. What makes your campus a good place to work and learn? And what is suboptimal or needs improvement? We heard some common responses as well as some widely different details.

This report provides a summary of more than 50 pages of notes from the 30 hours we spent at these campuses. One recurring theme was that the campuses are committed to helping their students. And common concerns associated with that are worries about future enrollments and supporting increasingly vulnerable student populations. Reports like this are provided to the entire Senate so the officers can share what we heard.

If you want to take a trip down memory lane pre-pandemic, read this report. As the Senate Secretary last year, I'm here today to present our campus visits report to the full Senate and try to answer any questions you may have. Are there any questions?

Chair Seymour: Are there any questions for Judy?

Bonj Szczygiel: None here.

Report on Spring 2020 College Visits

Judy Ozment: All right, I'll move on to my next report. This is the college visits report. Penn State's colleges and other units such as division of the undergraduate studies and the University libraries are key assets to our University. Each year the University Faculty Senate officers also visit of these units. As with the campus visits, they are structured as a listening tour to meet with staff, students, faculty, and administrators.

Due to the pandemic shut down last March, we Zoom visited five units-- agricultural sciences, the Schreyer honor's college, arts and architecture, information sciences and technology, and the University libraries. Two other visits were postponed. We heard some common responses and got some wildly different answers to three open ended questions.

We asked, what makes your college or unit a good place? What could be improved? And how are you managing transitions related to COVID-19? This report provides a summary of more than 50 single spaced pages of notes as well as the Zoom chats and emails we received from everyone.

Everyone was finding the pandemic transition difficult in some way. Some units like IST and the libraries were really feeling like they were taking the lead in managing the transitions. However, two colleges especially expressed being seriously hampered by their environment. Here are just a few examples we've heard about.

It's difficult to milk a cow, or make cheese, or play a piano, or build a structure out of wood, or form something out of clay, through Zoom. Having no access to critical specialized facilities, equipment, and materials on campus created some very serious difficulties for arts and architecture and ag sciences. This
report helped the University Faculty Senate officers to stay in touch with these colleges. And it also
details many aspects of the remarkable historical event caused by this pandemic last spring.

As a Senate secretary, I'm here today to visit our Zoom college report to the full Senate through Zoom
and try to answer any questions you may have.

**Chair Seymour:** Are there any questions for Judy?

**Judy Ozment:** There's the dog.

**Chair Seymour:** All right, thank you, Judy.

**Judy Ozment:** Thank you.

**Interim Report: Curricular Policy and Process Reform**

**Chair Seymour:** Our next report is the Senate committee on curricular affairs. It is titled, Interim Report
Curricular Policy and Process Reform, appendix L. 15 minutes are allocated but it'd be really great if
there's less. Chair Williams will present the report. Mary Beth, you have the floor.

**Mary Beth Williams:** Thank you, Chair Seymour. I'll keep it less than five, to respect all of you who've
been sitting with us for more than four hours now. This report is purely intended to keep open and
transparent to the Faculty Senate the ongoing conversations that the Senate committee on curricular
affairs is having about curriculum, and to share back with you feedback that we got from Senators last
spring, pre-pandemic, about questions about consultation and its role in the curricular review process,
proposal and review process, and to share with you a report and recommendations that we received from
the special committee that was charged by Faculty Senate Chair last year, Chair Rowland last year, the
curriculum process reform task force. That final report and recommendations are attached to this
informational report for your information.

It contains a number of recommendations that are recommendations for next steps for the Senate
committee on curricular affairs. Together with Chair Seymour, the charges for curricular affairs this year
include work to consider those recommendations and some of that work has already begun. We expect to
present several reports to Senate this year with updates, including information on the implementation of a
new curriculum management system.

We want you to know too that the staff in the registrar's office has already heard your feedback and has
been working hard to reduce the implementation timeline for curriculum changes, that is the time it takes
to be entered into LionPATH and to show up. They've shortened those timelines by three to six months.
And faculty will see updates in those implementation dates on the Senate website shortly. So mostly this
report is to welcome continued dialogue, and input, and comments, and for you to have a look at what it
is that we are doing and thinking about as we move forward this year.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you so much, Mary Beth. Are there any questions for Mary Beth? This is really
important work. I apologize for the lateness and the length of the meeting. We have a lot of important
work.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** None here.
Chair Seymour: All right, thank you. No questions. I have a feeling everyone's just tired. Our next report is from the Senate committee on benefits, but the Chair has contacted me, and he would like a bigger audience and more time and that's understandable. And so, we are going to move that till October. So that report, Review of Principles for Design of Penn State Health Care Plans, appendix N, is moved to October. And I'll work with Senate Council hopefully to get that a nice position in the informational reports.

Our last report is from the Senate committee on libraries information systems and technology titled, Office365 Report in appendix P. Originally 10 minutes were allocated but I'm hopeful. We've got two presenters, Jennifer Sparrow, Associate Vice Provost of Teaching and Learning with Technology, and Ann Clements who's the Chair of List. They'll present the report. Jennifer and Ann, thank you.

Office 365 Report

Jennifer Sparrow, Penn State IT: Thank you. We've got is online as well. And if we can unmute her and allow her to speak, that would be great. Ann, do you want to start? OK, perfect. I only have 172 slides. We should be out of here by-- I'm kidding.

We should be out of here in just a few minutes. If you can pull up my side, though, that would be great. I did want to just review quickly, as you all know we put Office365 into place about 24 months ago. We started with email and calendaring, but we wanted to just give you a quick update and ensure that you all have the resources that you need to move forward.

I have a PowerPoint, too, that I think was sent over to you. Can you pull that up for me or no? No? It's OK if you can't. We'll just do this quickly. Let me see if I can maybe-- can you allow me to share? Sorry.

We have a ton of great apps. They're phenomenal. Maybe? All right, I will go without it. How about that? We'll get out of here.

We have Teams, which is one of the apps that's available for you all. It is a chat-based workspace that's similar to Slack. We have collaborative sharing of documents in there. There are private channels. We're actually using Teams within our classes. And if you want to do that as well, it's a great backup.

The first day of classes when Zoom was not available, we were able to set up a Teams live event. And you can pull that right into place from there. So, we're good to go with that.

We have Power Platform, which includes three tools for you all-- Power Automate, Power Apps, and Power BI. Those are things that allow you to automate the workflow that you're doing. And no worries if you can remember all this. We'll make sure that it's all available in the report.

We have Planner, which is an easy to do list. And it allows you to create plans, assign tasks, and share files, and get progress updates from your team members. We have something called Class Notebooks which, again, can be integrated right into your Canvas workspace. It allows you to create classroom plans and digital notebooks and create shared or individual workspaces for your students. So, this allows you to have a space where students can come in and utilize those spaces collaboratively or individually.

Obviously, OneDrive, and you'll have some more information at the next Senate meeting about Box and the end of life a Box that will be coming. OneDrive is one option for you for level one and level two data
can be stored there. If you want to store level three and level four data, we can do that via a secure enclave within SharePoint. But that allows for file sharing as well.

We have a whiteboard feature available to you all as well. And I wanted to spend a little bit of time-- it's in the report but talking about the numbers just so you have an understanding of where we are in terms of our products by user. Our highest date this year was in actually August of this year. The number of users that are on Exchange, it was 125,000 users on Exchange. That makes sense. That's probably most of our students, most of our faculty and staff on there as well.

OneDrive, we have about 50,000 users in there utilizing that already, and 44,000 in SharePoint. We have pretty significant usage of Teams. We were the number one user of Teams in the country until everybody went remote. Then several of the school districts across the country started using Teams and we bumped down in that a little bit. But we are one of the largest high ride users of Teams available.

There are some tips and tricks for you. Those are listed in the report. But what are you going to do if you want help with Microsoft Office? And we have several places where you can go. There's Office365.psu.edu, which just offers general information. And then if you just added /training onto the end of that, there's an opportunity to find individual learning paths and face to face on Zoom trainings for you all. Respectfully submitted, and I think I'm the last hurdle before happy hour.

Well, let's see the PowerPoint.

Chair Seymour: Yep, thank you, thank you. Thank you, Jennifer and Ann. And thank you for your patience. Technology is not always our friend, so I'm sorry.

But let's now look at the results of our earlier votes. So, Anna, can you please share your screen and read out the report's name and the results of the vote for the record?

Anna F. Butler, Senate Office: Yeah. It's just going to take a few seconds.

Chair Seymour: All right, so the vote-- I'm actually having trouble reading this, so maybe you need to read it.

Dawn Blasko, Executive Director Senate Office: OK, so let's start with the short version-- everything passed. So that's the good news. We reordered the agenda, 131-1, approved the minutes 138-0, revised the bylaws, article IV, committee section one and two, appendix Q, 159-5, revised the standing rules article two, section six, 156-6, revised the standing rules, article three, other functions of the Senate, 158-6, general education requirements for associate degree programs, appendix E, 161-2, and election day absences in policy 4227, class attendance, 141-25. We made the amendment to the word governmental, 103-14, called the question 143-13, and Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, 139-5, and the task force recommendation 140-5.

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Seymour: Perfect. Thank you, everybody. And thank you for your patience. Let's move to the last few items. Item L, new legislative business. Is there any new business? If you want to get the floor or Q&A, I think you know the instructions by now. Is there any new business?
COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Seymour: Seeing none, item M, comments and recommendations for the good of the University. Are there any additional comments for the good of the University? Again, Q&A or raise your hand. Chris Byrne, you have the floor. Are you having trouble with your button, or just sound?

Bonj Szczygiel: The last time he typed in into the Q&A. He could do that.

Chair Seymour: Yeah, Chris, you might need to type into the Q&A again.

Bonj Szczygiel: Chris is saying, mic is still broken.

Chair Seymour: Do you have a comment for the good of the order? Chris?

Bonj Szczygiel: I just want everyone to look up Michael Milla at Harvard.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Any context you want to add to the Q&A as well?

Bonj Szczygiel: $1 instant COVID test exists, he follows up.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Chris. Any other comments for the good of the order? Hearing none, may I have a motion to adjourn? All in favor, give thumbs up, in the room and also in the participants box.

Oh, sorry, sorry, sorry-- I need a second. Do I have a second?

Bonj Szczygiel: Second

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Seymour: Well, thank you. I think the motion likely carries, though I don't see it. The Senate is adjourned until October 20th, 2020. Thank you so much.

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, October 20, 2020, 1:00 p.m.
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