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The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, October 20, 2020, 1:00 p.m., via ZOOM.
The University Faculty Senate met on Thursday, October 8, 2020, at 1:00 p.m. via Zoom Webinar with Elizabeth Seymour, Chair, presiding.

Chair Seymour, Altoona: All right, hello, everybody. If I could ask, just right off the bat, it seems like the chat function isn't working for everybody. So, if I could ask maybe Akash or Edwin if you could see if you could enable the chat function? It should be enabled.

Akash Damle, Cyber Security: Sure thing. I can try messing around a little bit here.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Akash. So welcome, everybody. It's good to see you. It is 1:00 PM-- a little after, actually-- 1:01 PM, October 8, 2020. And the Senate is now in session. This is a special Senate meeting I called at the request of a petition by University faculty.

We are running this meeting using the same webinar format that we did on the special meeting of September 29. So, we are all on Zoom together. The only people as permanent panelists are people running the meeting, including the Senate officers, the Parliamentarian, and Senate office staff, and Jim Strauss representing the faculty petitioners.

We are also joined by two tech TAs who will be helping with the meeting. I just asked them both to help me. Akash Damle is majoring in cyber security. And Edwin Lu is a double major in computer science and electrical engineering. Welcome. Thank you.

The instructions for this meeting are the same as a regular meeting. Let me go through the instructions. Who can speak in a Senate meeting? Only those who are elected or appointed student faculty administrator, or retired senators, or past chairs have the privilege of the floor.

The meetings are public, and others can join and listen. But please do not try to ask a question if you are not a Senator. You can email me, Beth Seymour, ems22, our executive director, Dawn Blasko, if you would like to request to speak at a future meeting.

Our Zoom capacity is 500. And if we've reached capacity, you may not be able to attend. Currently, it looks like we have about 168. So, we're doing good. 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. Hopefully it's working now. But we're not closely monitoring chat.

You may use it to post a comment, let us know you are having a technical problem, or let us know you joined late, or tell us that you are joining by phone. And if so, please list your phone number for attendance. But do not use it to ask a question or to be recognized to speak and have the floor. If you have an emergency, please email Kadi Corter at kkw2. She will funnel tech problems to Akash and Edwin.

How do you ask a question? You have two ways to ask a question. You can raise your hands 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 a fully in-person Senate meeting, we may not be able to answer everyone's questions. But we will capture the Q&A and pass along questions that haven't been answered.

Please use the instructions on the agenda or on the Senate website to log on to Poll Everywhere. We will be voting today. And shortly, we will be taking a present vote to see how many senators are present today. A reminder-- to vote, you have to be in attendance at the meeting. There are no such things as proxy votes for our meetings, just to remind everyone of that. A final note, please be patient. Running a meeting like this has a lot of moving parts. So please give us time.

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. This is a special year that requires more work of all. And this is more true than usual for the Senate to fulfill its vital roles.

So a shout out please to Dawn, Erin, Sarah, and Kathy, Kadi, and Emily, and today, Akash and Edwin, because they're doing so much hard work behind the scenes to make our meetings run smoothly and also to provide all the support the Senate needs to engage in its role of shared governance. Thank you, all.

---

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

**Chair Seymour:** So, let us move to the agenda. Item A, Announcements by the Chair. My announcements will be brief. I called this meeting in response to a petition of concerned University faculty. According to our rules, Faculty Senate bylaws, article 5, section 3, the chair shall convene the Senate in response to a written petition of at least 50 members of the University faculty to consider proposals of the petitioners stated in writing.

I received a petition that met these requirements on October 1. The petitioners asked for the convening of the Senate as soon as possible to discuss the resolution introduced on the September 29 meeting during the new business. I called for the special meeting of the Senate on October 2 and set the date for the special meeting to consider the resolution for October 8.

The bylaws require that five faculty members will review the issue substantively with the Senate council before the special meeting of the Senate. These faculty members, Michael Bérubé, Frank Marko, Jim Strauss, Martha Strickland, and Sarah Townsend, met with Senate Council to discuss the resolution on October 6.
POSITIONAL REPORT

Chair Seymour: Let's move to the next agenda item. Item B is a Positional Report. The positional report is the resolution that was introduced during new business at our last meeting on September 29. As the motion to suspend the rules was not successful, the resolution was automatically placed under unfinished business on the October 20 plenary agenda.

The petitioners called for a special meeting of Faculty Senate to discuss the resolution introduced at the meeting on October 29. As the petitioners explained, quote, "With rapidly changing COVID circumstances and the imminent plans being developed by the University, we hope this can be acted upon as expeditiously as possible with a special session of the Faculty Senate called as early as Thursday, October 8." end quote. I honored their request and expedited the meeting. So, we are here to discuss this resolution.

Before we begin, let me explain the rules for discussion. I will alternate, as I did the last meeting, between those with raised hands and those who ask questions in Q&A. I also want to provide an opportunity for as many to speak as possible on the question. If you have already had the floor and a Senator who has not spoken yet raises their hand, I will call on that person next.

The Q&A will be read by Vice Chair Bonj Szczygiel with the help of Secretary Lisa Mangel and must include your last name and academic unit, such as Seymour, Altoona. Remember to focus your discussion on the motion on the floor. It's possible we might get complicated today. So, I'll try to keep reminding people of what they're voting on at a particular point in time.

This, I'll admit, is more challenging when we are in an online format like we are. So just patience, bear with us as we manage this. You may only cast your vote today using Poll Everywhere. We need to make sure that our vote is accurate. So, make sure that you are logged onto Poll Everywhere. We will not take votes by email, phone, chat, or any other means. You have to do it by Poll Everywhere.

Today we'll use Poll Everywhere to take a present vote. This is going to be part of the way of making sure we're using it and you get it practiced before we vote on anything else. This will allow us to easily know how many senators are currently present in the meeting without trying to count. And it will also ensure that everyone is able to log into and use Poll Everywhere. So, let's get ready to take a present vote.

So, I'm going to pause while everyone gets into Poll Everywhere. And there's really only one-- should be only one option on your poll, it's a present option of A.

We need to figure out how to get into Poll Everywhere or you won't be able to vote. So please keep trying if you're struggling with getting into Poll Everywhere.

Anna Butler, Senate Office: Votes are tallying, Beth.

Chair Seymour: OK, thank you, Anna. Just so everyone knows, there's 207 people present. And that doesn't mean they're all voting members. But there's 270 members-- there's 207 people participating.

Anna Butler: Votes are still tallying.
Chair Seymour: Thank you, everybody, for your patience. I know it can take us a little while. I see there is a question from Rena Kass from Hershey. Will we be able to make modifications if necessary, on the resolution and still be able to vote on it today? Yes, that's why we need to make sure we've got Poll Everywhere working, because it could get complicated.

I do see your question, Cindy. I'm not ignoring it. I'm just waiting until we get to the motion itself.

Anna Butler: So, it looks like we have 125 senators who will be voting today.

Chair Seymour: Excellent. Thank you, everybody. I hope everyone was able to work out their Poll Everywhere frustrations. And again, I appreciate your patience as we work through this. All right, so let's move on to the business. The resolution is already on the floor as it's part of the petition. So, it needs no motion or second. Jim Strauss is here to discuss the resolution and to answer questions. So, Jim, if I could ask you to begin our discussion.

James Strauss, Eberly College of Science: I believe the most expeditious way to proceed would be for me to offer the amended-- so what I'd like to do is I'd like to make a motion to offer the amended version of the resolution that was already distributed and substitute that for the original resolution.

Chair Seymour: Do I have a second? OK, Josh Wede seconds.

James Strauss: OK and let me make a couple comments. The reason I would like the amended or updated version of this is that since our last special meeting, we basically shopped the resolution around to as many stakeholders as possible. And we collected edits from them. And those edits, the majority, were added to this amended version that you see. And the amendments, or the changes, are in bold.

Chair Seymour: So, the question before the body is, is there any discussion on substituting the new document for the old document? Does anyone have any discussions on that particular motion? If you do, either put it in the Q&A or raise your hand and we will elevate you to discuss it. I see no discussion. So, let's take a vote on this.

Bonj Szczygiel, Arts and Architecture: Beth, we have a question that just popped up.

Chair Seymour: OK.

Bonj Szczygiel: From Michael Tyworth at Smeal. Why are deletions not recorded in the revised draft, for example, the specific reference to the Abbott test?

James Strauss: I can answer that. Essentially, they are, if you scroll to what would be the second page of this document, we simplified the language and we put in, rapid testing options should be examined as these tests yield faster results and our cost efficient. The original resolution had specifically identified the Abbott test, basically because this is brought up in our original plenary session that there were other tests available that yielded faster results and that we're also less expensive.

I did some research on this. And one of the tests that I identified in that research was the Abbott lab test. When this got shopped around over the last week, there were some senators that objected to indicating that specific corporate body in tests. So, we just decided it was far easier to just put in rapid testing
options. So, it is reflected in bold, in number four, number five, and number six in terms of revised language.

**Chair Seymour:** Any other questions or discussion on the motion? And reminding everyone, the motion is to substitute to the document that’s on the screen in front of you with the original document.

**James Strauss:** I can go through what was edited if that is useful.

**Chair Seymour:** There is a request to enlarge that, if possible-- the text on our screen.

Any other questions or comments about the motion that's on the floor? Raise your hand if you want to speak. Put in a comment in Q&A if you'd rather do it that way.

I see Robert Hoffman has a question, Bonj.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Yes, just received it. So, this is Robert Hoffman from Abington. Is there any discussion of separating some components of the resolution that deal with entirely different issues? Please consider that the component of eliminating spring break does not necessarily correspond to many other components of the resolution.

**James Strauss:** Can I speak to that, Beth?

**Chair Seymour:** Of course.

**James Strauss:** The component of eliminating spring break has actually been eliminated from this edited version of the resolution. And the reason was the announcement earlier this week that the official Penn State calendar for spring 2021 will no longer have spring break. And that is no longer in the resolution in the edited version.

**Chair Seymour:** So, Cindy Simmons from Communications also has a question, Bonj, in Q&A.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Well, I've got it. I've just replied to her. Yes, Cindy then, setting aside her earlier comments. Is the numbering the same as in the one emailed today?

**James Strauss:** Yes, it should be.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Thanks, she says.

**Chair Seymour:** Any other questions or comments about the motion on the floor, which is to substitute the new document for the old document? I've got a hand up, Saurabh Bansal. Could you elevate him for me, please?

**Akash Damle:** I just allowed him to talk, so he should be able to talk.

**Saurabh Bansal, Smeal College of Business:** This is Saurabh Bansal from Smeal College of Business. I have a question. One of the items on the resolution is that the administration releases the original model that was built. Once that information is available, what will happen? What's the plan after that?
James Strauss: So presumably, the administration has talked about two aspects of what they're doing, modeling and contact tracing. Right now, as faculty members really don't know what, if anything, the modeling actually reveals that might be useful, the same goes with contact tracing. From a public health standpoint, we think that both might be useful for both faculty, staff, and students in terms of them making decisions about where they want to be, what precautions they need to take, et cetera. So that's the main goal behind having access to that information. We'd like at least components of that information to be public so that people can make informed decisions. That's the main goal.

Bonj Szczygiel: Beth, we have one call to question on the substitution from Nathan Tolman, Libraries.

Chair Seymour: Do I have a second. I see a second in Chat. I'll accept it from Josh Wede, Liberal arts. And a second from Frank Marko, so we've got plenty of seconds. Frank Marko's from Hazleton.

Bonj Szczygiel: And another from Victor Brunsden,

Chair Seymour: Altoona.

Bonj Szczygiel: Altoona.

Chair Seymour: All right, so we need to vote on call the question so that ends debate. So, we're not voting on switching out the documents yet. And I'm looking at my parliamentarian to keep me honest. We're voting on ending debate here. So please go to Poll Everywhere and cast your vote. And let Anna set it up. And cast your vote for ending debate. If you wish to end the debate on the action of switching one resolution for another, then you would vote A. If you wish to continue discussing whether or not we swap out one for another, then vote B.

James Strauss: Now, if appears that your screen is dominating, at least my screen, I can't switch anything out. Much better.

Chair Seymour: It wasn't my screen, Jim, but yes.

Anna Butler: The votes are tallying for call the question. OK, for call the question, we have 123 accept and two reject.

Chair Seymour: All right, so we've ended debate on the motion. So now we need to vote on the motion. And the motion is to separate-- sorry, to substitute the new document-- the new resolution, the edited version that Jim was just discussing-- with the original version. And Anna will set up that poll for us.

As it gets set up, to clarify, if you want to accept the motion, you would click on A. If you want to reject the motion, you would click on B.

Anna Butler: For the substitution, we have 122 accept and two reject.

Chair Seymour: All right, so the motion passes. We now have one document, which is the new edited version of the resolution. If you could put that back up again, Erin. Thank you. So now, this is the motion on the floor, which is to discuss this document.

James Strauss: So, Beth, could I say a few words about--
Chair Seymour: Sure.

James Strauss: --this and how this was created? So first, I'd like to thank all the senators for taking time out of your very busy schedule to attend our special meeting. Once again, our goal is to enable Penn State faculty to speak as a unified body and help Penn State move forward with their COVID policies.

I'd like everybody to know that faculty from the Commonwealth Caucus, the University College, College of Liberal Arts, College of Medicine, College of Engineering, and Eberly College of Science were involved in the original drafting and then subsequent editing of this resolution as you see it. I personally reached out, after the last special meeting, to faculty who had expressed concerns for their thoughts and edits. And the majority of those edits were incorporated.

The faculty that are responsible for this resolution, again, acknowledge the considerable work that Penn State administration has put into our fall reopening plan. And we understand the importance of this plan for Penn State to continue its educational mission. Reopening is very, very challenging. And this has been a difficult process at every higher education institution across the country. Penn State is not unique. And we are not here to point fingers or make accusations.

Our goal is to establish a positive pathway forward for the greater administrative faculty cooperation planning and information release. We're requesting information and involvement with modeling and contact tracing for greater understanding of the COVID landscape at both University Park and our campuses. I'd like to also say that we are not asking to violate a policy or asking for illegal access to information. We're just simply calling for a little bit better public access to the information that's already been collected in a, hopefully, usable form.

We are calling for more access to testing at University Park and the campuses with an increase in surveillance testing. We very happily acknowledge Penn State's announcement this week to add additional testing centers at University Park and to make testing more available to faculty at Commonwealth campuses. These are very positive developments.

We look forward to planning for a more streamlined spring semester, hopefully with pre-arrival testing for everyone and increased involvement in Faculty Senate leadership with our administration and planning modeling and implementation. And again, we happily acknowledge this week's announcement to eliminate spring break from the spring 2021 calendar and begin that semester one week later.

I'd like to remind everyone that the enemy of good is perfect. We've tried our very best to involve stakeholders in the creation and editing of the document you see in front of you. Ideally and respectfully, we are asking Faculty Senate to accept this entire resolution without further edits or additions. We believe the elements in this document are representative of the majority of concerned opinion across our faculty, focusing on inclusion and transparency.

And we're not trying to make statements that are inflammatory or exclusionary. We respect everyone's opinion and ask everyone to consider the most important goal. Our goal is to have this document in place as a unified voice for our Faculty Senate. Thank you, very much.

Chair Seymour: And thank you. Anybody want to discuss the document? Looks like we've got some in Q&A, Bonj?
Bonj Szczygiel: Yeah, first, Beth, I'm just going to mention-- call out Nathan Tolman because he's requesting that, if at all possible, could the document be made available as a Google Doc or something similar as a link, perhaps on chat, so that they can view it independently of the shared screen. I'm assuming for ease of reading.

So, I've just put that request out. And looks like Josh Wede has the floor Thank you, Josh. I can go back. And Cindy Simmons from Communications has been patiently waiting. Shall we start there?

Chair Seymour: Yes.

Bonj Szczygiel: All right, Simmons College of Communications, a colleague who's concerned about medical privacy asked that the resolution be amended. I offer these amendments because I agree that medical privacy rights are guaranteed under HIPAA and ADA should not be eroded by the resolution. There are also concerns that testing itself might infect people. Paragraph 8, she is suggesting, quote, "Testing should be offered without precondition, that is, no requirements for other tests prior, like flu, having symptoms, having traveled, or possible contact."

Paragraph 9 same as for paragraph 8. Quote, "Continued testing will be made available during spring." end of quote. For paragraph 9, she is suggesting mail-in drop-off options should be available. Also amend to say, quote, "test results will be sent directly to the patient, not the University." And add, the University will provide a map identifying the filtration system, for example, true HIPAA.

Chair Seymour: So, is Cindy suggesting these is a motion to amend the document?

Bonj Szczygiel: She is offering them as amendments.

Chair Seymour: I see her hand is raised. Could we unmute her so she can speak, please? Or could we elevator her to a panelist, whichever we want to do?

Cynthia Simmons, Communications: I'm trying to start video and am unable to. But for the sake of moving things along here, I think we need to recognize that the majority cannot always act appropriately for people with disabilities which, if it were known, they would face considerable discrimination.

I trust that the authors can lay these amendments in where they are appropriate. I have not had a chance to look at the substitute document such that I can see does the numbering line up. But we need to be very, very careful that no one's disability status or a health status that would make them the subject of opprobrium be disclosed accidentally in this testing process.

It may be the case that people with COVID themselves become a reviled class. So I request that these amendments be accepted and that in all advice to the administration moving forward, that we'd be very careful of the rights to medical privacy and of the FDA rights, which despite being federal law, are not always observed.

Chair Seymour: I guess I'll just make the point, Cindy, that the resolution isn't policy. So, it's a statement of, sort of, purpose by the Senate.

Cynthia Simmons: I'm well aware of that. I also remember this administration attempting to require people to answer questions that would reveal their pregnancy status. This is not an area where privacy
has been respected. And we need to raise that to the forefront in all our communication to the 
administration.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Jim?

James Strauss: I think, by law, there is reporting that has to take place on COVID positive tests. And 
they've got to basically be reported to the state. And the state has to report to the CDC. That's really 
beyond the control of Senate, from my perspective at least, meaning that when the University collects 
testing information, that information has to be released to public health authorities. I don't believe that 
information is necessarily attached to a person. It certainly is not when they report it on the dashboard. 
But the information, because this is a public health concern, is actually released to state and national 
agencies.

Chair Seymour: All right, well, thank you, Cindy. I see Ann Clements has her hand up.

Akash Damle: Ann, you've been unmuted. You are able to talk.

Bonj Szczyiigel: Ann?

Chair Seymour: Ann, if you can unmute yourself, you can probably talk now.

All right, do we have any other comments? I never did get a second on this motion, Cindy, for us to 
accept all of the items. So back to discussing the resolution. I think there may be some other questions, 
Bonj.

Bonj Szczyiigel: We've got a question from Terry Blakney, Behrend. I have serious concerns of 
resolution six requiring all persons to be tested before arrival in the spring. It does not say, quote, 
"returning personnel" end of quote, to the campuses. And I believe the spectrum of 100% testing is only a 
snapshot of the time the test has taken.

How will this be helpful when it takes time to send these tests and administer them? And what do you 
have for the gap in time between test administration and arrival on campuses? There are many faculty 
staff that are working from home. Just believe it would put a false sense of the true state of the disease 
and people may act more recklessly.

James Strauss: I can comment on that just in terms of the intent. And I think the intent was as much as 
humanly possible for us to try to identify, in all our different locations, folks who are COVID positive. 
And the reason for that is, at least at University Park, for this fall, we only tested a portion of those 
arriving.

And obviously, we've had a lot of cases subsequently. But I think the take home message is we probably 
came in with many more positives at this campus. And that brewed for a while. And we have the 
situation we have. So, we'd like there to be far more thorough testing at the beginning of spring semester 
to hopefully keep our caseload down.

Chair Seymour: It looks like we have a suggestion from Annie Taylor.
Bonj Szczygiel: Annie Taylor Earth and Mineral Sciences is requesting might we go through it section by section, starting with the first "where as."

Chair Seymour: So, I see Josh Wede has his hand up?

Josh Wede, College of Liberal Arts: Josh Wede, College of Liberal Arts. I just want to reiterate what Jim kind of said earlier. You know, we're never going to get a perfect resolution. I know that there are probably lots of little things that people might want to add or subtract, especially as I'm looking through some of these comments. You know, this is a non-binding resolution.

I think that it'd be nice to have kind of as close to unanimous faculty support as we can. And I think, in my opinion at least, it would be more fruitful if we could, instead of going through this item by item, send this forward to the administration with the expression that the Faculty Senate is behind this. And so, I think I would rather call the question on the current resolution than try to go through item by item. And that's it.

Chair Seymour: All right, thank you, Josh.

James Strauss: Was that a motion to call a question?

Chair Seymour: I think it was, Jim. But I'm running the meeting, thank you. So yes, there's a motion on the floor to call the question. Is there a second?

Bonj Szczygiel: We have a motion from Mary Beth Williams from Science seconding the motion to call the question, Brian King, a second.

Chair Seymour: All right, so now we need to set up a poll, Anna, if you will, to call the question. And this means it's to end debate on the resolution. So, if you want to end debate and no longer edit or comment on the resolution before we vote on the resolution, then you should vote, yes. If you do not want to end debate on the resolution, you should vote no, or A and B, right?

James Strauss: Can we release the screen?

Chair Seymour: Sure. I think if you hit Escape, you can release it yourself, Jim, but--

James Strauss: OK, thank you.

Chair Seymour: See I don't think you have to wait on somebody else to do it for you.

Anna Butler: Votes are tallying for call the question.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Anna. Yes, just to be clear, we are voting on whether or not to end debate on the resolution. If you want to end debate, press A. If you want to continue debating the resolution, press B.

Anna Butler: OK, for this call to question, I have 91--92 accept, and 31 reject.

Chair Seymour: I think that's the ratio we need, isn't it, Keith?
Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture: Yes, it is. It's a 2/3 vote.

Chair Seymour: Yep, just to remind people to call the question, it's a 2/3 vote. It's more than a majority. But we did reach that bar. So now debate has ended on the resolutions. So, if I could ask Anna to put up a poll on accepting or rejecting the resolution itself, I would appreciate that.

So, I assume the poll's working. If you accept the resolution, press, click, however you want to do it, A, if you reject the resolution, B

Anna Butler: Yes, the votes are tallying.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Anna.

Anna Butler: For the vote on the resolution, I have 89 accept and 37 reject.

Chair Seymour: The motion passes, so the resolution is accepted. Thank you, everybody. Thank you, Jim. And thank you, senators.

____________________________________________________________________________________

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Seymour: So, we'll move on with our agenda. Item C, New Legislative Business, is there any new business? I see a couple of hands up. Greg Shearer and Josh Wede, are those old hands up or new hands up? OK, I think they were old hands up. Thank you for taking your hands down. Hearing no new business--

Keith Shapiro: Beth, there is a point of order on the floor. Greg Shearer asks the question, is there a minimum standard for debate from the floor. And the answer to that is-- I'm not sure exactly what he means. However, since we've had a period of debate and the question was called, once it's had a second, according to Roberts, the chair is required to call a vote on it. Once a point of order-- or calling the question doesn't have-- you don't debate calling the question. You merely vote on it. The bar for call the question is 2/3, which we achieved. Does that help, Beth?

Chair Seymour: Yes, it does. Greg, if you have any other questions or you want more clarification, just raise your hand and we'll bring you up. What was the vote tally, again? I'm getting a couple of people asking, Anna. Could you let me know?

Anna Butler: Yes, the vote tally is 91 accept and 37 reject.

Chair Seymour: Yep, all right, thank you.

____________________________________________________________________________________

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Seymour: So, we're moving on. Item D, Comments, and Recommendations for The Good of The University. Are there any Comments for the Good of the University? Raise your hand or put your comments in. I think the Kent Vrana is maybe an old comment. Bonj, do you know?
Bonj Szczygiel: I'm sorry, from--

Chair Seymour: Kent Vrana in the Q&A. I think it may be--

Bonj Szczygiel: Yes, these are old questions. Mark Stephens to pass, is it simply majority, 2/3, or 75%?

Chair Seymour: To pass the motion of the resolution, it's just a majority. So, it doesn't have to-- and correct me, Keith, if I'm wrong-- but it's just a majority.

Keith Shapiro: Yes, it's just a majority. The reason the call the question was 2/3 is because it's a parliamentary issue on whether or not you're going to end debate early or end debate at all. And in order for that to happen, you need to have a super-majority of the group to agree to it.

Chair Seymour: Yep, and being a former parliamentarian myself, I can say that these are comments for the good of the order. So, thank you. Any other comments for the good of the order? Seeing none

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Seymour: I'll move on. Item E is Adjournment. Do I have a motion to adjourn the meeting?

Keith Shapiro: So, moved.

Chair Seymour: And it looks like there's a second from Mary Beth Williams, College of Science. So, we have all those in favor of adjourning, please raise your virtual hands. So y'all can all raise your hands. I see tons of hands. So, we have many, many hands, OK. Thank you, all. The Senate is adjourned until October 20, 2020. And I hope you have a good rest of the week and weekend. Thank you, all. Bye.

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