THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

THE SENATE RECORD

Volume 54----September 29, 2020----Number 1

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

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

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

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

Reports that have appeared in the Agenda for the meeting are not included in The Senate Record unless they have been changed substantially during the meeting or are considered to be of major importance. Remarks and discussions are abbreviated in most instances. Typically the Senate meeting is webcast via MediaSite. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic this meeting was held via Zoom Webinar. All Senate meetings are digitally audio recorded and on file in the Senate office. Transcriptions of portions of the Senate meeting are available upon request.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

III. Appendices
   a. Attendance
      Appendix I

FINAL AGENDA FOR September 29, 2020

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR
   Page 2

B. FORENSIC BUSINESS
   The State of Penn State- Appendix A
   Pages 2-24
C. **NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS** - Pages 25-39

D. **COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY**  Page 39

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

E. **ADJOURNMENT**  Pages 40-41
The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, September 29, 2020, at 1:00 p.m. via Zoom Webinar with Elizabeth Seymour, Chair, presiding.

Chair Seymour, Penn State Altoona: OK. Hi, everybody. It is 1:00 PM Tuesday, September 29, 2020, and the Senate is now in session. Welcome everyone. Because this is a special Senate meeting which I called to discuss issues of urgency, we will be dispensing with most of the items on the agenda to focus our conversation.

We are running this meeting using the same webinar format that we did last time. However, we don't have the modified in-person component, so we're all on Zoom together. The only people as permanent panelists are people running the meeting, which includes the Senate Officers, the Parliamentarian, and some of the Senate office staff. The instructions for this meeting are the same as a regular meeting but let me go through them a little bit first.

So, who can speak at the meeting? Only those who are elected or appointed faculty. A student, 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're 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. 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. Chat is turned on for you to communicate with each other, but we are not closely monitoring chat. You may post a comment, but you should not post questions there. If you want a question read into the record, it should go in Q&A. If you have an emergency, email Kadi Corter at kkw2.

How do you ask a question? The same as the last meeting. There are 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 the panelist, and then you can ask your question. Remember, you must begin by stating your last name and academic unit. For example, Seymour, Altoona. Please speak clearly and slowly, as the audio is not always clear on Zoom calls.

You can also enter your question into the Zoom 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 in a fully in-person Senate meeting, 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.

We are not scheduled to have votes today, but if there is a vote, we will use Poll Everywhere. If you have not already done so, please take the time to log into Poll Everywhere. A final note-- please be patient. There is a lot of moving parts, so give us some time to be able to get to everything.

I want to welcome everyone. And thank you for being here for this special meeting. I want to thank our guests for attending and engaging in the work of the Senate. And I want to thank the Senate Office for their hard work. Without their support, the Senate could not get its work accomplished. So, let's move on to the agenda.
Chair Seymour: Item A, Announcements by the Chair. The recording of the September meeting has been posted on the Senate website. The full transcription of the record will be approved at the regular October meeting. I decided to call this special meeting, as it was clear to me after the last meeting that Senators needed a forum for discussion and the sharing of ideas. As the Senate, we are deeply committed to representing our faculty and student body during these challenging times. At the September 15 meeting, we posed tough questions but were unable to have a robust conversation. Events have continued to evolve, and I felt that we would benefit from an open conversation with all members of our community, which is why I asked Senate Councilors and the Standing Committee Chairs to reach out to their units and committees to gather feedback for this meeting. I thank you all for your efforts to do that.

So I'll begin the meeting with an extensive forensic to support a conversation about how we can best continue to meet our shared mission of teaching, research, creative activity, service, and outreach for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania across all of our campuses. I also realized after the September 15 meeting that several Senators' questions posed in Q&A were not addressed. I've asked for those questions to be answered, and we'll get those answers to the Senators soon.

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Seymour: Let's move into the forensic. Item B, Forensic Business. The topic for today's forensic, The State of Penn State, can be found in Appendix A. I want to thank the faculty members of Senate Council for their input on framing this forensic. The forensic discussion will start with a focus on the University Faculty Senate Resolution on Return to Work passed by Senate Council at its June 23, 2020, meeting.

This resolution was drafted and approved by the chairs and vice chairs of our 15 standing committees. It was submitted to Senate Council on June 23 and approved unanimously by that body acting for the Senate. The resolution is focused on faculty choice regarding the University's planning process for returning to in-person instruction in the fall. The resolution presented a set of principles focusing on the role of faculty as key partners in the decision-making process for instruction at the University across all of its campuses. It expressed concern about the health and well-being of our campuses and communities and ended with a set of requests to the University.

The principles, concerns, and requests to the University issued in this resolution are still relevant now and provide a framework for discussing many of the most pressing issues today. The questions in the forensic are intended to help the Senate briefly review the work of the last few months, identify concerns and requests that have arisen since the Return to Work Resolution, or that had been unsatisfactorily addressed, and offer substantial time for open discussion and comments that Senators may want to make along with providing points of convergence for us moving forward.

Before we begin, let me explain the rules for discussion. I will alternate between those with raised hands and those who ask questions in the Q&A. I also want to provide an opportunity for as many to speak as possible. If you've already had the floor and a Senator who has not spoken yet raises their hand, I will call on that new person first. The Q&A will be read by Vice Chair Bonj Szczygiel and must include your last name and academic unit-- for example, Seymour, Altoona. We'll get to as many questions as possible, but
just like in a regular meeting, I cannot guarantee that we will get to them all. Any unanswered questions in the Q&A will be saved and sent to the appropriate person.

Let me get everything up so that I can see what's going on. So, if you could scroll down, please, Erin, in the resolution. You can see. I'm just making sure I don't see any raised hands. Am I seeing that correctly? Could someone please look? It doesn't look like we have any raised hands.

Bonj Szczygiel, Arts and Architect: Yeah, I don't see any, Beth, either. We do have a question, though.

Chair Seymour: Yes. Bonj, could you go to the question in Q&A?

Bonj Szczygiel: Yeah, our first question is from Cindy Simmons, who is writing, represents Michelle Rodino-Colocino, a Communications colleague, who is the President of the Penn State Chapter of the Association of American University Professors. She asks that this concern of UP be raised. "The 12-week layoff/furlough clause added to all fixed-term faculty contracts this past summer should be rescinded immediately. This needs to be a priority to save precarious fixed-term faculty positions and prevent the adjunctification of these positions. Non-tenure track instructors teach most of the classes at Penn State campuses, and their significant contributions need to be recognized and protected by the University. The Faculty Senate should not accept the, quote, 'explanation' that was given at the last Faculty Senate meeting that the new language was included to ensure the stability of non-tenure track faculty positions. Moreover, salary transparency and an insistence on paying living wages are priority items that need to be addressed by the Faculty Senate." And I'm afraid that's where the text is cut off. There's a partial sentence, but that's all we have.

Chair Seymour: Cindy, if you want to say more, you can raise your hand, and we can elevate you to speak. So, I recognize Cindy Simmons. Erin, if you could bring her in as a panelist.

Cynthia Simmons, Communications: Hi.

Chair Seymour: Hi go ahead.

Cynthia Simmons: So, the sentence that is cut off was the AAUP sentence there, a fixed-term faculty working in departments where the wages are so low that they cannot sustain a dignified standard of living.

Chair Seymour: Thank you.

Bonj Szczygiel: I have a question from Saurabh Bansal. They've raised their hands. Could you please elevate?

Saurabh Bansal, Smeal College of Business: Hello this is the Saurabh Bansal. I'm representing Smeal College of Business. I want to echo what Cindy said. I asked two questions to President Barron as well as Provost Jones in the last meeting on this issue. And what both of them said was that this step was meant to actually help faculty in order to protect their jobs, because otherwise, in the absence of these provisions, deans' officers were reluctant to hire folks.

The general perception in my unit is that that is a very, very sort of roundabout argument and that two years back Penn State actually won an award, and there was a profile on various websites that featured
Nick Jones saying that Penn State has done remarkable-- has taken remarkable steps in ensuring job security as well as a path to professional growth for non-tenure track folks. And I think that this step of adding that 12-week probation period takes many, many steps backwards.

I also think that even if it is true that that clause was added to nudge the deans to continue to hire non-tenure track positions, it was done in anticipation of code-related situations. In the least, there should be a clarity there that is a temporary step, that there is a timeline in which this thing will be taken back, that the contracts will go back to their standard language. Otherwise the perception in my unit-- again, Smeal College of Business, is that we are letting go of something that was good, and there is no guarantee that it's ever going to come back. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you very much, Saurabh. Bonj, if I could go to Q&A again.

Bonj Szczygiel: We have Josh Kirby weighing in, and he would like to present the statement. So, Josh, I don't know if you-- he's wishing to present a prepared statement regarding faculty representation on University committees. And he says-- he writes, "I will be presenting the statement." So, Josh--

Chair Seymour: Yeah, he's raised his hand. So, if you can elevate Josh, thank you. Josh, are you there?

Josh Kirby, Education: Yep. Just getting audio set. Are we OK?

Chair Seymour: Yeah, you're good.

Josh Kirby: Excellent. So, this statement is on behalf of the caucus of Senators from the College of Education. We are referencing specifically in the June 23 resolution on Return to Work where faculty staff and graduate students should have input on any decision that impacts the teaching and learning. Our observations have been noted and compiled, and we wish to present the following prepared statement.

In recent meetings and town halls, the University asserts it has appointed faculty representatives to various University level committees as a means to providing faculty voice and consultation regarding major issues that affect every aspect of the current Penn State University experience. The caucus of Senators from the College of Education speaks today of our concern with the nature of faculty voice on University committees.

Whether by design or by default, faculty representation on critical decision-making committees has been reported to be effectively symbolic and possibly token. A recurring illustration comes from our faculty colleagues across this Senate and across our college who report sitting as the lone faculty members on committees with six, 12, 20, and more total members.

Such disproportionate representation mutes faculty voice and offers no significant level of shared governance for the University's benefit. In order to endorse more equal and substantive representation of faculty, we urge the University leadership to consider the proportion of faculty members on committees and the very philosophy behind seeking faculty collaboration in the first place. Meaningful shared faculty governance is not possible when committees are dramatically unbalanced due to limited faculty representation.

This imbalance is more than numerical. It is deeply conceptual. This imbalance hobbles our universities ability to address challenges and harness collective expertise with a pluralistic and committed spirit. This
imbalance creates a culture of distrust between faculty and administration at all levels and casts an "us versus them" mindset that overreaches the teaching, working, and decision-making environment affecting every member of the University community. This imbalance will continue to have short and long-term impacts for Penn State manifested as decreases in faculty engagement, productivity, retention, and recruitment of diverse world-class educators and researchers.

We assert that balance in our shared governance will begin to be restored when the University committee process is substantially reconceptualized. We offer three readily implementable methods for this reconceptualization. First, the committee formation process requires a charge that values faculty contributions equally among administrative and staff representatives. Second, the best faculty expertise will emerge from a transparent and open process in the call for, and appointment of, faculty to University committees. And third, when serving equally on University committees, faculty members of committees must be privy to the full detail of the facts, challenges, and constraints related to the expectations and actions of the committee.

The pursuit of balance in our reconceptualization of University committees is necessary for the vitality of our University and the revitalization of faculty trust and the restoration of collaborative spirit during these and future challenging times. We urge our colleagues in the Senate and our partners in the University administration to be unwavering in their pursuit of substantive shared governance. An earnest review of the composition and philosophy of University committees must be a commitment we endeavor to fulfill beginning today. That is all from us.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Josh. I see from Nathan Tallman that there may be a technical problem. So, Erin, if you could take a look at the chat. There seems to be a problem with-- non-panelists do not see the participant windows, so have no way of knowing who is on the call. Anyway, Bonj, since Josh was really a raised hand, if I could go back to you again for the next person.

Bonj Szczygiel: Sure. But we've got a follow up question from Professor Dube in Liberal Arts. This is a follow-up to the question on the new language introduced in the contracts of fixed-term faculty. At the last plenary, President Barron stated, quote, "I have no interest in laying off anyone." If this is the case and the position of the University, isn't this a contradiction in terms to continue with that kind of language, which effectively says, we can dispense with you by giving you a 12-week notice?

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Let's go to the first hand I have up, which is Ira Saltz. If you could elevate him, Erin, thank you.

Ira S. Saltz, Shenango: Hello, can you hear me?

Chair Seymour: Yep, we got you, Ira.

Ira S. Saltz: OK. I guess I'm going to be the contradictory voice here. And I'm not sure people are fully understanding these fixed-term faculty contracts and why that 12-week language was put in there. You know, without that language, as was pointed out, a fixed-term term faculty member could still have their contract voided if there were certain financial emergencies in the University. For example, maybe the University through the summer found itself down 30% of its students, and units therefore had to have their budgets slashed. And in doing so, some units said, well, all right, we're going to have to get rid of a number of classes that we were teaching, and in doing so, eliminated a couple of fixed-term faculty. And that the University always has the power to do even after a contract has been issued.
And because of the uncertainty over the budgets, that's right, a lot of the Deans and Chairs were very reluctant to commit to a certain number of classes, and therefore not hiring fixed-term faculty. And so, what this contract did is saying, look, there's still uncertainty. But we're committing, once we get to 12 weeks before the start of semester, your contract is safe. And this cut off the possibility of two days before the semester beginning a faculty member suddenly being notified, well, we no longer need you because there's been quite a decrease in enrollment or the University has asked each unit to give back another 5% or 10%.

And I believe both the President and Provost said this language was temporary for during this crisis. And I mean-- I agree completely with the sentiment that we strongly value fixed-term faculty and wanted stability. And that's why they did this and that without that language, as I said, Deans and Chairs were very reluctant to commit to fixed-term faculty because they didn't know what their budgets were going to be. And it might be that some of their best fixed-term faculty would have taken positions elsewhere until they had a firm commitment from the administration about their budget.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Ira. Is there anything else you want to add? Or is that good?

Ira S. Saltz: No, so I'm just saying, I think there's a little bit of an overreaction.

Chair Seymour: I think we got it, Ira. Thank you. Who's next? I had seen a couple of people in Q&A.

Bonj Szczygiel: Yes. We do have a question or comment from Martha Strickland. Penn State Harrisburg Caucus of Senators brings the following concerns. One, we appreciate the strong recognition of the faculty choice/input regarding instructional modes and ask that this continue throughout the COVID time. Two, request that SRTEs for fall 2020 and future COVID semesters be optional, with the choice of adding these to Activity Insight be given to faculty. Three, we request stronger communication to students from administration regarding the responsibility as Penn State students around class engagement. And four, we request library support and communication be at the pre-COVID level during this COVID time. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Bonj, I had seen questions earlier from Gretchen Casper. Did those just disappear? And Nathan Tallman?

Bonj Szczygiel: Yes. They've been responded to. They really weren't questions. They were asking us questions. So, I diverted them to chat and requested that if they have something that they would like read out to then post it on Q&A.

Chair Seymour: OK. Thank you. Yeah, people were just asking. So, I wanted to make sure that that was transparent to everybody what had happened. So back-- sorry?

Bonj Szczygiel: I do you have a note from Nathan Tallman who's saying that if you're a non-panelist you can't see the participant window in the webinar format. So, the observation is that people don't know who is on this meeting and joined the meeting.

Chair Seymour: Yeah, I think Erin texted me that that's how it's set up. And we'll worry about that some other time, maybe for setting up the next meeting.
Bonj Szczygiel: I think the concern is whether members of administration were on the call. And I believe the answer is that they were invited. So, if they wanted to be here, they could be here.

Chair Seymour: Yes. If that's the question, they are not panelists. I said that in my opening statements. And I have not looked through the list to see if they're here. But if they want to speak, they can raise their hands like any Senator. Kathy Bieschke tells me she's on the call. But if they want to speak, they can raise their hand. So hopefully that's clear to all of the Senators. Next is Allen Larsen. He has a hand raised.


Chair Seymour: Yeah. Hi, Allen.

Allen Larson: Hi. So, I just wanted to return back to that first point for a second.

Chair Seymour: Could you give us your unit, Allen, just to--


Chair Seymour: Thank you.

Allen Larson: I'll just say a couple of things, of partly in response to Ira. I think that we all heard the very clear explanations from the President and the Provost at the plenary regarding the fixed-term faculty language and contracts, and that one thing that somebody could have taken from that was, of course in a moment when there was absolute ambiguity around what fall enrollments would be that you could understand why that might have seemed even beneficial to fixed-term faculty and in their best interests and so on and so forth.

I think another thing that we could take from that is that, well, the worst-case scenario did not come to pass for this academic calendar year. And that being the case, and no reason to think that it's going to get significantly worse for spring-- no numbers indicate that-- that this would be a good time to just clarify and ideally rescind in some way that language in the contracts to the extent that that can be done at this point. But a clear administrative statement about the fact that, yeah, we see now that we can change this for this year.

And I would just like everyone to know that the New Kensington plenary did pass a resolution that included that request which has been forwarded up to the University Executive Committee. And I'm hoping-- my understanding was that other campus students would be seeing a version of that resolution and be asked to pass them or consider them in the near future as well. And thank you for your time.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Allen. Bonj, can we go to the next Q&A?

Bonj Szczygiel: I've got a procedural question for you. We've got Michael Bérubé, who is responding to the question about job security for fixed-term term. But we also-- prior to him submitting that question, Mari Pierce has a question that takes us off that track. So, do we want to follow the track of this conversation or just take them as they arrive?

Chair Seymour: You can go with the track of the conversation, and then we'll come back to Mari.
Bonj Szczygiel: So, Michael Beraboo-- sorry, Michael Bérubé, responding to Senator Saltz. As a former Senate Chair and as someone who worked for years on increasing job security for fixed-term faculty, I am puzzled as to why the new contract language was inserted into all fixed-term contracts, even the multi-year contracts. Quite apart from the concerns already voiced by Senator Simmons, which I share, I believe that inserting this language into multi-year contracts effectively rewrites those contracts as a one-year contract with 12 weeks' notice of non-renewal. He follows up, this would of course imply a possible violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of our recent revisions to AC21. And this is Michael Bérabé of Liberal Arts.

Chair Seymour: And thank you, Michael. Let's go to the next person who has a raised hand, which is Ray Najjar.

Raymond Najjar, Earth and Mineral Sciences: Hi. My name is Ray Najjar. I'm from Earth and Mineral Sciences. I have some points I want to convey from some individuals in my unit about communication, about COVID from the University point. The main point is about the Dashboard, that the twice weekly updates are not really adequate and are kind of incongruous with the daily updates from the county. Having daily updates would be particularly useful to local school districts that have to make decisions about opening. Updates in the Dashboard, numbers up to a week after the first posting, make it more difficult to reliably use the Dashboard.

The Dashboard would benefit from showing quarantine capacity, as well as the total number in quarantine. And just more broadly about communication, hearing more frequently from Penn State epidemiologists about the state of COVID and the University community would be highly beneficial. I have another comment about deadlines for faculty and staff, that they should be relaxed whenever possible given the decrease in productivity created by COVID. Then finally, I have a statement I would like to read from someone in my unit who said--

Chair Seymour: And it's the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, isn't it?

Raymond Najjar: Yes. I'm just aghast-- this was sent to me two weeks ago-- I'm just aghast at what is happening right now. And the worst clearly still lies ahead. For crying out loud, kindergarteners and 7,000 other kids, including mine, can't go to school so Penn State can stay open and play football. I have to teach the same students who are keeping my own kids out of school.

Football players can have advanced and frequent testing, but not the other 100,000 students who are getting infected by the thousands, and on and on. The University's reputation and Centre County's health and safety are being vandalized. We're the second hottest spot in the whole country. People are going to die soon. Our faculty who can leave will do so. What is the Faculty Senate doing about this? I think it is past time for a no-confidence vote in our failed University leadership, all of them. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Ray. Let's go to Mari maybe, Bonj, since we skipped over her the last time.

Bonj Szczygiel: Sure.

Mari Pierce, Beaver: Several faculty have expressed concerns regarding the requirement to work on Labor Day, which is typically a paid holiday. This impacted all faculty but impacted part-time faculty who received limited pay and those who teach on Monday. Faculty would have liked to have seen the semester end a day early or Thanksgiving holiday extended a day to compensate for working on this
holiday. There are concerns regarding something similar happening to MLK Junior Day, spring break, and other holidays.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, Mari. I don't have any hands raised right now. So you can go, Bonj, to the next person on Q&A.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** This is from William Kenyon from Arts and Architecture. And he's going back to the 12-week language in fixed-term contracts. Regardless of intention behind the 12-week language, my wife, who has served the University since 2004, simply felt marginalized and seriously devalued. There are much better ways to make all our faculty colleagues feel like we are part of a valued and respected faculty cohort.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you. Still no hands raised, so feel free to continue, Bonj.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** This is from Karyn Marvasti from Altoona. Some questions from faculty at Altoona. One, assuming we continue in-person classes, could faculty, staff, and students be given access to free COVID testing? Two, we've been told wastewater testing is being done. Is it still being done, and if so, what is being found in that testing? And three, the Dashboard is hard to interpret. Could the rates of infection be displayed as a percentage?

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you. I see a question in chat. And the last I looked; Nick Jones was also in attendance. If someone else could keep track of attendance a little bit and just let me know. I know that Frank Guadagnino is also in attendance. So, there's several-- Renata Engle, just looking through. So, there's several-- Rachel Powell. There are several administrators that are on, just so you know. I think that seems to be an issue. People want to make sure that people are attending. I still have no raised hands, Bonj, so keep going with the questions.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** If I could, Professor Turk, I'm just going to put you on hold and follow up on this track of conversation about the contract language. This is Stephen Snyder. Steve, you are from-- I should know this-- from Berks. And he writes, at least one fixed-term contract at Berks has been reduced to an FT-1.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, Stephen-- or Steve. I see Rose Jolly has a hand raised, if you could bring Rose Jolly in.

**Rosemary J. Jolly, Liberal Arts:** I'm just waiting.

**Chair Seymour:** Oh, Rose, you're here. I hear you.

**Rosemary J. Jolly:** OK. Hi there. Just a couple of comments.

**Chair Seymour:** Could you say your college, Rose?

**Rosemary J. Jolly:** Oh, sorry. Liberal Arts.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you.

**Rosemary J. Jolly:** My apologies.
Chair Seymour: No worries.

Rosemary J. Jolly: First of all, I just want to make two observations and a point. My first observation I want to make in relation to a kind of response to the feelings of extremity expressed by one of the earlier participants in terms of presenting a point of view in which we are all threatened. I just want to point out that for those of us who have lived through pandemics before, there is a certain amount of lack of safety that we are all exposed to in terms of a pandemic situation. And I see the best way to approach this as being very clear about what the University Senate can and cannot do.

So at the same time, as obviously a workplace needs to respond responsibly to its workers, I just want to say that this is also an environment in which business as usual and the need to turn corners is going to be difficult for everybody-- which isn't a defense of any particular decision made by Penn State. I'm just trying to point out that a pandemic environment creates anxiety and that how we get work done is how we deal with that anxiety in ways that ask for specific issues or make specific points that are related to the mandate of the Senate.

Second of all, I want to point out that as somebody who has worked as a lead on a project on gender-based violence and AIDS, you know, the presentation of epidemiological data in a commonly accessed framework is very difficult. So it's often possible for people to think that scientists aren't telling them, quote-unquote, the truth, when the difficulty is that it's hard to present percentages without really looking at sample sizes and confidence intervals and so on in terms of determining ranges of accuracy.

So I just want to point out that presenting epidemiological facts can look as though it's not easy to read precisely because the people presenting the facts are trying very hard to make sure that they're accurate within a commonsense knowledge of what epidemiology does. So, I just want to acknowledge that it can be difficult to convey that information.

The third point I want to make, and I will make this again, is that in terms of our global classrooms, I would again want to draw the Senate's attention to the need to ensure that foreign censorship, whether it be explicit or not explicit, is not active within our conversations during classes, which are obviously differentially impacted whether you're teaching biology or literature and human rights. So I just want to say that in a new environment of teaching online-- because I believe the COVID environment is one we need to learn to live in-- we would need to make sure that one of our points of differentiation between other universities is academic freedom. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Rose. And I am following up on that last item.

Rosemary J. Jolly: Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Let's go for another one on the Q&A. But first, Carrie Eckhardt had agreed to speak her colleague from Liberal Arts, who's not a Senator's, question into the record. But I'm happy to do it for her, since I see it. So, the question is, is the Faculty Senate considering a resolution to address inequities concerning childcare, dependent care, during COVID-19? As you know, SCASD, State College Area School District, was closed for in-person instruction. Regardless of the school district's decisions, many of us are currently unable to send our children to school for in-person instruction or supervising them at home for remote schooling. We're not working under normal conditions, and the University has not acknowledged these challenges. Well, thank you for that. So, let's go to the next Q&A, Bonj.
Bonj Szczygiel: This is from Tai-Yin Huang at Lehigh Valley. Some faculty members who are currently teaching from outside of the United States have been asked to return to the US before the spring semester starts, regardless of their teaching mode for the spring. If things happen that prevent them from returning to the US, they would be forced to take a leave of absence. I have two questions-- one, is it safe for people to travel internationally during this time? And if it is not, is it reasonable to expect them to travel? Two, why do they have to take a leave of absence when they can work?

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Erin, could you remove the resolution from the screen? I think people would rather see us. That's a feedback I'm getting. Thank you. Let's elevate Katherine Allen. She's a counsel for the University. I don't know Katherine. Do you have a question or something you want to say?

Katherine M. Allen, Office of General Counsel: No, unless you wanted me to give a brief response to the last question. Did I raise my hand accidentally?

Chair Seymour: Yeah, I think you did.

Katherine M. Allen: Oh, sorry about that. No, no. I don't have anything to--

Chair Seymour: That's OK.

Katherine M. Allen: Sorry about that.

Chair Seymour: No worries. The next question in Q&A. I still don't have any hands raised.

Bonj Szczygiel: This is from Paul Frisch in Scranton. If the administration including this new language into the teaching line faculty contract was essential, as Provost Jones stated at the plenary, to ease worries across the commonwealth, why was there no communication from the Provost's office to explain why this language was included in these new contracts at the time of issuing or directly after to try and ease our anxiety over the issuing of this new language instead of silence?

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Could you read another question for us, Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel: This is from Chris Byrne. And folks, you just need to put where you are located. And this is Chris from Eberly College of Science. Respondents seem to be ignoring Senator Saltz's point that all fixed-term contracts already contained implicit early termination criteria and the new language actually mitigated the worst-case implicit early termination right of the administration. If Senator Saltz is correct in his interpretation, then rather than eliminate the clause, it would need to be rewritten into a shield against early termination due to any form of financial crisis by the University.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Chris. Keep going, Bonj. I have no hands raised.

Bonj Szczygiel: All right. Susan Fredricks from Brandywine. My question is in regard to the spring 2020 as an ongoing concern about what might happen to faculty choice if the percentage of remote classes increases beyond what any location or the University feels is unacceptable. For example, if we are fully remote but the administration wants a percentage in person, what happens to our choices as faculty?
**Chair Seymour:** We do have administrators present. If any of them wish to raise their hands to address any of these questions, feel free to. We've gotten a bunch of questions in. It's harder for us to elevate you if you don't raise your hand, just letting people know. And to let all the Senators know, because you can't see each other, we've got 289 people attending with a lot of Senators and a lot of administrative Senators and other administrators. I even saw a Board of Trustee member. So, we've got quite a good collection of people here. Bonj, if you could continue.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** This is Lisa Volk Chewning. And I don't show Lisa on our list of Senators. She does have a question. I could read it, if you would like me to, Beth.

**Chair Seymour:** Not now. If someone recognizes her, please let me know who she is. And I'm happy if a caucus member or representative would like to-- she's a Senator from Abington. Thank you.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** So, Lisa writes, according to the Penn State COVID Dashboard, result times for surveillance testing at commonwealth campuses seems to be taking two weeks or longer. At Abington and other campuses, the Dashboard reads as if we are still waiting on test results from 8/28. If results are taking two weeks or more to get, they are basically useless. So, either the Dashboard is not being updated efficiently, or test results are lagging two weeks or longer, neither of which seems acceptable.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** We have several more questions if you want me to keep--

**Chair Seymour:** Yeah, keep going, Bonj.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** This one is from Nathan Tallman, University Libraries. University library workers have noted that accommodations being afforded to faculty and staff at campuses are not equal to those at University Park. For example, the Plexiglas guards installed at library service desks vary widely across commonwealth campuses. One has a single hanging panel, some are entirely enclosed, and one has a shower curtain hanging. Health and safety accommodations should be consistent across Penn State.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, Nathan.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Chris Byrne has a question for Nick Jones, if Provost Jones is still with us.

**Chair Seymour:** I believe he is.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** I can go ahead and read it. I have a question for Provost Jones. I have been told that numerous Penn State experts are contributing to the predictive models being used by the administration. What expertise is being drawn on for the sociological assumptions that are being inputted into these models? No matter what biological assumptions about contagion are in the model, human behavior is surely a strong variable in containing the pandemic-- percentage of wearing masks, participation in big parties, et cetera, et cetera. How are these assumptions being crafted? And are the best, worst, and expected cases of these assumptions being considered? Thank you.

**Chair Seymour:** Yeah, I don't think Nick Jones is on right now. He must have dropped off. If any-- oh, no, his hand is raised. Sorry, you raised your hand. So, if you could elevate Nick Jones, please.
Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: Hey, am I on?

Chair Seymour: Yep, you are.

Provost Jones: Thanks for that question. I'm actually not the best person to answer that, but I think it's a very, very good question. First, I would acknowledge the importance of the point you are making. At the end of the day, I think we all know that we are going to be successful or not in our ability to manage the spread of COVID-19 based on people's behavior.

The Infectious Disease Modeling Team-- Matt Ferrari obviously is one of the key leaders in that effort-- I think has pretty broad experience in modeling the spread of viruses through communities. And we deferred to Matt and his team to use their best judgment to factor in behavioral effects. But Matt would be the best person to answer that question specifically, and I can certainly follow up with him after this meeting to get his input on that.

I do also agree with the importance-- I was speaking to my provostial colleague at the University of Illinois. And it was absolutely clear that some of the challenges that Illinois had early in the semester were because they had mis-modeled some of the behavioral aspects, assuming certain behaviors among the broader student population that did not actually play out in reality. So again, I appreciate you raising that question. It is a very important one. And I'm happy to follow up with Matt Ferrari for his feedback.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Nick. So, I think there's another question in the Q&A, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: We do. We have several. This is from Karyn Marvasti from Altoona. Responding to Rose Jolley, I understand the data is complex and hard to interpret and read for epidemiologists. But the point of the Dashboard communication is to make it accessible for the average person. There perhaps could be better ways to do that. One theme I continually hear from faculty as well as community members is not being able to tell what the Dashboard data is communicating.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Karyn. Keep going, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: We have another question. This is from Joe Mahoney at Berks. Why is the University not promoting or requiring the use of the recently released PA COVID Tracking app? Could its use be required for attendance in the spring?

Chair Seymour: That's a good question, Joe. Since you're still here, Nick, do you know the answer to that?

Provost Jones: Yes. I do, as a matter of fact. We agree completely. Requiring is always tough in a big complex community like ours, but we are absolutely going to be strongly, strongly messaging that everybody in our community download and use that app. We think it's a great tool. The PA Department of Health is a good and important partner to us, and we want to support their efforts. So, we'll be doing everything we can do to encourage the use of that app.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I don't have any hands raised still, Bonj, so keep going.
Bonj Szczygiel: We have questions. The next one is from Kaleigh Quinnan, who is a student representative of the UPUA and I believe a student in the College of Arts and Architecture. Yay. Hi, Kaleigh.

Going off the sentiments regarding the failed leadership with regards to COVID regulations, students like myself are wondering when the University is going to take the necessary precautions to ensure both the health, like accurate testing, and academic success, like re-implementing the pass-fail system, as Ohio State has recently done. We are falling behind as a University by not taking such steps.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Kaleigh. At least for the second item, that is something that's been in discussion in the Education Committee. So, feel free to either email me at ems22, Kaleigh, or just contact Michele Stine, or Shelly Stine, who's the chair of that committee. But that's the committee that would be considering the alternative grading if we were to implement it. I still have no hands raised, Bonj. Any other questions?

Bonj Szczygiel: You do have a request. Well, no. That last request from Nick Burns has been taken care of apparently. And so no, we have no questions in the queue.

Chair Seymour: All right. Any other conversations? Oh, Nathan Tallman's raised his hand. So, if you could elevate him, Erin, please.

Nathan Tallman, University Libraries: Hi, thank you. So, from the Libraries, we've noticed the reports in the local media about the conditions and concerns for students in isolation and quarantine. And we're just wondering if there have been any actions on the part of the administration to try to rectify some of the problems that seem to be there or to otherwise respond to those situations. And I was wondering why there was a call for volunteers at University Park when layoffs from the Nittany Lion Inn would potentially have accounted for those needs. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Nathan. Do you want to try to tackle any of those, Nick, since you're still in the panelist position?

Provost Jones: Sure. Thanks, Beth. I'll give it my best shot. Yes, we saw those articles and had concern and followed up with those specific cases to try to address the concerns that were raised. Unfortunately, in all candor, I think it focused on a couple of instances or a handful of instances where something went wrong.

We are standing up big, complex processes with very little runway in many instances and have a whole lot of people working really, very, very hard to do that. And every now and again, there might be a cog slip that occurs. But I think by and large, we also get emails from parents on a fairly regular basis that thank us for the great support that we're providing to their sons and daughters while we're taking care of them in quarantine and isolation. So, I don't want to lose sight of that and not do a shout-out to the folks in Residential Life and Housing and Food who are really going to extraordinary lengths to support our students. Unfortunately, those stories don't always make it into the media. And I think-- what was the second question, Beth? Or Nathan?

Chair Seymour: Nathan, did he answer it? I'm trying to remember.
Nathan Tallman: It was slightly different, actually. I'm sorry. There was a call for volunteers at University--

Provost Jones: Ah, right. Yes.

Nathan Tallman: But then there were also potential layoffs. And so just matching those up.

Provost Jones: Yes. So, I can tell you, Nathan, that we have repeatedly looked for opportunities to provide opportunities for the people who were laid off from the Nittany Lion Inn. We just went through a period where it was an "all hands-on deck" moment. We just needed some help with a surge at a particular time and so issued a request for help among faculty and got quite a few volunteers, actually, who stepped in and were willing to help out. But I can assure you that the folks were very mindful about the people who were laid off from the Nittany Lion Inn. And if any opportunities present themselves for them to be rehired into alternate roles, we're certainly committed to trying to do that.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Bonj, I think you have another question.

Bonj Szczygiel: We have a few more questions. And they might be able to be answered by Provost Jones. I don't know if he wants to hang around. But anyway, Eric Novotny from University Libraries. I would welcome a presentation or a conversation about University endowments. There seem to be conflicting statements about how much is available to help us get through the pandemic.

Eric Barron, President, Penn State University: I'm happy to do that one, Beth, if you like.

Chair Seymour: Sure. Welcome, President Barron. I didn't see you.

President Barron: Well, I've been sitting in the room with you. So, I thought that was where we were supposed to enter. So that's the way I did it. But I was just listening intently and taking as much notes as possible for all of the comments.

So, you know, absolutely we could provide such a presentation for endowments. Increasingly, donors wish to give for a particular reason, and so donor intent is associated with something like 97% of the endowment. And so, without their permission, we would not be able to use them for any other purpose. The ones that are departmental only, it is possible we could use that within department. But then you would be taking it away from some others purpose that is supporting the department. So very few that are unrestricted that would be easy to use.

On the other hand, we're managing the budget quite well, I think. We came into the fall with better than expected in enrollments that certainly made the financial losses less. We're moving into the spring with a more conservative, as if we were starting again, because a lot of uncertainty with similar kind of conservative posture, as we did for coming into the fall. So hopefully that will turn out all right.

But we've informed the Board of Trustees that we will not be tapping into our line of credit that we got for an emergency. Before I would tap into a donor's dollars, I would go to that line of credit and spread out what this pandemic hurricane here that we're experiencing. I would spread that out rather than take dollars given by our alumni or friends that go to support particular programs, even if we could.
But I think we're optimistic that the steps that we have taken on the budget in looking for savings, we found close to $150 million worth of savings over the last two years. We had anticipated half of that going into innovation and half going into access and affordability, in agreement with the Board of Trustees. And pretty much, we have used it all just to make sure that the educational and general budget is balanced as opposed to doing it for innovation.

So, I think we're in a good place, better than a lot of institutions. It gives me a lot of confidence that we will move along without additional stresses, financial stresses, that we might have to deal with, unless spring brings us something completely different than what we currently expect.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, President Barron. Bonj, do we have another question?

**Bonj Szczygiel:** We do, for anyone who would like to jump in. This was actually directed to Provost Jones. But could Provost Jones address the question asked by Senator Huang about current faculty abroad?

**Chair Seymour:** And the question is posed by Egolf at Lehigh Valley.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Thank you.

**Provost Jones:** Yes, I'm happy to jump in on that. But I think you saw Katherine Allen pop on before. So, can I just maybe do a lifeline to Katherine Allen first and ask Katherine to provide the legal context for that? And then I know that Kathy Bieschke was also involved, led a group to discuss this issue. So actually, maybe Kathy could say a couple of words first and then call on Katherine as appropriate. That might be the better way to handle this most directly. Kathy?

**Kathleen Bieschke, Vice Provost:** Sure. Happy to address those, Nick. We are in the process of developing some standard practice on this. We recognize that there were tax and regulatory implications to allowing faculty to work from another country remotely. We are also sensitive to faculty who essentially got stuck somewhere while they were on sabbatical or leave or some other kind of trip. And we certainly don't want to bring people back and put them at risk.

It is also true that some people left in the midst of the pandemic, and those same people don't want to return. So, it's somewhat costly to sort this all out. But we are working together to try to develop a standard practice that's as fair and consistent as possible. And in fact, we're meeting later this week to look at what we've developed so far in regard to standard practice. Katherine, if you have anything to add to that, please do chime in.

**Katherine M. Allen:** Sure, thanks. Without getting into the details, I think the broadest thing to say is just that each situation is unique. Every country's regulations are different. And so, it takes time and resources to assess every situation. And some of these situations we're learning about piecemeal.

And so, as Kathy said, it's taking an effort to try to figure them out. It's not just a simple matter for the University of whether or not a faculty can perform their work remotely when they're sitting in another country for an extended period of time. There are implications to that. So, we have to assess all of that.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you both. Bonj, can we go to the next question? Bonj, you're muted.
Bonj Szczygiel: This is from Amanda Byrd, Student Representative, UPUA, and from Earth and Mineral Sciences. She asks, does the University intend to change their pre-arrival testing strategy for the spring? For example, switching to an on-arrival testing strategy of all students, which has been successful at several schools in the New England area.

Provost Jones: I can respond to that, Beth, if you like.

Chair Seymour: Sure, Nick. Please.

Provost Jones: Yeah. So, I think apart from a few challenges that we had with the pre-arrival strategy that we implemented for the fall, like a tropical storm passing up through the Eastern and Northeastern states, we actually did reasonably well. We learned a lot, and there are opportunities for us to improve that process to make it more effective and efficient than it was before. But I think that would be our starting point for testing in advance of the spring semester.

A general observation has been looking at what we did, and what many of our peer institutions had done, was that pre-arrival testing was a very robust strategy. And we certainly met our expectations with that process, but certainly opportunities to make it better.

Chair Seymour: Sounds good. I have a question in the chat that I'm going to read into the record just for-- it kind of follows along this. So, this is from Rose Jolley in Liberal Arts. In terms of leadership, are we looking at COVID as completely exceptional, or are there ways in which the University will be completely changed forever, even post-COVID, which may well be the case? How do we ensure we take a lead on COVID lessons learn to maintain Penn State's points of differentiation in a post-COVID environment?

Normally we should post those in Q&A, just to remind everyone. But it looked like it was meant to be in Q&A, so that's why I read it into the record. Are there any lessons learned that you would like to add, Nick, there?

Provost Jones: I would just say-- and perhaps Eric would like to comment, too. But I'll just say, from an operational standpoint, we're using, as I think everybody is aware-- this is the year that we're all revising and refreshing our strategic plans. And so, we have asked unit leads across the University to reflect on this very issue, Rose.

I think it's great that you bring it up, and 100% behind your thinking on this. So, we've asked unit leads to reflect with their faculty staff, students, on this issue. And in addition, centrally, with the Strategic Plan Implementation Oversight Group, we've done some restructuring.

And one of the groups that is focused on operational excellence, the supporting strategy of operational excellence, we have really charged them very specifically with addressing this issue and thinking about all things Penn State and how they have been impacted by our experience over the past six months and probably the next six months as well, and how we can learn from those and, in a very strategic way, make adjustments to the way the University does business to make us even better, but importantly not lose sight of the core mission of the institution and the focus that we must keep on that. So, we're looking to do this, certainly, as part of the strategic planning process. And you'll see a number of initiatives and task forces that emanate from that plan implementation that address these types of issues, many of them, I anticipate.
**President Barron:** I certainly agree with that. I must admit, I really look forward to it, actually, because that's a different way to be thinking. I mean, we're in the midst of massive and continual short-term necessity in making decisions, which is a challenge with data changing and circumstances changing, availabilities changing, reactions changing. And I think there's a tremendous amount that we can learn and take advantage of. You know, One Penn State 2025 comes to mind as a really big element.

But there are an enormous number of things that the efforts that people put forth ended up with more participation than they did before, which suggests that the old ways that we may have been doing a lot of different things in order to get input or be able to reach people could change rather dramatically. So I think to be able to sit back and look at that differentiation and what it is that we've learned will be a moment which will feel a lot better than the daily efforts that we're forced into right now, decision making efforts we're forced into right now.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you. I'm conscious of our time, and I want to make sure that we have all the questions asked or at least ideas shared. So, I think, Bonj, you've got another one in the Q&A.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Yes, we have several questions queued up here. Next is from Jonathan Matthews, Senator from EMS. As this impacts the community risk profile, do we know how many students are here in the State College area— that is, off campus— and if they plan to reside in the area after fall break?

**Chair Seymour:** I was looking to see if we had anyone from Student Affairs, but I don't see anyone in a quick look through the 267 names.

**President Barron:** You know, I don't think we know the exact numbers, but it strikes me as something 2/3 to 3/4 off campus, from the numbers that I've seen. And this is a common topic among all of the Big Ten presidents and chancellors that they're here, they've signed leases, it's their preference, and difficult to control them as individual citizens.

And a lot of them are going to stay. And some will go back and forth. And a tremendous effort has to go into working on having people aware and understand what's going on. But this actually presents the biggest challenge of all of the major universities with large populations within towns, is essentially their behavior and what to expect. Some people believe we'll have more students staying behind because of circumstances for them to return are challenging.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, President Barron. Next question, Bonj.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** This is from McKinney Marvasti from Altoona. There are many faculty questions about the University going to remote-only classes. I know Provost Jones and President Barron have communicated that the decision would be more complex than just numbers of cases. However, several faculty continue to ask how large the numbers would be, or what the rate of increase in cases would be large enough to suggest various campuses should go remote.

Others asked if students are not catching COVID in classrooms, wouldn't going remote increase the rate of infection since students can't, or won't, go home? Other faculty members are suggesting we should begin thinking of going remote, and one faculty member suggested that students could be encouraged to quarantine for two weeks before returning home. I think the question is about— what is the best step forward or best-case scenario?
President Barron: So, this really is a challenge. And it is one that we go back and forth with. There is a lot of concern that going remote presents challenges in engagement, including testing, of our students, not knowing who's there and who's not there. And so that presents a lot of challenges. It's interesting that the Department of Health is saying we need to do more and more activities. We need to have watch parties. We need to have other types of activities for students that keep them within the student population and give them activities so they're not wandering through towns that are there.

So, I mean, I think that's part of the crux of the issue is what student behavior would be like in a remote world, given their challenges when we have more control over them and we have more activities and more interaction on campus. If that disappeared, does it actually make the problem worse? And of course, we also have the Department of Health saying, whatever you do, don't send everybody home, because that's a way of spreading the disease. We would much rather have the students be a more controlled and engaged population. So, these are issues we're constantly wrestling with and watching what other universities are doing in the same space. But it certainly is a challenge, and that individual basically summarized the differences of opinions that are out there.

Chair Seymour: Bonj, next question.

Bonj Szczygiel: Tai-Yin Huang from Lehigh Valley. I just hope that the University will put its employee’s safety and health a top priority when making decisions that affect their well-being.

Chair Seymour: And I see that the next one sort of follows along with that. It's more of a question. So, Melton from Engineering.

Bonj Szczygiel: So, this is a question about asking for more details about why an instructor's physical location is relevant to remote learning.

Provost Jones: Yeah, I can just jump on that and just reiterate what Kathrine said. You know, at the very highest level it's not, obviously, because somebody can participate remotely from truly any location around the world. But if a person is living for an extended period out of the United States or even in some instances out of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, there are legal complexities associated with that. And as Kathrine indicated, these vary a lot from country to country, and they evolve over time. And so we just need to be careful and work on these individual cases with individual faculty members, Bob, to make sure that they're not inadvertently breaking any laws or finding themselves in a bit of a quandary with respect to compensation and taxation and so on.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Bonj, it looks like we've got a new question.

Bonj Szczygiel: This is from Galen Grimes in Greater Allegheny. Are there any plans to establish on-demand COVID testing on campuses where it is currently not available?

Provost Jones: Well, I can respond, Beth, quickly. My understanding was that we were providing on-demand testing for students. We were not for faculty and staff. It just was announced today that we have begun that process. So, there is walk-up testing now available for faculty and staff who are involved in either front-facing activities, interacting with students, or face-to-face teaching at University Park. And so, we're taking advantage of the existing capacity that we have for walk-up for students and carving out a piece of that for faculty and staff. So that is in place now.
And we are working, Galen, on rolling out the equivalent support for campuses. It's a little bit more complex because of the nature of the campuses and the infrastructures that we have in place there. But just literally today, we started up at University Park, and we're working on developing it for the campuses as we speak.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Provost Jones. It looks like the next couple are kind of paired together a little bit.

Bonj Szczygiel: So, these are questions from Allen Larson at New Kensington and Terry Blakney at Behrend asking questions about the spring calendar, when it will be finalized. Do we have any sense when an announcement might be made about it? So, spring scheduling ya.

Provost Jones: There is-- actually, possibly, within a few days. We've had a group that's been working very, very hard on that that have come up with what we believe to be a robust recommendation. And so, we're hoping to get the announcement out about that in the very near future-- like, that being this week.

Chair Seymour: And it looks like we've got a hand raised. So, let me go to that. If I could recognize Indrit Hoxha.

Indrit Hoxha, Harrisburg: Yes. Indrit Hoxha from Harrisburg here.

Chair Seymour: Sorry about mispronouncing your name.

Indrit Hoxha: No problem. No problem. It's a pretty common thing. So, I just wanted to comment on the role of the Senate and its role as legislative and consultative rather than direct decision making. I mean, we had a question, can we add more faculty members though committees that make the decision? Probably yes. But probably we can't expect to have majority in executive decision making.

There is no way that we can have thousands of faculty members participating in them in any way. It's going to be a very limited number of faculty members that will be joining. And it would be better just to have people who are the experts in the field for whatever is being talked about. And I want to share that actually, out of these thousands, not all of them have the same ideas, have the same concerns, have the same risk-taking willingness, and not all the faculty members have the full picture of what's going on, what Department of Health is requesting, what the CDC is saying. I mean, especially we're living in pandemic time, where actually new information is coming in every day, and we can't expect thousands of faculty members who have lots of things on their books to actually be following every guideline and every new information that's coming in.

And we do hear sometimes many faculty members that are pretty vocal. But I've been asking from faculty members here that are representing Harrisburg. And the majority of them were silent. And if anything, they do appreciate the handling of the situation, especially where we have two groups which are requesting two completely different things.

And I'm part of School of Business Administration in Penn State Harrisburg. And we have about 50 faculty members. I have personally asked about 15 of them, and they were-- I mean, I didn't hear anything bad about it. They were pretty happy with the way that it was handled. And when this meeting was announced, I sent an email asking all faculty members. I heard from them something, but I never
heard something like we weren't heard. Actually, everybody is appreciative of the way that we've been asked and given the choice whether we want to go remote, face to face, mixed, or whatever we wanted.

And I wanted to bring this point because these are probably the faculty members that are most silent, actually. And I wanted to share that. I think we should focus our energies to see how we can do better, how can we adapt to this new normal, how can we respond to this new way of doing. So, we need to figure out, are the supporting units doing whatever they're supposed to do? Are libraries supporting faculty? Are libraries supporting students the way that they are supposed to do? Unfortunately, I've heard that that's not the case from a few people.

Are childcares providing the services that are needed? I think this is where we need to focus our energies. Or what should happen with SRTs-- I mean, this was a common theme across all faculty, including full professors, which are distinguished authorities. I mean, would it--

Chair Seymour: Thank you.

Indrit Hoxha: impact grades or spring calendars-- things which basically impact our new normal and how we can adjust to this new normal.

Chair Seymour: Thank you very much for your comments. I think we've got a couple of more questions. So, let's make sure we get those in. But I feel us winding down a bit. So Bonj, I think Ray Najjar is willing to sponsor his colleague from EMS's question.

Bonj Szczygiel: The question is, what is the plan for testing students leaving campus at Thanksgiving to prevent their seeding infections elsewhere, as we've been warned not to do by Dr. Fauci? Thank you.

Provost Jones: We're working on a plan to do that exactly. I think the chief concern from Dr. Fauci and from others-- for example, in the Pennsylvania Department of Health-- is if we found ourselves in a situation where we truly had an outbreak, for example, in State College, that they really discouraged institutions like ours from addressing that problem by sending everybody away with appropriate levels of infection-- just not the right thing to do from a public health standpoint.

We continue to manage the spread of COVID at UP and all of our campus locations. And we are planning for an orderly transition leading up to the Thanksgiving Break and developing a hybrid approach that includes a component of quarantine as well as perhaps more focused and targeted testing strategies in the two weeks in advance of November 20. So that plan is still being developed, but it's a very good question. We're very mindful about our responsibility as an institution not to send the virus into communities across the commonwealth and nation.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. And I think we've got two more questions, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: Sure. This one is from Greg Shearer in Health and Human Development. I'm finding students having both in-person and online instruction are finding it challenging to balance going to campus, limiting time on campus, and finding accommodations while on campus. This should be on our radar as we plan to continue. And then the second question is, my understanding is that the is claiming the right to monitor religious assembly by our students. I find this and similar claims to regulate protective behaviors concerning. How is the University considering the civil rights of our community?
Provost Jones: So, I'm happy to take those two. Yeah, that's a great point about on-campus spaces, and we've actually put a lot of effort into both making sure that buildings are open in evenings and weekend, a little bit more limited schedule than normal, but making sure that there are spaces for students to work or touch down. And we've actually done a pretty robust inventorying across the entire commonwealth, looking to make spaces available for students to do that.

Unfortunately, we recognize that many of these spaces are often spaces that were not really viable for use as classrooms, so there's a limit to the capacity in those rooms. But we've really done a full court press to turn out as much of that space as possible. And we know that it's been very popular, and we'll continue to look for more opportunities for that. I think we're finding that students just like to be on campus. Sometimes they have constraints that they have to work around, but they just like being on campus and having the campus experience, even if it's a little bit different from what they were used to or were counting on.

The second part of the question-- oh, religious activity. Yeah. No, we're not doing that, except the one thing that trumps what we say or do is when the commonwealth places restrictions on gathering. So that is our only consideration and the thing that we have to be respectful of, is the guidance or requirements that are imposed upon us by the commonwealth. So, we are very mindful of that issue.

President Barron: So I'd be concerned about that word, "monitor," because that does sound like we're violating people's civil rights when the only thing that I'm aware of, just as Nick said is, is to make sure we don't have large gatherings that are not socially distant.

Chair Seymour: And I think this may be our last question, Bonj, and it's being posed-- oh, Judy snuck one in-- and it's being posed to the Provost and President while they're here, since they're responding.

Bonj Szczygiel: This is from Julie Gallagher at Brandywine. Many faculty ask questions about the 12-week contract language and the FT contracts prior to Provost Jones and President Barron responding. Could they address the question about the removal of that language and a recommitment to the important work that had been accomplished together on AC21?

President Barron: Well, I will give my thoughts. Nick is welcome to give his. But of all of the discussion, the things that I hear the most are concern about that language. I don't have any hesitation to go back and look at it. I hear faculty representation on committees is sometimes lopsided. I think there are some other areas where the faculty are very well represented, but I just don't mind going back and saying, OK, should we be doing this differently? Where and how?

And then the questions about the Dashboard, availability of data, how do we interpret it-- Kelly is doing a webinar on this topic. Perhaps we could do better. And then the issues that are concerning the spring semester, which makes an enormous amount of sense to me that there should be a great deal of concern about that, including the testing plans that are there, as certainly we have one set of strategies.

But there's also a group looking at how it is that we can get our hands on all of the new technologies that are out there. A comment was made about the Big Ten, for instance, testing early sign-on on contracts for now publicly available rapid testing that they did. And quite frankly, if we can do that, everybody is saying that's of a much greater value. And I agree. It's also remarkably less expensive if we can do that.
So, I think those four or five things are top of my mind in terms of what so many faculty have talked about and made compelling arguments about. And so, I'm certainly willing to go back and look at each and every one of them and see how we can do better.

Chair Seymour: Thank you.

Provost Jones: I would just maybe speak, Beth, quickly to the 12 weeks' notice issue. I did appreciate Ira's comments before and his interpretation, which are pretty close to what we have explained previously but acknowledge it has created some angst. So just to be very, very clear-- we did put this language in because we were concerned that deans and chancellors would be reluctant to extend full-year contracts to people, given the extreme financial uncertainty that existed at the time these contracts were being extended.

As Eric pointed out earlier, it's now September. We're not out of the woods yet. We've got some pretty big gaps to address. But it's certainly not as uncertain as it was back in the May-June timeframe. And I think we are pleased with the outcome that, in fact, there were very few fixed-term contracts that were not extended or renewed. And I think Kathy is in the process of sharing some data with the Senate on this, pretty much as we speak, in response to the resolution from back in June.

So, we think that we succeeded by putting that language in. The contracts were offered. A complementary piece was that any contract that was not being renewed at University Park or any campus location had to be specifically discussed between the budget executive and either Madlyn Hanes for the campus locations or Kathy for University Park. So, the combination of those two things I think really achieved the goal.

Whether we can do away with that language moving forward, we're certainly-- we understand that the communication maybe wasn't what it should have been around this. And we understand the anxiety that it's caused. So, we can certainly take a look at that moving forward.

Chair Seymour: All right, Bonj. Do you want to read Judy Ozment's into the record? I think President Barron addressed some of it. But--

Bonj Szczygiel: Yes. Judy Ozment from Abington was asking the President or the Provost to further address the concern expressed earlier about the Penn State COVID Dashboard regarding surveillance testing, the length of time for that to take place. At Abington and several other campuses, the Dashboard reads as if we're still waiting for test results. Again, to recap, if the results are taking two weeks or more, they are basically useless. Either the Dashboard is not being updated efficiently or tests lagging too long, neither of which is acceptable. If either of you could expand on that issue from before.

President Barron: I can speculate. There definitely were some ups and downs there, but there are some other issues. We occasionally have students that are hoarding the test kits and deciding they're going to use them for a time when they're worried about it. And so, they would still be hanging out there and not having the test results reported. Certainly, if it's 8/28 and we haven't heard the results, I suspect that's a test that was not taken.

Provost Jones: Right. I agree, Eric. I'll talk to Kelly and the Dashboard team about this, just to see if we can get a little bit more clarity about what specifically is happening. But I agree with Eric some sense of that.
Chair Seymour: Thank you. Let's go on ahead with Susan Fredricks.

Bonj Szczygiel: From Brandywine is asking, are there a set percentage for in-person classes for each campus for spring? Please speak about the faculty concern about what might happen to choose if the percentage of remote classes increases beyond what any location or the University feels is unacceptable. What recourse do faculty have?

Provost Jones: I don't think we quite have the notion of acceptable or unacceptable. We never really have. You know, we certainly encourage faculty members, if they have concerns about teaching in a modality other than remote-- so in hybrid or face to face-- to discuss those concerns with their division heads or our CAAs or even their chancellors or deans, whatever the appropriate academic up-line is.

We do want to make sure that we are doing everything possible to make the classroom as safe and healthy a learning environment it can be. And if there's things that we're not doing, we need to hear about them. That said, our preliminary look at the numbers that are coming in for the spring, consistent with the request that went out several weeks ago, is that the numbers are coming out about fairly similar, at least in aggregate, to where they were last semester, this current semester. So that is promising.

In consideration of how we will approach the spring, the very real issue of the fact that we are one University geographically distributed with 24 locations and we have campuses in completely different environments across the commonwealth is critical. And it may well be that some campuses trend a little bit more to in-person teaching. Some other campuses may trend a little bit more towards remote, depending on circumstances and situations faced by the faculty themselves.

So, we don't really have an expectation. We want to make sure that concern about safety of the environment is not a factor. But we are trying to be as supportive as we can of the faculty preferences in this.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I think we may have a final comment from Roger Egolf.

Bonj Szczygiel: E golf from Lehigh Valley. Maybe the Dashboard should be changed to show the numbers of tests sent out, the number received back, and the number of positive cases. Just a suggestion, I believe.

Provost Jones: Beth, I think Kelly Wolgast might be on, and it might be nice to call upon her or elevate her, because she could actually address some of these Dashboard issues directly if there's time for it.

Chair Seymour: Yeah, there is. But I did not see her listed. If she's here, she could raise her hand, and we could elevate her easily. So, I'll wait a second to see if she's here and wants to-- sometimes the names get entered oddly.

Provost Jones: OK. I just got a text. She's actually not, it sounds like. She had to leave for a meeting, so sorry.

Chair Seymour: Oh, no worries. But we'll take those considerations back hopefully. So, I think at this point, we have had a pretty good discussion. And so, let's move on to the next items.
NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Seymour: Item C is New Legislative Business. Is there any new business? I see that Jim Strauss has his hand raised. Hi, Jim. I think you're in.

James Strauss, Eberly, College of Science: Thanks, Beth. Good. Can you hear me?

Chair Seymour: Yep.

Jim Strauss: OK. I move to--

Chair Seymour: Make sure to list your college and your affiliation.

Jim Strauss: Jim Strauss, Eberly College of Science. On behalf of the Eberly College of Science Caucus, I move to introduce a resolution.

Chair Seymour: OK.

Jim Strauss: And I have sent that resolution to you folks.

Chair Seymour: I see that we have a second in the Q&A. So Keiler of Science seconds.

Jim Strauss: And while the Senate at large reviews the resolution, I'll just give some background on this document. First off, I'm going to start off with a friendly reminder that I received from Senator Mark Stephens this morning, reminding me that the enemy of good is perfect, and we have to compromise on things.

So, I'll speak on behalf of the faculty that put a lot of time into drafting this resolution. First and foremost, we acknowledge the considerable work the Penn State administration has put into our fall reopening plan. We understand the importance of this effort to the future of Penn State as an educational entity and leader. Reopening is very, very challenging, and this has been a difficult process at every higher education entity across the country. Penn State is not unique.

We as a faculty group are not here to point fingers or make accusations. Rather what we aim to do with this resolution is to chart a positive pathway forward for the greater administrative faculty cooperation plan and information release. What we are requesting information and involvement with-- or excuse me, we are requesting information and involvement with modeling and contact tracing for the greater understanding of our COVID landscape, both at University Park and our campuses. With our resolution, we are looking to forward and planning a more streamlined spring semester, hopefully with pre-arrival testing for everyone, smart calendar changes, an increased involvement of Faculty Senate leadership, with our administrative partners in planning, modeling, and implementation.

Respectfully, we are asking the Faculty Senate to accept this entire resolution without edit or additions. Our goal here is to have this document in place as a first step. We believe the elements in this document to be representative of the majority of concerned opinion expressed across our faculty without it being inflammatory or exclusionary. We are acknowledging it is very difficult to discuss, debate, and pass resolutions given our Zoom format. While we respect everyone's opinion, it is imperative that our Faculty Senate combined sends a unified message about COVID.
Should you, as an individual Senator or group, wish to make additions, we respectfully encourage that effort be in a separate resolution or document. Our goal is to have this document in place as a unified Faculty Senate's first step. We have consulted with members of Commonwealth Caucus, University Colleges, Earth and Mineral Sciences, College of Liberal Arts, College of Engineering, separate groups of Senators and Senate council members, in the creation of this resolution.

Very briefly, the resolution features in terms of its asks, if you will-- access to the model predictability; access to contact tracing information; declaration of COVID thresholds that would cause a pause in either face-to-face instruction or a return to remote instruction; COVID testing availability for all community members at all locations; examining rapid testing options; call for significantly increased random surveillance testing for the Penn State community at all Penn State locations; plans for spring semester pre-arrival testing; recommendation of the free-- or excuse me, recommendation of free cost fast antigen test, one offered by Abbott Labs or other vendor, for all Penn State community members at all locations; plans for a spring semester academic calendar that involves the elimination of spring break; and involvement of Faculty Senate leadership in COVID planning, models, and implementation. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Chair Seymour: Keith, could I ask you just to speak to what films when we have new business? So, I'm asking the Parliamentarian, Keith Shapiro.

Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture: Thank you. Thank you, Beth. Can you hear me?

Chair Seymour: Yep.

Keith Shapiro: Great. Thank you. New business under this part of the meeting falls under the standing rules article 1, section 8-- Section 8a, specifically-- which gives a Senator the ability to introduce, by direct motion from the floor, new business that they consider to be of exceptional urgency. Once it's been seconded, under normal rules, it's laid on the table according to our rules until the next regular meeting or the next meeting of the Senate, if we have another special meeting to give the body a chance to review it.

However, our standing rules have a caveat in it. Later on in section 8, article 1, section 8i, there is a provision that says this rule, that rule that requires waiting, can be suspended by a 3/4 vote of the Senators present. That's a strong supermajority. And I think that's included in there just to ensure that there is consensus that we want to move forward on this without waiting until the next meeting for that review period.

This idea of previous notice is common in parliamentary procedure, and it appears in both Robert's Rules and the Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure. Our rules specifically give us the ability to suspend that under the provisions of 3/4 of the members present. Does that help, Beth?

Chair Seymour: Yes, it does. And so just to remind everyone, right now this would be an unfinished business on the agenda for the October 20 meeting of the Senate. I will ask Erin to make sure that we have quorum. And correct me if I'm wrong, Keith, but a quorum is 50 Senators.

Keith Shapiro: A quorum is 50 Senators. And there would have to be a motion from the floor to suspend the vote. It would have to be seconded. And there'd have to be a debate.

Chair Seymour: But even before we get there, if we don't have quorum, we can't do anything.
Keith Shapiro: Exactly.

Chair Seymour: The Senate office is working on it. For those of you who are new to the Senate-- if we were in person, we would be counting heads in a room. We're doing the virtual version of that right now. It's a little more difficult in Zoom, because we have assigned seating for Senators, or at least in sections of the same room. So as long as people are sitting in one section, they're assumed to be Senators. That doesn't happen, unfortunately, on the participants list of Zoom.

Jim Strauss: Beth, am I still miced?

Chair Seymour: Yes.

Jim Strauss: I might ask that second and third pages of the resolution be posted.

Chair Seymour: Do you mean just scroll down? Is that what you're asking?

Jim Strauss: Yeah. Just scroll down because-- yeah.

Chair Seymour: Yeah, there are three pages. There is a link that Josh Wede put into chat, I see-- a Google doc link. If people look to that to click on it, you may be able to pull it up on your own computer, which might be helpful.

Right now, just so everyone knows what we're doing, we're just seeing if we have quorum, so that if anyone wants to suspend the rules or do anything like that, we'd need quorum before we can. And we do have quorum, so we have more than 50.

So, we've gotten two moves for suspending the rules in the Q&A. And I'll ask Bonj to double-check this with me. But it looks like Steinn Sigurdsson from the College of Science has moved to suspend the rules. And there's a second from Roger Egolf at Lehigh Valley.

Bonj Szczygiel: The original being posted by Josh Kirby.

Chair Seymour: Oh, sorry. I missed Josh. So, we've got a threefer.

Bonj Szczygiel: Yep.

Chair Seymour: So, we need to have a discussion on whether to suspend the rules or not before we can suspend the rules, because we should know for sure what we're doing. So, I open the floor up for a discussion on the pros and cons of suspending the rules before we vote on it.

Bonj Szczygiel: And Beth, it might be helpful to have Keith or you just summarize real quickly what that vote would be on, or what that discussion is on, rather, the specifics.

Keith Shapiro: The vote that we would be making now would be to-- how do I say this-- would be to move to suspend the standing rules, article 1, section A-- that's the rule that puts the motion on the table until the next meeting-- to allow the resolution to be debated on and voted on during this session. That's what we would be debating and voting on right now.
Chair Seymour: And I should remind everyone that there will be a vote now for sure. And so make sure you're logged into Poll Everywhere and that that is working for you. We're not voting yet. We're discussing it. And I see a hand raised by Rose Jolley. So, if I could ask that she be elevated.

Rosemary J. Jolly: Hello?

Chair Seymour: Hi, Rose. I hear you.

Rosemary J. Jolly: I would like to suggest that we do not suspend the rules. I understand that to mean that we would discuss this at the next regular meeting of the Senate, to the degree that I think adopting something of this scale within an exceptional meeting for which there was not an enormous amount of lead time for people to change their schedules just doesn't seem appropriate to me.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Rose. Anyone else? I see that Greg Shearer has his hand raised. So please recognize Greg Shearer.

Gregory Shearer, Health and Human Development: Thank you. I don't--

Chair Seymour: And the College of HHD. Sorry.

Gregory Shearer: Sorry. Greg Shearer, College of Health and Human Development. I guess I'm confused as to-- I'm appreciating that this has been submitted, but what is the compelling reason to vote today?

Chair Seymour: And would anyone like to address that? Maybe Jim, are you still here?

Jim Strauss: I'm still here. I think the compelling reason to vote today is that so we, the Faculty Senate, can be involved in some of these decisions, as has been expressed in a number of different questions, hopefully starting very, very soon rather than having to wait until late October.

Chair Seymour: And just for the record, Bonj, there's Cindy Simmons from, I believe, Communications has a question, or has a--

Bonj Szczygiel: Yeah. Cindy is asking a similar question-- and yes, from Communications. What is the perceived benefit of voting for the resolution today versus at our next meeting?

Chair Seymour: And thank you, Cindy. I see Communications. It took me a while to remember. I think Jim sort of answered that. Are you comfortable, Jim, with the answer you gave?

Jim Strauss: Yes. And I will say that you have to understand that with any resolution of this nature, we cannot compel the administration to necessarily oblige the requests. But by acting on this now, we basically can make these requests today, and we do not have to wait until late October to make those requests.

Chair Seymour: Could I ask that Josh Kirby-- I see he's raised his hand-- be elevated?

Josh Kirby: I support suspending the rules for the reason that, as a Senate body, we are facing extraordinary times. We need to be able to be responsive to the needs in the terms by which those
decisions are being made in the University that surrounds us. And those decisions about the spring are being made now, and we need to have faculty members at the table who are actively participating in those conversations. This resolution was very carefully crafted by many colleagues of ours to enable us to speak as a unified body, responding quickly to the situation at hand and to ensure that our voice is unified for being a party to the conversations that affect all of us going forward. Therefore, I support the suspension of the rules so that we may consider the resolution today.

Chair Seymour: I just want to remind people, if they want to make an official statement, please don't use chat. I have been a little willing to read chat out. But please remember to put it in Q&A or to raise your hand. One question I want to make sure, if I could ask Erin and the Senate staff to figure out what fraction of the full Senate is still present. We're going to need to know that number for the vote anyway.

Keith Shapiro: The vote-- may I step in just a moment? So, the vote is suspended only by 3/4 vote of the members present today.

Chair Seymour: Yes. I didn't mean to imply that it's the entire body that's the 3/4. But we're going to need to know the number, and that number will tell us how many we have of the total number. So, thank you, Keith. Let's see I have not heard from Victor Brunsden, so could you elevate him?

Victor Brunsden, Altoona: Hi. Can you hear me?

Chair Seymour: Yeah, Victor, I can.

Victor Brunsden: Brunsden, Altoona. I appreciate the effort that has gone into this resolution. However, I am going to urge my colleagues to follow my lead in voting against suspending the rules to vote on this resolution. I do not see that there has been sufficient time for me to study this resolution. I am a quick read. Yes, I've read it. Have I been able to think about it? No. It has only been less than 20 minutes that I have been able to think about this resolution.

While it looks OK on the face of it-- and I appreciate all the work that Jim and others have put into it-- I do not think that this would be a good idea for us to vote on this resolution today. I realize it will be another four or so weeks. I can't help that. We should be deliberative on this. So, colleagues, I would urge you not to suspend the rules.

Chair Seymour: And I just need to add, it would be three weeks just for the accuracy--

Victor Brunsden: I stand corrected.

Chair Seymour: --of the amount of time. Not weighing in one way or another, a reminder to everyone, unless it's a tie, I don't get to vote. I'm here just officiating. It looks like--

Jim Strauss: Should I respond?

Chair Seymour: I don't think you need to, unless you wish to, Jim. We have a lot of people with hands raised. We have a lot out there. I was hoping just to let the floor continue.

Jim Strauss: I am happy again to run through the main statements of the resolution for explanation if that helps, Victor.
**Chair Seymour:** He may have been demoted already. I don't know. So, he may not be able to respond back to you. I don't know. But anyway, I want to make sure this is correct. Erin, if I could ask you to unmute, do we have 216 Senators present right now?

Well, I think we're working to figure that out. So, let's keep going with questions. I see Carrie Eckhardt has her hand raised. Could you elevate her, Erin? Carrie. I think you're there.

**Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts:** Hi. Am I on?

**Chair Seymour:** Yes, you are.

**Caroline Eckhardt:** Thanks very much. I guess I would like to support everything that has been said in favor of allowing us adequate time to fully absorb this resolution, or perhaps a shorter one if there would be a shorter one coming forward, for a couple of reasons. One is that I think this resolution has already done some of the work that might be intended by its proposers, in that it's out here, people are aware of it, people are reading it.

But more important for immediate purposes now, although I was able to see it slightly ahead of the meeting-- and thanks to my colleague Steve Browne, we were able to get it distributed to Liberal Arts Senators, at least to send it out to them, before the meeting-- it's very long, it has so much detail in it, and the details are not all of the same order. For example, there's one little phrase in there somewhere about asking to know whether particular apartment complexes have an outbreak of COVID-19. I don't personally even know whether we have the right to have that information if the apartment complexes are in town.

But if I get stopped looking at very specific things like that, and there are other large ideas in the same document that I probably would in fact be in favor of, the net result for me is that I don't feel that it's ready, that we've had the time for all of us to read it and to ponder it and maybe for those who designed it to give us something shorter, briefer, and a little more general. And therefore, I would say, let's not suspend the rules. I would rather give us the three weeks until the next Senate meeting to be able to go through it, or perhaps for the proposers to have the opportunity to revise it. Thank you.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, Carrie. Bonj, could you read some of the responses in Q&A?

**Bonj Szczygiel:** I think the first question that we have that hasn't already been addressed is from Cindy Simmons in Communications. Would it be possible to tease-- I think Carrie just spoke to this? Would it be possible to tease out those things that need immediate response from inclusion of faculty in decisions by the administration? It seems rash to vote on something we don't have time to read and digest. So, the resolution stands as is, and it sounds like the question is about are we able to respond to part of it.

**Chair Seymour:** If we suspend the rules-- and I think this helps to answer some of Paul Frisch's question from Scranton-- if we suspend the rules, then we would then take up the resolution as an any motion on the floor. And correct me, Keith, if I'm wrong. And at that point, anyone could edit it or make motions to change that motion, as with any other report or document in front of the Senate. Is that correct, Keith?

**Keith Shapiro:** Say again, Beth. I kind of drop out here.
Chair Seymour: Sorry. Sorry, there's been a couple of questions that if we suspend the rules-- so then this would be a motion on the floor for us to take action on. And at that point, people could amend it if they wished. They could put further motions on it to change it.

Keith Shapiro: Absolutely.

Chair Seymour: So, it would become like any other report or motion that's on the floor.

Keith Shapiro: Absolutely.

Chair Seymour: So, I think that helps to answer some of Simmons and Frisch from Scranton.

Bonj Szczygiel: We have another comment by Amit Sharma. And Amit is-- HHD. He writes, if we must act in unity, then let's take the time to deliberate and vote on this at the next Senate meeting. Let's not suspend the rules.

Chair Seymour: I want to go back to some of the people raising their hands. I see Josh Wede, if he could be elevated to speak.

Joshua Wede, Liberal Arts: Yeah, can you hear me?

Chair Seymour: Yeah.

Joshua Wede: So, I just wanted to express my support for suspending the rules. Some of the things we ask for are critical pieces of information in terms of the modeling that the University has done and the data that they're presenting. And I'll be honest-- I'm at University Park in the College of Liberal Arts, sorry for that-- things in State College are not going well.

You know, all throughout the summer, we never rose a seven-day moving average above eight cases per day. And in the past three weeks, we've been over 100. And so, things are not going well in State College. And so, I think we have to act with some urgency. Waiting three weeks to discuss this, I think, is far too long with the conditions-- if you look at the positivity rates of even what the University is reporting in testing, the positivity rates of symptomatic cases has gone up every week for the past three weeks. So, things are not going well. And if something doesn't change, things are likely going to get worse.

Chair Seymour: All right. I have quite a list of people. Thank you, Josh. Just to help answer Chris Byrne-- I see his question in the Q&A-- Erin has tallied-- and I think we have 141 Senators now. I think our total-- and I'll ask Dawn and Erin to weigh in. But I think our total number of Senators, we have 200 faculty Senators, 20 administrative Senators, and 20-plus students Senators. So, our normal Senate total for the full body, if they're all present, is somewhere in the 240s. Is that correct? I think it's correct. It's close enough. Yes, Erin tells me it is correct.

So that should help answer the question that Chris Byrne has, who's from the College of Science, to address the Senator who spoke against suspending. We should know how representative the present attendance is of the full Senate. I'm not going to weigh in on whether or not people think that's representative enough, but I just wanted to let people know. Let's go to Sarah Townsend. Sarah-- please, Erin, could you bring her in so she can speak?
Sarah Townshend, Liberal Arts: Hi. Can you hear me?

Chair Seymour: Yeah.

Sarah Townshend: OK. Sarah Townsend, College of Liberal Arts. I would also like to speak in favor of suspending the rules so that we can vote on this resolution today. As all of us know, planning for the spring will take time, and decisions are being made already. And things have not gone well this semester. And there's no indication from our administrators that they're planning to do things significantly differently in the spring. And so faculty need to be part of those decisions. Things need to be done differently in the spring. And if we do not take action on this now, if we wait three more weeks, many of the most important decisions will have already been made.

Obviously passing this resolution does not guarantee that the University or that the administration will take any of these things into consideration, that it will increase the role of faculty in decision making, but at least it's out there and the request has been made. I don't think the Faculty Senate wants to be a body that just continually weighs in on things after the fact when it's too late to make a difference. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Sarah. Bonj, could you take the next question in Q&A?

Bonj Szczygiel: Yeah, this is from Nathan Tallman in Libraries, and it's really a question for Jim and the other authors. If the Senate wants to make revisions, would the authors retract the resolution? Or would they be amenable to revisions?

Chair Seymour: I think the more general answer to that, Nathan, just from a parliamentary perspective, is that if we suspend the rules and take it up as an article for us to address, then it's editable or amendable by the body by its vote. So, to some extent, it's no longer owned by the original authors once it's on the floor. Is that generally correct, Keith?

Keith Shapiro: It is correct.

Chair Seymour: There's no such thing as a friendly amendment. People do that because they're polite. It doesn't mean amendments are grotesque. It just means that amendments are amendments. And the body has the right to amend. I'd like to recognize Ray Najjar.

Raymond Najjar: Hi. Ray Najjar, EMS. Yeah, I support suspending the rules so that we can make a vote now. And if this was normal business of the Senate, I would agree that we could wait a couple of weeks to make a decision, along the lines of the normal decisions that we make. But we're really in really unprecedented times here.

And I'll just remind folks that State College and Centre County are, like, nationally ranked in terms of how bad COVID cases are here, in terms of the rate at which they are rising and the number of per capita cases, and so forth. So, we really could be on the precipice of something really, really awful.

We have thousands of cases already. Fortunately, we haven't had many hospitalizations and no deaths since September. But things could spiral worse. And the Faculty Senate needs to be involved. So, I understand the reluctance. I see this in faculty meetings all the time. Everything happens in a very measured way, we weigh everything, very deliberate, and normally that's fine and it's very positive. But in this case, we really need to act quickly. So that's why I vote for suspending the rules.
But I'll just say one other thing. I don't know if this is at all possible. I don't know why we are forced between these two possibilities of voting, say, within the next 15 minutes or voting three weeks from now. Is it possible by some article within the Senate rules that we could vote on this over the next week or so by email or some other way? I mean, can't we be a little bit more flexible here in terms of how we conduct our business? Are we that rigid that we only have these two options?

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you. Thank you, Ray. And I apologize for keep mispronouncing your last name. I'm sorry about that. Keith, could you weigh in on that?

**Keith Shapiro:** Yes. We are rigid on these two options. That's what our rules say. And this is the parliamentary procedure we need to follow. Otherwise it would be very difficult to know how this was going to happen or how the vote was going to take place in a fair way. So, these two options are provided to us by our rules, and we follow rules in this body.

**Chair Seymour:** Just in the spirit of making sure I'm getting people who haven't spoken an opportunity to speak, I'm going to skip people in the list a little bit. So sorry about that. So, Kent Vrana, if he could be elevated. Hi, Kent. I see you're in here.

**Kent Vrana, School of Medicine, Hershey:** Kent Vrana, Hershey. I stand in support of my colleagues--Amit, Victor, and Carrie-- in opposing suspension of the rules. And I'll just add one other consideration. As has already been noticed or realized, that nothing needs to come of this once we pass it. However, I think there's tremendous value in having it debated on the floor in the public setting in essence in front of the entire community rather than in a special meeting of the Senate. So, I stand in opposition to suspending the rules. Thank you.

**Chair Seymour:** You're welcome. Thank you. I just want to make sure everyone's on Poll Everywhere, if you've haven't had time. But please get into Poll Everywhere. And let me again-- I don't think we've heard from Elizabeth Kadetsky. I think you're in here, Elizabeth.

**Elizabeth Kadetsky, Liberal Arts:** Hi. I didn't have a comment. But since my name came up, I will just say that I am in support of suspending the rules because of the reason’s others have given about the urgency of the situation in State College.

**Chair Seymour:** OK. Thank you. Your hand has raised, so I was just recognizing that. And Julio Palma, could you also raise him up?

**Julio Palma, Fayette:** Oh. Julio Palma from Fayette. I would like to support the motion to suspend the rules. Yesterday we had a caucus-- the Commonwealth Campuses had a caucus. We, some of us, some Senators, had not seen the resolution in advance. Nonetheless we were able to discuss it, and we actually endorse it unanimously.

I think that other Senators have expressed these are not ordinary circumstances. So, I would like to vote to suspend the rules and then go ahead and discuss the resolution. As I said, the Commonwealth Campuses unanimously endorse this. We can discuss and spend our time of this special meeting to talk about this resolution.

And again, now we already know that there is no flexibility, and we will need to wait three weeks for this. Some of us have expressed our concern about faculty involvement. So, I would like to invite all our
Senators-- this is the time that we can use to be involved in the plans today. I don't know how long it's going to take, but let's take the time today instead of waiting three more weeks. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Julio. One more, and then I see various "call the questions" out there. But I want to make sure Chris Byrne is given an opportunity to speak, since his hand has raised.

Chris Byrne, Eberly College of Science: Can you hear me?

Chair Seymour: Yeah

Chris Byrne: Good. OK. Thank you. So again, like the others, I do very much respect the opinion of people who are concerned about suspending the rules. But I have to come out in support of suspending the rules.

And I normally am one of those people who wants to scrutinize every detail and make sure it's perfected. But I think that besides the comments about urgency that have already been made, I think Jim's comments at the beginning are also very important-- that, first of all, we knew this was going to be a way to try to get some tangible action out of today's meeting, to not have it just be a discussion but actually some tangible action. And because we wanted to do this on us such short notice, we knew that we would have to basically make it pretty mild.

I mean, we're asking for some information-- Jim can review everything, but we're asking for some information and some involvement. We are not laying out-- and there may be some specifics about information we're asking for, but still, we're just asking for information. We're not giving somebody orders about what they should do exactly, other than just give us information and involve us. So, we did make it mild.

You know, I was involved-- as the caucus prepared this, I was involved in reviewing earlier drafts. But I got so busy grading them over the weekend that I didn't have a chance to even review the final draft myself. And at that point, I had to trust my colleagues knowing what they're doing, knowing that they're aiming for this mild resolution that everybody can get behind, and also knowing that Mary Beth Williams took it to all the other Senate caucuses, the Commonwealth College, as you heard, their caucus, several other caucuses. So I would kind of ask the other Senators to trust their respective caucuses who endorse this already, that we know it's a rush, but we tried to make it mild because we did not think it reasonable for people to commit to some huge, overly strong language in such a rush. We think this is just as strong as it needs to be to make some very important information visible and to really pressure the administration to get the faculty more involved.

Chair Seymour: All right. Thank you. One more question, and then I'm going to have to recognize, I think, the call to questions that are in Q&A. But Tealine Williams has not had a chance to speak today.

Tealine Williams, Abington: Hello. Can you hear me?

Chair Seymour: Yes, I can.

Tealine Williams: Hi. My name is Tealine, and I'm a Student Senator at Penn State Abington. And I'm in favor of suspending the rules because I know for a fact there are many other schools that have already made decisions about spring break. And just looking at it from a student perspective, I think we should
give students the space to be able to react to the decisions that we make. And if we make these decisions too late, we may not have the ability to really comprehend some of these major decisions. And I just want to make sure that we have enough time to be able to at least tailor what we need to tailor today and then push it out so that students are able to respond to the proper changes effectively.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. So, I'm going to recognize that I see a call to question. And Bonj, help me out here, but I see several call to questions. Could you let us know who they are?

Bonj Szczygiel: We have a caller a question by Greg Shearer, Judy Ozment, and Ann Clements are the ones that I've seen.

Chair Seymour: So, Greg Shearer, HHD, and Judy Ozment from Abington seconded.

Bonj Szczygiel: Clements from A and A.

Chair Seymour: Yeah. So, at this point, we need to-- is there any discussion about calling the question? Which calling the question means we end discussion on suspending the rules, if we vote in favor of calling the question. If we vote down calling the question, then we would continue discussing suspending the rules. Am I correct, Keith?

Keith Shapiro: Absolutely. 2/3 vote.

Chair Seymour: 2/3 vote required for this. And I think I'll just ask Erin to double-check our total votes right now. Make sure everyone's got Poll Everywhere up. But I think we've got about 141 Senators, so if we could double-check that count while we're going through this process, that would be wonderful.

Keith Shapiro: And that's 2/3 votes of those voting.

Chair Seymour: Yes, that's true. Thank you. So, does anyone-- I know, Ira, your hand's been up for a while. Do you want-- I'm not sure if it's to call the question. That's what we're discussing right now. Any discussion on call the question?

Keith Shapiro: May I step in, Beth?

Chair Seymour: Sure.

Keith Shapiro: There's no debate on calling the question.

Chair Seymour: Oh, sorry. Thank you. Thank you. Please step in. So, let's just vote on calling the question. To accept, you're going to click on A in Poll Everywhere. Is anyone having trouble getting Poll Everywhere up? Please let us know in chat or in Q&A. Either will work.

Bonj Szczygiel: There's just been a request, Beth, for a little bit of extra time in the parliamentary process.

Chair Seymour: Sure.
Anna F. Butler, Senate Office: This is Anna Butler. The numbers are still tallying. I'll let you know when they're finished.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Anna. So, we have in chat a Daniel Thacker, Library, Altoona, who says he doesn't have an account set up for him. He says he's new to the Senate. I don't know if you're new to the University Senate. Geoff Scott says he's in Poll Everyone but was not given the opportunity to vote.

Anna F. Butler: For those who can't seem to get into Poll Everywhere for some reason right now, if you're comfortable stating what your vote is in the chat or another route, you can do that. Or you can send me an email at afb11.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Ann. Ann's just clarifying, this is to stop debate, that we're not voting on suspending the rules or the motion. We're voting on stopping debating on suspending the rules. It looks like I see-- are you all voting in Poll Everywhere? So please, if you put a vote in chat, let me know that you did not put a vote in Poll Everywhere. We don't want to do it in both places.

Anna F. Butler: The votes have tallied in Poll Everywhere. And I have 113 accept and five reject.

Chair Seymour: It sounds like it passes. So, we've stopped debate, and now we need to vote on suspending the rules. Now, that one we really do need to tally well. And it seems like people are having trouble voting. Anna, people say they're in Poll Everywhere, and they don't have the question.

Anna F. Butler: I just took the question down for the call the question. I just removed that one, and now I'm going to go ahead and post the other one for voting to suspend the rules.

Chair Seymour: OK. So, she's posting to suspend the rules.

Anna F. Butler: I just now activated that one.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Josh Kirby has put in chat the voting instructions for Senators.

Anna F. Butler: They're also on the Senate home page on the website.

Chair Seymour: And Josh Kirby also said, you may need to refresh after logging in.

Anna F. Butler: If all else fails, if you hit the Home button in Poll Everywhere and put in Faculty Senate as the username for the presenter, that should let you join. And it's Faculty Senate, all small letters, all one word, Faculty Senate, as the username for the presenter. And that should let you join. That's after hitting the Home button.

Chair Seymour: And let's remind ourselves what we're voting on once you get in. If you wish to suspend the rules so that this motion can be discussed and voted on today, then you hit, however you wish to hit it, A. If you don't wish to suspend the rules and you wish to have this motion discussed in three weeks at the next meeting, then you're to signify that by B.

Thank you for that description, Ann. It looks like it's working. People are saying it's working. People are getting punchy. So just to remind everyone, if you hit A, you wish to suspend the rules so that we can discuss this motion today. If you don't want that, you hit B. Yes, Nathan-- to vote on the resolution today.
Unless someone decided to table it, right? There are other things one could do besides just vote on it. So that was one of the reasons I didn't just specify that.

Anna F. Butler: So, the poll reads, "vote to suspend the standing rules to allow debate and vote on resolution." So, A to accept or B to reject. And the votes are tallying, so it must be working. I did get a couple via email.

Chair Seymour: Right. I see that Andrew Freiberg said he did not vote in Poll Everywhere, and he rejects.

Bonj Szczygiel: Just a reminder to everyone, the chat is the place for you to communicate significant or important information with your fellow Senators. The question and answer is the format for ideas or questions to be read on the floor. So, if you want to talk to everyone, please use chat. That's the best place to do that.

Anna F. Butler: Yeah, I still have a couple coming in via email.

Chair Seymour: Did Poll Everywhere get fixed, Anna? I see comments that it says, "accept and accept." There's not "accept or reject."

Bonj Szczygiel: Yes, it was corrected.

Anna F. Butler: It says A, accept, B, reject.

Chair Seymour: OK, thank you.

Anna F. Butler: Do we have any in chat?

Chair Seymour: Other than Andrew Freiburg, which I told you about, which is one--

Anna F. Butler: OK. So, it looks like the tallying has finished in Poll Everywhere, and, including the ones I got via email, I have 83 accept and 46 reject.

Chair Seymour: Keith, can I ask you to weigh in?

Keith Shapiro: Sure. We need to know how many Senators are present.

Chair Seymour: The last tally I saw was 139. But I think Erin's still working on that. But our accept is 83, and our reject is 46.

Keith Shapiro: Well, with 139 Senators, you would need 105 Senators or 104.25. Of course, we don't have 25% of a Senator there. But we need 105 Senators in order for this to pass.

Chair Seymour: And even with the numbers we have, it's not 3/4 of the numbers who voted either, correct?

Keith Shapiro: No, it's not. It's not. So, the number we have is 83 divided by 139. So right now, according to the numbers you gave me, we're at about 60%.
Chair Seymour: So, Nathan, could you please raise your hand and let me elevate you so you can explain what's going on with the Poll Everywhere? Erin, could you please elevate Nathan?

Nathan Tallman: Hi. I just observed that people are seeing different text in the Poll Everywhere. Some of us are seeing the language "accept, reject." And some are seeing language "original, proposed." So, I just wanted to be sure that everyone is voting in the same poll so the votes are all going to the same place for tallying.

Anna F. Butler: The ones that are seeing the accept with the original one proposed should refresh their screen. It does say A, accept, and B, reject, the poll that I'm looking at.

Chair Seymour: And a person couldn't vote twice. If they go back in and try to vote again, it's not going to--

Anna F. Butler: No, they could not.

Chair Seymour: So, I think--

Nathan Tallman: I just did that. I voted, and then I refreshed the page, and I was able to vote again.

Anna F. Butler: You can clear your response and vote again, yes. But you can't just vote twice. But you could clear your response and then vote again, and that would take your first vote out and put your second one in.

Nathan Tallman: Right. But I didn't click the button to clear the vote. So, it's a little disconcerting. But I understand we're all doing this live in the moment, and there's lots going on.

Chair Seymour: So, I was going to ask people who think they voted in the wrong thing to try to vote in the one that says "accept, reject." And if you wish to accept, you're accepting suspending the rules. And if you hit reject, you don't want to suspend the rules. You'd want this item to be considered in three weeks at the next meeting. Are there more votes coming in, Anna?

Anna F. Butler: There are a few more coming in, yes.

Chair Seymour: OK. So, we'll wait a few more minutes for people to make sure they've cast the vote they wish to cast. Does that sound fair, Nathan?

Nathan Tallman: Yeah.

Anna F. Butler: Yeah. The only other thing we could do, Beth, is I could start completely over, if you'd like me to.

Chair Seymour: What do you think, Keith? Let me know.

Keith Shapiro: I think that since this is the same poll and we haven't changed it and we can clear our responses and vote again, which I just did, then if we have doubts about whether our vote was counted, we just clear the response, click on the right thing, and then Anna could tally it.
Anna F. Butler: And I can see they're changing.

Keith Shapiro: Good.

Chair Seymour: And it looks like we have the total of Senators now at 125, so that people know that that's the number for the 3/4. The Senate office just sent me that tally.

Keith Shapiro: In that case, we'll need 94 Senators to pass.

Anna F. Butler: OK. It looks like the tallying has finished. And including the ones that I got via email, which are a couple, and the one you gave me in chat, we have 89 accept and 50 reject.

Chair Seymour: So, Keith, where does that sit us with this motion?

Keith Shapiro: We are five votes under the needed 94.

Chair Seymour: So, it looks-- sorry.

Keith Shapiro: It does not pass.

Chair Seymour: So, it looks like it does not pass. So, correct me if I'm wrong, Keith, but at this point, that leaves us with this being unfinished business on the agenda for the October 20 meeting.

Keith Shapiro: Absolutely.

______________________________________________
______________________________________________

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Seymour: Chair Seymour: OK. So, I'll go to item D, Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the University. I see a couple of hands raised. If you'd like me to recognize you, I'll recognize you. So, Tim Robicheaux. Hi, Tim.

Timothy Robicheaux, Liberal Arts: Hi. That was from earlier. But if I have one second, it was about what I emailed you about earlier. I just want to remind everyone on faculty that we have access to the Employee Assistance Program here, which talking to some of my colleagues, a lot of people don't know about.

But it's worth looking at. If you just search Employee Assistance Program here, it's really cool. It gives you access to 24-hour mental health support. They do some really cool stuff when I've-- I had to get childcare for my daughter and called them up. And they called every one of the nursery schools and preschools here in town and sent me a super spreadsheet and scheduled meetings with me.

You can get five free sessions per issue per concern with a local therapist. That's no copay, and it doesn't go through insurance. And it also is-- other people that are eligible are your spouse, dependent children, parents, and parents-in-law to use this. So, I may still have in-laws if we could have used this program. So, I just wanted to bring that to your attention, because a lot of people don't know about it. And it's
really worth looking at. They do all sorts of things. And we pay for it through our hard work. So, thanks, Beth.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. And I see Geoff Scott. Hi, Geoff.

Geoffrey Scott, School of Law: Yes. I will yield. I was just commenting on Poll Everywhere.

Chair Seymour: Oh, OK.

Geoffrey Scott: That's been resolved. Thank you so much.


Raymond Najjar: Najjar, EMS. That's OK. It's multiple--

Chair Seymour: I keep trying. I'm so sorry.

Raymond Najjar: No, no. That's all right. This is something completely off topic, but it's a request from the Graduate Council Chair, Ken Davis, about whether-- I don't know if it's anything we need to decide right now. But it's about-- the Grad Council opened discussion on whether or not its standing rules should be changed to make Graduate Council meetings open to the public. And Ken wanted to know if the Faculty Senate has any opinions about it. The question will be discussed again at the October 21 meeting. So maybe this is an item that could be brought up-- we'll be meeting before that, right?

Chair Seymour: Yes. And the Committee on Committee and Rules has weighed in on that. And so, we've already sent a letter to Grad Council.

Raymond Najjar: OK, great. All right, thanks.

Chair Seymour: You're welcome. Any more comments for the good of the order? I'm just clarifying that the vote had to be 3/4 of the 125, not 2/3. Some people were confused. The 2/3 is for call the question to stop debate. So, any other comments for the good of the order?

____________________________________________________________________________________

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Seymour: Item E, Adjournment. Do I have a motion to adjourn the meeting?

Keith Shapiro: Moved.

Chair Seymour: Do I have a second?

Bonj Szczygiel: Second.

Chair Seymour: I'm thinking we want to adjourn the meeting. All those in favor of adjourning the meeting, please raise your hand, your virtual hand, if you wish. I see a lot of virtual hands going up.
Thank you. And the Senate is adjourned until October 20, 2020. Thank you, everybody, for a very productive and good meeting. The Senate needs to do this. So, thank you.
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