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The next Regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, September 14, 2021, 1:00 p.m., via ZOOM.
The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, April 27, 2021, at 1:00 p.m. via Zoom Webinar and in person at the Foster Auditorium, with Chair Seymour, Chair, presiding.

**Chair Seymour, Penn State Altoona:** It is 1:00 PM, Tuesday April 27, 2021, and the Senate is now in session. We're meeting today via Zoom. We're having some technical difficulties in case you're wondering why I stopped.

**Chair Seymour:** Let me go through the instructions for the meeting. Who can speak in a Senate meeting? Only those who are elected or appointed student, faculty, administrative or retired senators or past chairs have the privilege of the floor. The meetings are public, and others can join and listen, but please do not try to ask a question if you are not a Senator.

You can email Executive Director Dawn Blasko or me 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 create a complete record of the meeting that will be available about three weeks after the meeting.

This meeting, like all Senate plenary meetings is being recorded. We have brought you in with your microphones muted and your video off. If you are presenting a report, when it is time for your report, we will unmut you and put your video on. Please wait to speak until you are introduced by the chair. When you are finished, we will mute you and turn your camera off.

We are continuing to use the Zoom features in the following way. Chat will be turned on for you to communicate with each other. The chat will not be closely monitored.

You may use it to post a comment, let us know you're having a technical problem, let us know you joined late, or tell us that you are joining by phone, and your phone number for attendance. But do not use it to ask a question for a presenter or to be recognized to speak and have the floor. If you have an emergency, email Kadi Corter at kkw2. We have Akash Damly, Guneet Baweja and our tech TAs. Thank you for joining us.

How do you ask a question? You have two ways to ask a question. You can raise your hand using the Raise Hand function. Wait until I recognize you for the record, state 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 and the Zoom Q&A with your name and unit. As always, we might not be able to answer everyone's questions, but we will capture the Q&A and pass along questions that have not been answered.

How do you vote? In order to get an accurate vote, we're using TallySpace. 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. Your commitment to the Senate has been more important than ever over the past 14 months. Thank you for staying focused and committed to shared governance. I value your time, commitment, and efforts, and have been humbled by the experience.
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 with the agenda.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Seymour: Minutes of the preceding meeting, the March 16, 2021 Senate record, providing a full transcription of the proceedings of the meeting was sent to the University archives and is posted on the Faculty Senate website. If there are any corrections or additions to these minutes, please send them to Dawn Blasko at dgb6 at your soonest convenience. May I hear a motion to tentatively accept the minutes?

Victor Brunsden, Penn State Altoona: So, moved.

Chair Seymour: Brunsden, moved. Second?

Bon Szczygiel, Arts and Architect: Szczygiel, second.

Chair Seymour: For the minutes, let's just use the virtual hand feature. So, all those in favor of accepting the minutes, please raise your virtual hand. Going to give you time. Are we raising?

Chair Seymour: All right, thank you. It looks like we have passed the minutes. So, thank you for that. The minutes are accepted.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report

Chair Seymour: Next item, B, Communications to the Senate. The Senate curriculum report of April 6, 2021 is posted on the University Faculty website and is in Appendix A.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Seymour: Item C, report of Senate Council. Minutes from the April 6, 2021 Senate council meeting can be found at the end of your agenda. I want to make one correction to the minutes. The meetings will be updated-- sorry, the minutes will be updated to read that Senate Council met for an hour with the search firm providing information for the Next Gen Penn State Group after approving the April plenary agenda. Also included in the minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President at its April 6, 2021 meeting.
ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Seymour: Item D, Announcements by the Chair. First, I want to start with this announcement. At the officers and chairs meeting last night where the Senate officers and the chairs of the standing committees meet to discuss their work, we drafted the following letter in response to the racist hate crime targeting Black faculty at Penn State and the defacement of the Martin Luther King mural in downtown State College. These follow other hateful and racist attacks against students, staff, and faculty at Penn State over the past year. This statement will be sent as a letter to the President after this meeting.

This is the statement. "On behalf of the collective leaders for Penn State's Faculty Senate, we decry the appalling and racist actions targeting our Black colleagues, peers, and friends. Today, we do not ask for thoughts or prayers or empty promises for those hurt by the repeated targeted racist crimes within our own community. Today, we ask for commitment for action. In order for our relationships within faculty, staff, students to be healthy, all of our people have to be healthy in body, mind, and spirit. President Barron, today we ask for a commitment to act upon all of the recommendations put forth in the President's Commission on Racism, Bias, and Community Safety and the two More Rivers to Cross reports." That is the statement from offices and chairs that was presented last night.

Let's move on to the rest of my remarks. Thank you again for your tremendous work for the Senate and the University. This past year has posed extraordinary challenges for us as we live through a pandemic, political crises, and a long overdue racial reckoning. I am proud of the way we responded to these challenges in order to support student learning, undergraduate and graduate. It required a great communal effort across Penn State's 24 campuses.

I want to acknowledge that this endeavor required faculty, instructors, staff, students, and administrators from each unit across the University to work together. I am truly in awe of how we were able to successfully manage constantly changing dynamics to do our work and do it well. Your efforts have been truly inspirational as you fulfilled our land-grant mission of teaching, research, and service across the Commonwealth. Throughout it all, I've witnessed the incredible resilience, creativity, and hard work of Penn State's faculty and instructors to create and deliver high quality education to our students as situations changed and we adapted to maintain our high standards.

In recognition of these efforts, I'm proud to announce that the Teaching and Learning with Technology has awarded the TLT Distinguished Service Award to the faculty across Penn State. I accepted this award on the faculty's behalf yesterday, and I am deeply honored to do so. The award is for all of your collective efforts to maintain high quality education, research, and creative activity opportunities for our students.

I also want to thank students for their strength and resilience during these difficult times. You've been asked to start college, continue your education, and graduate under circumstances none of us could have imagined 18 months ago. Your ability to navigate a constantly changing landscape and still learn and succeed is a testament to your abilities and strength.

And finally, I want to end my remarks where I began, focused on what I consider to be the most important work that we can do at this University and in this country-- focusing our attention on building communities that are truly inclusive and where all people feel they belong. I've shared with the Senate the work of the More Rivers to Cross report part 1. This, along with the first report, is a call to action by the
Black faculty of Penn State to make significant structural change across our University in every department, in every unit, at every college, and every campus.

The Senate took the recommendations from their first report, as well as the recommendations from the Presidential Select Commission on Racism, Bias, and Community Safety, and wove their recommendations into charges. Our work this semester or this meeting on alternative grading, assessment of teaching, and a focus on equity and diversity has informed many of our reports during the year.

Reports today from Faculty Affairs, Educational Equity and Campus Environment, Intra-University Relations, and the Senate Self-Study are in response to this call to action. The Education Committee is reviewing our student policies for bias and will present necessary recommendations. The PIE Task Force - Policies Influencing Equity -- created in response to the need for alternative grading, will be making recommendations to change policies using an equity mindset.

The Joint Curricular Task Force on Racial and Social Justice has started its work and should have recommendations for various Senate committees in the fall. And the Senate is in the process of centering the work of diversity, equity, and inclusion in its standing committee so that it will be a major consideration during report generation. But there is still a lot more work to do in the Senate at Penn State and in this country.

Chauvin's conviction for the murder of George Floyd is an important step in accountability. But we have a long way to go before we have true justice. This is just the beginning, and there's a lot more necessary work to do. I am committed to this work, and I ask that you join me. I am now pleased to invite Tim Robicheaux, chair of the Senate Committee on Student Life, to introduce the John White Fellowship recipients.

**John White Scholarship Presentation**

**Timothy Robicheaux, Liberal Arts:** I'm trying to open my camera, but I don't really need my camera, I suppose. So, you're able to hear me fine, Beth?

**Chair Seymour:** Yes, I can hear you, Tim.

**Timothy Robicheaux:** OK, thank you. Before I start, I just want to say as chair of Student Life Committee that I wanted to give my verbal commitment that I, too-- that we all sign on to this letter. But I felt like I should say it out loud. So, I also want to thank Beth for her leadership and Anna Butler for her help with the John White scholarship this year and with the fellowship.

And also, not in my script here, but I want to thank all of the faculty who donated. We ended up getting extra money and were able to give an extra award this year. So really appreciated. It's not too late. If you go to the Senate website, there's a link to donate to the John White Fellowship there. And we are still taking money.

So, each year, the Senate Committee on Student Life recognizes outstanding undergraduate students who are graduating summa cum laude and who plan to enroll in graduate study. The John White Graduate Fellowship is one of the oldest continuing fellowships at Penn State. The award was established in 1902--not a typo-- by James Gilbert White to honor his father, Reverend John W. White of Milroy, Pennsylvania.
Joining me on this year’s review committee where Jennifer Nesbitt, associate professor of English at Penn State York, and Yasha Duggal, a PhD student in chemistry and GPSA representative. We began with over 40 applicants, 43 specifically, and interviewed 12. To say that the students were impressive is an understatement. Again, thank you for your donations because we were able to provide funds to seven incredible students, listed in no order other than this is the order I wrote up about each one.

So Mingsong Chen will graduate with degrees in earth science and in energy business and finances with a minor in statistics. Whether the course was electricity and magnetism or art history or calculus or risk analysis, Mingsong earned an A grade in each of these classes, a perfect 4.0 GPA.

He's the president of the Chinese chess club on campus. Mingsong is the student marshal for the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences. He expressed interest in the tragedy of global climate change as a high school student, and he began to rethink potential solutions to climate change and future energy crises after attending a conference on environmental protection and sustainability.

He works with Professors Joel Landry and Seth Blumsack on an honors thesis protecting the potential health effects of Pennsylvania joining the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative. Mingsong plans to pursue a PhD in economics and eventually to join the Energy Research Institution as an economic analyst where he hopes to apply economic theory and analysis to developing solutions for climate change and energy needs. We certainly will all benefit from his successes.

Certainly, this year, we know that immunologists and vaccine research is extraordinarily important, and hopefully it means that next year, we will have these awards in person. Nina De Luna hopes to join this group of researchers after earning her PhD in immunology at the University of Pennsylvania. Nina's a Schreyer Honors College student graduating with a Bachelor of Science in immunology and infectious disease.

Under the advising of Dr. Girish Kirimanjeswara-- and I apologize if I mispronounced that-- Nina is completing her honors thesis titled "Establishing the Role of Selenium and B-Cell Selenoproteins in Humoral Immunity." Also apologize if I mispronounced any of those. Nina is part of the Millennium Scholars Program and has presented at multiple conferences, has won a national outstanding research writing award, and is the co-author of a manuscript currently under review. She traveled to Tanzania as part of a biology of eco heath course in 2018.

While what I have already listed is impressive on its own, we were particularly pleased with her dedication to science education and outreach. She developed and presented a hands-on outreach activity to teach area high school students about cells and presented a hands-on activity about density as part of Exploration-U.

She also has mentored middle school girls as part of ENVISION-- STEM Career Day for Young Women. The opportunity to mentor underrepresented students in Philadelphia was one of her primary motivations for choosing UPenn for graduate school. It would be really great to see one of the students she mentors receiving this award one day in the future. We very well may.

Bing Zhang is graduating with a dual Bachelor of Arts degree in advertising through the Bellisario College of Communications and psychology through the College of Liberal Arts. He's a product of the Penn State's 2+2 Program, spending her first two years attending Penn State Abington where she enjoyed her great education and access to cuisines from around the world. This was very important to her.
Bing was heavily involved at Penn State during her undergraduate tenure. She was a trip leader for an Alternative Spring Break, an orientation leader at the Abington campus, and a line scout at University Park. She served Penn State as the marketing and social media intern with the Office of Global Programs and is currently a communications social media strategist at the Sustainability Institute.

After graduation, Bing has no immediate plans to leave Happy Valley. She'll be pursuing a master's degree in business analytics here at Penn State because, in her words, "big data demystifies advertising and a master's of business analytics demystifies big data." That sounds like a slogan that could be added to the recruitment material. Some people I know barely plan beyond on breakfast, but Bing has thought long into the future. Upon completing her graduate education, she hopes to work at an advertising agency to become a senior account planner and eventually to open her own business.

The next student, Rayna Marshall, will graduate next week with degrees in biology and in Chinese language. While she has not chosen a school just yet, Rayna has been accepted to medical school and hopes to earn her MD and potentially a master's in public health. Rayna would like to be involved in student-run free clinics to serve uninsured populations, and she aspires to volunteer with Doctors Without Borders to have a meaningful impact on global health issues and to widen her perspective.

Rayna demonstrated her dedication to serving the underserved as the co-founder of the Student Pad Project, advocating for basic health care product access. As part of the project, the organization set up a self-sustaining pad-making site for women in southern India who do not have access to feminine hygiene products and face menstruation stigma.

Rayna studied abroad in Florence, Italy, back when we were able to do those things. She is a clinical volunteer at Mount Nittany Medical Center, was a Biology 230 learning assistant, and was an orientation student coordinator for Penn State Global Programs. She has an undergraduate—she's been an undergraduate researcher in the lab of Dr. Charles Anderson, and she did all of this while maintaining a 3.99 GPA. In her words, Rayan says she is confident that her education at Penn State has prepared her for her future endeavors.

Caitlin Morris is a Schreyer Honor Scholar graduating from Penn State with a bachelor's degree in business accounting and a minor in entrepreneurship and innovation. In her application letter, Caitlin stated that she set a goal to contribute as much as she could make—as much as she could to make sure that by the time she graduated, she'd be leaving Penn State a better place than when she first attended. Her enthusiasm during the interview and her resume both make it clear that she meant it.

Caitlin spent her undergraduate tenure at Penn State Berks where she was a member of the Academic Integrity Committee, the Judicial Oversight Board for the Constitutional Review Committee—she was chair of that board—the Penn State Berks Sustainability Team, the Quality-of-Life Student Committee, the Student Initiated Fee Committee, and the Council of Commonwealth student governments. From 2019 to 2020, Caitlin was also the vice president of the Penn State Berks Student Government Association.

Caitlin supposed to study abroad in France, but the COVID-19 pandemic put the brakes on those plans. She plans to visit Europe for the first time this summer and fall, having applied to the Lappeenranta University of Technology in Finland. And in addition to all of this, somehow, she found the time to be a member of the venture startup team for Traduki Technologies in Honey Brook, Pennsylvania.
Our last two awardees attended Penn State's World Campus. Renata, if you need some alumni testimonials in the future, get in touch with these two. They were great for advertisement but also really enthusiastic students. One student, Anne Noble, won't be tough to find as she'll be attending Penn State for graduate school. Anne noted that her long-term passion in the welfare of children drew her to the field of social work. But her desire to have a broader impact in the field of child maltreatment drew her to Penn State's program in human development and family studies.

She earned her bachelor's degree in HDFS, and she's accepted an offer to attain her doctorate in HDFS beginning in fall of 2021. This summer, Anne will work in Dr. Christian Connell's Child Welfare Data Lab. She aims to work in academia when she's finished school as a social scientist specializing in the field of child maltreatment. Anne is a self-labeled military spouse and currently resides in North Carolina. Despite her physical distance from Pennsylvania.

Anne took full advantage of the opportunities available to World Campus students. She is a research assistant with two different Penn State research projects while serving as a teaching assistant at the University of North Carolina School of Social Work while also serving as a research intern and teaching assistant for the Children's Data Network, which is stationed in Los Angeles, California. Anne will be joining us in person soon. In fact, she will be moving here-- what's the date? She'll be moving here in a couple of days, I suppose over the weekend, so early May. So, say hi to her if you see her.

And finally, we're honored to award Katherine Lucas with the John W. White Graduate Fellowship. She goes by Katie. So, Katie's college experience began more than a decade ago when she attended Georgetown University. After a year in DC, Katie left for a location that was a bit more tropical, becoming a master scuba diver trainer in Hawaii.

She eventually made her way to Charleston, South Carolina to raise her family. She stated that World Campus gives her the ability to complete her degree and to begin a new career path. Katie will receive a Bachelor of Science in accounting and is another student graduating with a perfect 4.0 cumulative GPA. She has professional experience in marketing and accounting and has volunteered working with underserved populations in Charleston. Aside from her amazing classroom performance, one thing that drew us to Katie was her motivation for attending graduate school, something she expounded on during our interview. Her Penn State degree is more than adequate for her to take the CPA exam to work as an accountant in South Carolina.

But she's driven by a love of learning. For example, she mentioned her excitement with taking a graduate level course on the history of accounting because she finds the topic generally fascinating. Katie is a full-time student while also raising two young children who sadly never appeared in the background during our interview like my daughter has a tendency to do and many pets, et cetera. But her energy and enthusiasm during the interview were incredible. She has an interest in forensic accounting and hopes to work as an auditor for a local firm upon completion of graduation and hopefully can do some more scuba diving as well.

Like in past years, this was an impressive group of students. This was my second year choosing winners. This was Jen's third year. Determining last year's awardees was a major challenge. But even that was nothing close to the difficulty we faced this year. Every one of the applicants should make us proud to be at Penn State. While Zoom is no way to give these students the applause they deserve, I hope you can all join me in wishing them well.
Chair Seymour: Thank you, Tim. Fantastic students. Thank you and your committee for all the work that you've done on this. Thank you so much for your passion.

Announcement of a New University Ombudsperson

Chair Seymour: Next, I'd like to move to the Announcement of a New University Ombudsperson. At this point, I'd like to introduce Dr. Mohammad Ansari, who's our current University Faculty Ombudsperson, to introduce Larry Backer.

Mohammad Ansari, Berks: Thank you, Chair Seymour. Good afternoon, everyone. I am pleased to announce the election of my friend and colleague, Professor Larry Backer of Penn State Law, as our new University faculty ombudsperson elect. Larry is the former chair of the University Faculty Senate. He has extensive knowledge and service background that will help him to be a great University faculty ombudsperson as he will take over the office on July 1, 2022. Thank you, Chair Seymour. And please, all of us, join and congratulate our friend and our new University faculty ombudsperson, Larry Backer. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Mohammad. Larry-- is Larry there?

Larry Backer, University Park: Yeah, Larry's here. Hi, everyone. And there's very little I can add to the very, very kind remarks of Mohammad I'm delighted to be able to sit in Mohammad's shadow and try to learn as much as I can from him and try to live up to the job that he has been able to do during his time as University Ombud's. I'm very grateful for the opportunity to serve in this capacity, and I look forward to the future. So, thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Mohammad and Larry. Thank you both so much for your service. This is a very important role for the University.

Mohammad Ansari: Thank you so much.

Recognition of Fellow Senators

Chair Seymour: All right, now I want to offer some recognition to some of our fellow senators who are leaving us. Now I'd like to offer this special recognition to seven faculty senators who are leaving the Senate with distinguished records. If I were in person, I would hand you the Certificate of Service, but this year, sadly they're going to come in the mail.

First off, Laurie Breakey, assistant teaching professor in business and business administration program leader, Penn State DuBois, has served 11 years on the Senate, including two on CC&R and one year on Intra--University Relations. Laurie has tremendous experience in curriculum development and served eight years on the Committee of Curricular Affairs. She chaired Curricular Affairs for one year and served as vice chair for two years. Thank you, Laurie, for your long and distinguished service to the Senate.

Ann Clements, who's newly appointed as the assistant vice provost for Faculty Affairs, Faculty Development, and professor of music education in the College of Art and Architecture, University Park,
made many contributions to the Senate and had to leave us earlier this semester due to her new position. Still a little bitter.

Ann served on the Senate for nearly eight years. She started as a member of the Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology from 2013 to 2017 and served as vice chair. She then served two years on CC&R in 2019, 2020, and served as chair of the Educational Equity and Campus Environment Committee. And this year, she chaired LIST. Thank you, Ann, for your leadership and service to the Senate, and we look forward to working with you in your new role.

James Japp, teaching professor of English and assistant chief academic officer at Penn State Greater Allegheny, served eight years on the Senate, serving as a member of the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs for four years and serving as vice chair for one year. James served on ERISA as well for three years and the Committee on Education for one year. Thank you, James, for your service to the Senate. Jeff Laman, professor of civil and environmental engineering, the College of Engineering at University Park, served 11 years on the Senate. Jeff has served on four standing committees, including Intercollegiate Athletics, Faculty Affairs, Faculty Benefits, and Committee on Committees and Rules. Jeff served as chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee for three years.

He was elected secretary of the Senate from 2013, 2014. As secretary, he chaired the Senate Council Unit Constitution Subcommittee and the Elections Commission. For three years, he also served on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the president. Jeff has also been a member of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee for three years. Thank you, Jeff, for your long and distinguished service to the Senate. Rick Robinett, professor of physics and associate head for undergraduate and graduate studies, Eberly College of Science at University Park, served 12 years in the Senate. He has served on four different standing committees, holding leadership roles, including chairing Undergraduate Education for two years and vice chairing ARSSA for two years.

Rick served on the Committee on Committees and Rules for four years and Faculty Affairs for two years. He served a three-year term on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and was chair of that committee from 2017 to 2018. He also served on the General Education Assessment Committee. Thank you, Rick, for your long and distinguished service to the Senate.

Ira Ropson, associate professor of biochemistry, the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, served on the Senate for 16 years. He served on the Faculty Affairs Committee for four years and the Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits for five years. Ira served as vice chair of Faculty Benefits for two years and chair for one year. He also served as vice chair of Student Life.

He has served on the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits for six years. For the past three years, Ira served on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity. Having served on five Senate committees, Ira's leadership and experience has been invaluable. Thank you, Ira, for your long and distinguished service to the Senate.

And finally, Nicholas Rowland, professor of sociology, environmental studies in science, and technology studies at Penn State Altoona, served 12 years on the Senate. For three of these years, he served on the Committee of Intra-University Relations and was committee chair for one year. For four years, he served on the Faculty Affairs Committee, chairing that committee for one year. Nicholas was elected to the Senate leadership as chair-elect in 2018, 2019, served as chair of the Senate last year, and currently serves as the immediate past chair.
As part of the Senate leadership, Nicholas served on CC&R, the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, and served as a member on the Board of Trustees Committees. He was just elected to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. Thank you, Nicholas, for your many distinguished contributions to the Senate. If we could just take a second to thank our colleagues via Zoom. Thank you all for your service.

At this final plenary meeting of the year, we transition from one Senate to another with new senators and new officers coming in at the end of the meeting. While the official shift will occur at the end of today's meeting, I would like to take a little time now to thank our current officers and committee leadership. I don't know how to begin to thank the officers, the Senate leadership, and many senators for their support during this year. It has been a challenging year. And I have often leaned in on the support of many of you to provide counsel, push back against bad ideas, and provide me with excellent ones. Without your help and support, the Senate's work and shared governance could not have occurred.

I had the good fortune of sharing leadership with three wonderful colleagues in their officer roles. Bonj Szczygiel, chair-elect of the Senate. I've had to look to her to provide support throughout the year. You've seen us work together all year in the plenary meetings, and several of you privately have suggested that we have discovered an alternative profession if needed. As we address the questions raised by senators, I've been lucky to find myself in the position of chair with such a strong collaborative partner in the position of chair elect.

Lisa Mangel, secretary of the Senate. Working with Lisa has been a joy. I've been so lucky to work with her this year. And she provides such tireless support to me and the Senate. Nicholas Rowland, immediate past chair of the Senate. It is such a pleasure working with Nicholas. He was a wonderful mentor last year and has been a constant source of support for me this year. He's always been willing to step in and help whenever I have asked.

Keith Shapiro, our parliamentarian. Keith in this role and as chair of the Self-Study has provided constant support not only in the areas of parliamentary advice but as a constant counselor. He is always there for me when I need advice and is such a steady presence. Thank you.

And Roger Egolf, the Senate historian. Roger's constant curiosity for all things Senate enriches our work by helping us understand how things evolved, which help us direct current and future action. Thank you, Roger. Thank you all so much.

Behind the scenes, I have asked Senate Council and groups of committee chairs and vice chairs and the officers to give me advice. For those of you who I've asked, you've known that you've been part of this bigger team. Thank you. But I want to recognize all of those hours of effort that have gone unrecorded. So, I want to thank the Senate counselors for this work and thank them for their good advice.

I've also relied on the leadership of the Senate standing committees and special committee throughout the year. Let me thank them all by reading their names and recognizing them. Kat Phillips, chair, and Maura Shea, vice chair; Admissions, Record Scheduling, and Student Aid. Victor Brunsden, chair; Annie Taylor, vice chair; Committee on Committees and Rules.

Mary Beth Williams, chair; Harold and Suzy Linn, vice chairs of Curricular Affairs. Chely Stine, chair, and Steve Van Hook, vice chair of Education. Kim Blockett, chair, and Busi Dube and then Doug Bird,
vice chairs; Educational Equity and Campus Environment. Renee Bishop-Pierce, chair, and Josh Kirby, vice chair of Faculty Affairs.


Andy Freiberg, chair, and Cindy Simmons, vice chair of Outreach. Roger Egolf, chair, and Ira Ropson, vice chair; Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity. Tim Robicheaux, chair, and Jen Nesbitt, vice chair of Student Life. Jim Strauss, chair, and Frank Marko, vice chair of University Planning Thank you all for your work. It is the engine of the Senate to do those reports.

I also want to thank and recognize the work of the special committees and task forces. Keith Shapiro, chair of the Senate Self-Study. Kat Phillips, David Smith, and Jeff Adams, co-chairs of the Policies Influence, and Equities Task Force. And my co-chair, Dave Callejo, on the Joint Curricular Task Force on Social and Racial Justice. Sorry. Thank you all for your service this year and just your continued support.

A few other thank yous if you can indulge me. I want to acknowledge Lee Fessler of the Media Technology Services for providing technology support for the Senate meetings as we move to different locations and formats. John Maddie and Jacob Fischer helped us with our first Zoom meetings. We've also had great support from our tech TAs with special mention to Akash Damly and Guneet Baweja. And I want to thank the Senate office for their continual support this year. We could not do the work of the Senate without you. Most senators don't know what you do. But I can attest that they make the Senate function. And without their dedication, talent, and hard work, we wouldn't be able to do the work of shared governance.

Emily Derr and Katie Corter work on the curriculum for the Senate, working closely with Curricular Affairs. Kathe Craig is a jack of all trades, supporting the work of FR&R and the petitions process. Anna Butler provides the institutional memory of the Senate office, working diligently on petitions, accessibility, website, archives, and all things Senate.

Sarah Silverman is the main receptionist and supports the officers and committee chairs, making our work much easier. Erin Eckley, the office manager, manages the workflow of the entire office, including the flow of reports, support of the University Faculty Ombud’s, and the extra senatorial committees, as well as the running Senate Council and Senate plenary meetings. Thank you all for your hard work. And I also want to thank Executive Director Dawn Blasko for her advice during the year. So, thank you all so much.

And finally, I want to thank Victor Brunsden. While many of you know him as a valued colleague and a long-term senator, he is my life's partner. I've relied on his knowledge and expertise and shared governance every day as Senate chair. As my partner, he stepped up and took care of me this past year. Thank you for your wisdom, generosity, and support.

So, thank you, everyone. It's been a year, and we had to all do it together. So, thank you.
Chair Seymour: Next, we will hear from two sets of speakers sponsored by Senate Council that are focused on the Presidential search. The first is the Next Gen Penn State Advisory Group report presented by its chair, David Kleppinger, who is also Vice President of the Penn State Board of Trustees.

Presidential Search

David Kleppinger, Vice President of the Penn State Board of Trustees: Thank you. And I believe Julie Anna Potts was due to give this report as opposed to myself. But, Julie Anna, were you ready to proceed?

Mark Dambly, President, Pennrose Properties, LLC: We can't hear Julie Anna.

David Kleppinger: Julie Anna, we can't hear you.

Julie Anna Potts, President and CEO, North American Meat Institute: OK, I have come up--

David Kleppinger: Still not--we could hear you briefly.

Julie Anna Potts: --this any better?

David Kleppinger: There you go.

Chair Seymour: We can hear you now.

Julie Anna Potts: OK, all right. Sorry about that. So let me start over. This is the first opportunity I've had as a trustee to address the Senate. So, thank you for the privilege, Beth. We really appreciate Mark and David and I being invited to be with you today to update you on our search for the 19th president of Penn State. As Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Matt Schuyler has said this is the most important thing that the Board of Trustees will do as a board, and that is the selection of the president.

Faculty are critical to this process. We welcome the opportunity to engage with you all today, and we appreciate the many ways in which you are already participating and providing crucial insights for the needs of the University and for the opportunities that we have to select our next leader.

The trustees understand and appreciate that our faculty deliver world class education, for which we have come to be known. We know that Penn State is among the top universities in the world for competitively awarded research expenditures. And we take pride in all you do to keep Penn State one of the most sought-after universities in the world. Penn State is truly an amazing place in part because of the work you do at the core of the University. And I really appreciated seeing the students a little while ago. Whenever I have the opportunity to see such wonderful students, it makes me feel like such an underachiever.

As you are aware, Chairman Schuyler has appointed a Presidential Recruitment and Selection Committee, which Mark and I are privileged to co-chair. We have, in turn, established the Next Gen Penn State listening phase so that our community, all of you, can help identify those challenges and opportunities we need to consider and the qualities that we need in our next president to be successful.
Today, we will focus on the listening process we have undertaken and the ways in which faculty's voices are helping to contribute to the hiring of a world class leader. And then we have time for your questions. I'd like to just start out by saying there are three principal ways in which Next Gen Penn State is gathering input from faculty and others to inform the search and selection criteria.

First, through facilitated group discussions led by the research arm of the search firm we have selected, which is called Spencer Stuart. They have already held 35 stakeholder sessions with individuals and constituency groups. This includes faculty Senate leadership, Senate faculty chairs, and Senate Council. It also includes the president's Commissions for Equity, which includes, as you know, the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Equity; the Commission on Racial Ethnic Diversity; and the Commission for Women. And there are a number of other critical groups, like the Staff Advisory Council, Student Leaders Roundtable, Council of Academic Deans, Alumni Council Executive Board, and more.

Over 250 individuals have participated in these discussions so far. Spencer Stuart's research team has developed a questionnaire that is used consistently through the sessions so that there is comparative themes that emerge as different constituent groups get to answer the same questions on an ongoing basis. Second, Spencer Stuart's research team has developed and disseminated a survey to all faculty, staff, students, alumni, and other stakeholders. This was launched on April the 13th. And due to requests from faculty and others, we are extending the opening of that survey to April the 30th.

The survey includes opportunities for open-ended comments so we can receive lots of commentary. And I just learned that out of more than 9,600 responses so far, we have at least 1,259, probably more, from faculty at this point. That number is a couple of days old. And I really appreciate that. We all appreciate that.

The Board of Trustees Office, with the support of Strategic Communications, has aggressively disseminated the survey. An email was sent by the board chair to all of the faculty, staff, students, and alumni for whom we have email addresses. The alumni number alone exceeded 400,000.

There have been several Penn State Today stories, and it has been shared in social media channels. We get a weekly digest sent to all faculty, as well as multiple reminders. And we have asked our Faculty Senate leaders, our Next Gen Penn State Advisory Group members, and others to champion the completion of that survey by as many stakeholders as possible.

Third, we have established a form accessible to anyone at the Next Gen Penn State website to provide open-ended comments. Thus far, we have received more than 200 responses through the website. I hope you agree we are casting a very wide net for feedback. At the end of this month, the Next Gen Penn State Advisory Group will examine the data compiled by Spencer Stuart and finalize a report that will be publicly available on the qualities needed for the next president. That report will be delivered to the Board of Trustees in May.

I'll say a little bit about the 47-member Next Gen Advisory Group, which is chaired by trustee David Kleppinger. It's a broad and diverse mix of leaders that includes deans, chancellors, distinguished faculty, community leaders, students, administrators, alumni, and many others. The chair-elect of the Faculty Senate is on it. And in authoring a public report, all of you all will be critical in providing guidance on the Presidential Recruitment and Selection Committee. I hope that that adequately describes to you phase one of our effort, which is focused on listening.
Once there is a report delivered, our Presidential Recruitment and Selection Committee, working with the search firm Spencer Stuart, will create and publicize a job description and commence a search starting in late May. We hope to hire the next president by late fall. The committee is comprised largely of trustees and also includes Dr. Nina Jablonki, Evan Pugh professor of anthropology; Randy Houston, president of the Penn State Alumni Association; and Erin Boas, an undergraduate student.

I want to note a few things about the search that I feel are very important to share. We will not begin the search until we have guidance through the Next Gen Penn State listening phase, which is needed to establish the position criteria for us to go out into the marketplace. We are committed to achieving a diverse pool of outstanding candidates from which we can choose the best candidate for Penn State University.

The process of reviewing and selecting a final candidate has not yet been determined and won't be until the full Recruitment and Selection Committee has met to establish the criteria and approach. We have no preconceived notions and are open to what we learn from the listening phase so that we may make informed and thoughtful decisions about the needs for a world class leader.

I want to speak on behalf here of not just David and Mark but also the entire Board of Trustees, that we undertake this effort with deep reverence for the importance of the task at hand and to serve this University, one of the world's great public research universities. With that, Beth, I will ask Mark and David to join me in standing for some questions from the Senate.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Julie Anna, and sorry I didn't introduce you and Mark earlier. So sorry about that.

Julie Anna Potts: That's quite all right.

Chair Seymour: Are there any questions for the trustees? Bonj, do we have anything in Q&A?

Bonj Szczygiel: Nothing yet, Beth.

Chair Seymour: Any hands raised? Just to remind everybody— I recognize Brian King. He has his hand raised.

Bonj Szczygiel: He disappeared. He's not—

Julie Anna Potts: Beth, I can't hear anything. Is there—

Chair Seymour: No, we're trying to see if we've got anyone who's raised their hand.

Julie Anna Potts: Oh, OK.

Chair Seymour: And so far, we thought we had somebody, but I think they put their hand down.

Bonj Szczygiel: Beth, we do have a question from Michele Stine. And if the faculty voice is critical in the selection, can you explain why there is only one faculty representative on the Search Committee?
Julie Anna Potts: The opportunity that we took in putting together the listening phase is quite robust. And our approach here was to gather as much input from faculty and all stakeholders through this very robust listening phase. Spencer Stuart, our search firm, has commented that this is the most robust listening process with the most activity and the most input that they have seen for a search of this type. And we have very fine representatives from the faculty, the students, and the alumni sitting with a small group of trustees on the Recruitment and Selection Committee. So, our feeling was that we have-- we're committed to getting the absolute best next president for Penn State and that this process we put in place is going to deliver that result. Mark or David, you want to add anything there?

David Kleppinger: I would just supplement that in addition to the feedback and the survey forms of the over 1,200 faculty representatives that we're receiving, there's also the opportunity to email directly to Spencer Stuart with suggested names of potential candidates. I think that website has been-- or the email address has been out there. But for those that may not be aware, it's pennstpresident@spencerstuart.com. And that is a direct email confidential line into Spencer Stuart for additional input.

Chair Seymour: And just to clarify, Trustee Kleppinger, those are candidates for the Office of President, for the president-- that position?

David Kleppinger: Yes.

Chair Seymour: OK. Any other questions? No hands raised?

Bonj Szczygiel: No, nothing. No hands.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I think that's all our questions for today. So, thank you, Trustees Potts, Dambly, and Kleppinger, for joining us today.

Mark Dambly: Thank you for having us.

David Kleppinger: Thanks for the opportunity and look forward to continuing to work with you.

Julie Anna Potts: And feel free to contact any of us who are part of this process as we go forward. We'd love to have dialogue both with the process in place and outside of it. So, thank you all very much.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Thank you all.

Mark Dambly: Thanks.

David Kleppinger: Have a great day.

Chair Seymour: We're having to switch the order of comments a little bit here.

Chair Seymour: The president has a meeting he needs to go to at 2:00. He'll come back at 3:00. Just letting everybody know that's when the president will come back and give his comments, as soon as he can after he returns at 3:00.
COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

Chair Seymour: So, I'm holding on item E. And item F, Comments by the Executive Vice President and Provost. It is now my pleasure to recognize Provost Jones for his comments.

Nicholas Jones Executive Vice President and Provost: Thank you, Beth. Can you hear me? I'm trying to get my camera on. I guess you have-- there you go.

Chair Seymour: Yes, Nick, I can hear you great. Thank you.

Provost Jones: And now you can see me bearing down on you there. Thanks, Beth. And thanks for the opportunity to address everybody. I got a lot of topics to go through. I will attempt to get through them quickly. And then I'm more than happy to stand for questions, of course, as we get to the end, and I anticipate there may be quite a few.

Usually, as Beth just indicated, I follow the president. I know the president has a number of important topics to discuss with you. I'm going to do my best to not overlap with anything that I know is on his agenda. So, bear with me. And if it's something that I think he intends to address, I will just level any questions that come on those topics to him.

OK, first, planning around COVID. First, it goes without saying the context in which we're operating now is the guidance continues to evolve almost on a daily basis. A few days ago, the J&J vaccine was reapproved for distribution. The CDC today introduced a revised face mask guidance primarily focused on people who have been vaccinated. We continue and will continue to ensure that all of Penn State's guidance and requirements are consistent with guidance that is coming from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as well as the Pennsylvania Department of Health. So just that as context.

Planning is-- well, first of all, we are now just a little over three days from the end of the spring semester 2021. A big shout out and thank you to all of you for all of your efforts to get us through this semester. It was tricky. We had a bit of a rough start. Ancient memory now, it feels like. But you recall back in January, things nationally were not looking so good. That's not that long ago.

I think we made some decisions as an institution that meant that we were bringing students back at a more appropriate time. We had a few periods through the spring semester where things were a little bit tricky in terms of the number of cases. But we were able to manage those. Our quarantine and isolation processes and infrastructure worked reasonably well. And we're thrilled that we have made it through to the end of the semester-- last day of classes this week, examinations next week, and then our commencements.

Big shout out to the entire commencement planning team for pulling together for us across all of our campus locations really, I think a nice set of events to celebrate the graduation of our students. Not the same as a regular commencement, but appropriate to the circumstances. So good progress in making it through what has been a reasonably challenging spring semester.

As we roll into the summer, I think everybody is aware that we are continuing to use the COVID codes for the summer, although our emphasis is really on leveraging all of our spaces and the weather to do as much face-to-face instruction. There'll be more at the face-to-face end of the instruction spectrum and the remote.
And summer will definitely be a transitional period for instruction. And then the plan for fall, as everybody knows, plan A for fall is that we will return to face-to-face instruction. Big assumption, speaking of guidance, is that the 6-foot physical distancing requirement will be relaxed by August. If it is not, we will have to rethink our strategy and move to plan B. We hope that that will not be the case, but that we will be ready in the fall to have a semester that looks a little bit more like the fall of 2019 semester versus the fall 2020 semester. Oh, I see somebody just said, what is plan B? Plan B is really something that is more like the fall 2020 semester where we would have-- go back to using the COVID cards, were that to be necessary.

There will be guidance coming out actually in Penn State Today tomorrow about our return to work thinking. And I would say it includes several phases. It addresses expectations and provides guidance for both faculty and staff. Clearly, the rest of the semester, what is left of it, will just continue steady as she goes in the mode that we are in.

Summer will be an opportunity to begin to bring folks back who are interested and able to return to the workplace. We still have 6-foot physical distancing in place. We will still have mask-wearing in place. But looking for opportunities to start bringing back people who are ready to return to the workplace. In fall, we'll be looking to bring back people in larger numbers. This is not going to be a switch that is thrown where we have everybody come back on the same day. Of course, we will be rolling out processes that bring people back on a graduated basis so not everybody is showing up at once.

Clearly, 6-foot physical distancing is an issue. Again, we are making the assumption that in the fall in the workplace as well as the classroom that the 6-foot distancing will be relaxed. If it is not, we will have to keep some of the current low-density expectations in place. So, look for the article tomorrow in Penn State Today and other announcements that'll be circulated starting tomorrow about this for our early thinking about these procedures.

I don't want to give everybody the impression that the fall is-- that's it for the future. We still consider the fall to be a transitional period as well as we bring people back and begin to adapt ourselves back to a more normal but different environment from what we have been experiencing over the last several semesters.

The president I know is going to talk about vaccination and our vaccination strategy. So, I'll just pause on that here, except to say-- put in a plug that you all have access through various outlets to vaccines certainly at University Park and across the Commonwealth. I think probably starting later this week, both the Moderna and the J&J vaccine will be available at the Bryce Jordan Center, at least that's the plan.

We're waiting for confirmation on J&J. So, I strongly encourage anyone who is able to get the vaccine to take advantage of that opportunity. But, again, in terms of strategy for vaccine, I'll defer to President Barron and his remarks when he rejoins us.

And then just final thing to mention on COVID planning is around testing and testing for the fall. We will be ending the random testing process at the end of this week. We don't really plan to go back to that. But we are going to really switch as we go into the summer and into the fall to be focused much more on just on-demand testing, walk-up testing, as well as, of course, symptomatic testing for anybody or students who are feeling ill, as opposed to having a random testing strategy in place again.
So, we've got-- the issue of testing capacity now is really-- I think it's probably safe to say it's a thing of the past. We have adequate supplies for both rapid testing and PCR testing for the foreseeable future and so are really just making testing available to anybody who needs it or wants it.

Let me jump to admissions because, of course, one of the impacts and concerns relative to COVID has been what has been the impact on our admissions process. So let me just hit some highlights. These are numbers as of today, this morning, just to give you a sense of where we are. And the news is basically good. I would say that we are not out of the woods yet. And there are some-- the connection between enrollments and finance is not a linear one.

So, while we're very happy about enrollments, there are still some financial impacts because of the nature of the enrollments. But all in all, we feel that we are on a very good vector. So just some highlights for you all. First year baccalaureate applications for summer and fall admission are up 15% with 108,000 applications received so far. That's a really big number and a great number.

Combined direct and referral application for our Commonwealth campuses are up 7-and-1/4%. And at University Park, applications are up a little over 17% for a total of almost 86,000 applications. The remaining applications in World Campus, which has seen almost a little over 30% increase in the number of first year baccalaureate applications, which is really just a terrific increase.

When we include applications for associate, graduate, and professional degrees, this year, Penn State has received 161,160 applications, which is about 16,000 more applications than we've received in either of the past two years. So that is really very, very significant. And I think it speaks volumes to the reputation that Penn State enjoys as a destination and, as we've said many times before, a port in the COVID storm. I'm not going to worry too much about-- dwell on offer numbers. But needless to say, we have a lot of offers out there to many students. I want to focus on paid accepts, which is these other students we anticipate coming. So as of this morning, we are a little over 7% down from where we were at this time a year ago. Just for context, on Sunday, two days ago, we were down 10-and-1/2%. So, we're on a very steep gradient and closing that gap very, very rapidly at this point.

For a while, we were behind 2020 and behind 2019. We're now ahead of where we were this time in 2019 by half a percent. It's only half a percent, but we will certainly take it. University Park has just shy of 8,100 students who've accepted their offer. And the Commonwealth campuses are up 12-and-1/2% versus last year and down about 6% from 2019 with almost 5,900 students accepted their offer of admission. And that gap is continuing to close, and several of our campuses will continue to accept students through the summer.

So, these numbers are really great news, and kudos to the admissions team or teams, I should say, obviously central admissions, but also the admissions staff at all of our campuses who've been working very, very hard in these difficult circumstances to ensure that we're able to generate applications and convert those applications to enrollments.

We got a lot of work ahead of us. We need to continue to engage our students through NSO so they are confident in their decision to enroll at Penn State and that we will meet our mission as a residential University. We also need to work with our continuing students to assist them with enrolling for the fall semester.
We've got a reasonably small percentage of students who are unable to come to campus for the fall. Those students are using and should use the Raise Your Hand feature in Starfish to alert their advisor about their circumstances. And those advisors will work with students to explore the best options for them to continue to make progress towards their degrees. So, we got a lot of work to do, I would say, in the background there with our students to make sure that they have the support they need to pull this all off. So generally good news there.

Just a quick sidebar on international. There's actually some good news today. I know that many of us have been anxious for some time about the news on the international front. So, we've gotten several bits of good news just this morning actually. So one is that we have a lot of Chinese students in particular who have an F-1 visa in hand but were stuck and unable to travel.

Our read of the latest update this morning is that these students will be able to return to the US with their current F-1 visa within 30 days of the beginning of the fall semester without having to reapply for visas. We need people obviously to check in with Roger Brindley's shop to make sure that all the Ts are crossed and Is dotted. But this is certainly terrific news.

And if that's not enough, more possible good news, we are hearing through the academic grapevine that US embassies and consulate-- the US embassy and consulates in China will be opening up as soon as early or mid-May for new F-1 visa appointments. Big backlog to process, we know. But any glimmer of hope in terms of opening of the embassy and consulates is significant. A lot of work to be done there by us and by others. But we've got our fingers crossed that that is a light at the end of the tunnel for many of our international students.

Budget, budget planning. This is the time of year that we are working very closely with the Board of Trustees to prepare for a final budget submission for approval in the July Board of Trustees meeting. I think we've shared some of these numbers with you before. But just a reminder president and I are making the case for a general salary increase program for Penn State and, in addition, an opportunity to have some extra dollars in the budget for strategic investments, which we think are critically important.

This is going to require a couple of things to make it happen, including a modest tuition increase. We had no tuition increase across the board last year, as you will recall. We are making the case for one this year to support those initiatives. And we are asking all units to plan for a 2% rescission. Last year, we know you had a 3% rescission. This year, we're asking you to plan for a 2% rescission. We haven't said that we're going to do it yet, but that we need to be prepared to do that, and all units need to have planned accordingly.

Searches. We have two active searches underway, one for the Dean of the Schreyer Honors College. In fact, we have candidates in for that search as we speak. And Kathy Bieschke just sent a preliminary list of possible committee members for the search for the dean of the graduate school and vice provost for graduate education to replace Jean Younken when she retires at the end of the year. So that search is in the early stages yet. We haven't really launched it. But we're putting together the committee and the charge to that committee.

Our strategic plan. We are pretty much done with the unit planning process at this point, and the strategic plans are in the process of going live across the University. So, this is almost like a commencement of sorts for the strategic plan where we now transition from planning to implementation. And there's just-- I
can just tell you there is so much excitement and so many exciting ideas out there. We're just thrilled to see us at this point now where we can roll up our sleeves and get some of these ideas in action.

And then I think the final thing I'll mention, just because there have been a lot of questions about it, and this is the issue of contracts for non-tenure-line faculty. I think, as most of you recall, last year, we inserted phraseology in the non-tenure-line offer or reappointment letters stating that the contract could be terminated with 12 weeks of notice.

Said many times that we did this with the intention of actually providing additional protections for our fixed term faculty. But we understand that the language did cause a lot of angst. So, after consultations with members of the Senate, with HR, and the Office of General Counsel, we did make the decision to remove that phrase for offer and reappointment letters issued this spring and moving forward.

Upon request, we will reissue contracts for faculty members who received a contract last year that contained the phrase referencing the 12 weeks of notice should folks want to have that language removed. Faculty members will receive an email from Kathy Bieschke’s office informing them of the opportunity to receive a new contract.

And to do so, we need a response from you by Friday, May 7. So, it's a relatively short time window. The contracts will be reissued by HR personnel and the academic units from mid to late May with the same contract dates as the original contract but just with that language removed. The only change is the removal-- will be the removal of the 12 weeks of notice clause. Faculty members will sign and return the contracts to their HR strategic partners. If we don't hear from folks by May 7, the current contract will stay in effect.

And I will just say that the University at this point does not have any plans to cause the 12 weeks of notice clause to be executed at all. So, I just wanted to take a moment to share with you where we were on that issue because I anticipated that there may have been some questions out there about it. So let me stop there. I know I covered a lot of material. And I'm happy to respond to any questions.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Provost Jones. I think we've already got some hands raised. So, let's go with our firsthand raised. A Q&A first or-- OK.

Victor Brunsden: They're all Q&A.

Chair Seymour: Oh, they're all Q&A. Sorry. So, let's go with Q&A. Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: Sure. The first question, Provost Jones, is from Galen Grimes at Greater Allegheny. At last count, there were over 60 colleges and universities in the US that'll be requiring all students to show proof of vaccination before returning to classes, including two in the Big Ten, Rutgers and Purdue. Is Penn State considering a vaccination required policy for all students? Also, is the plan to resume in-person teaching in the fall semester contingent on the US achieving the CDC level of herd immunity?

Provost Jones: To the second question, herd immunity is a great but elusive concept. And so, we're not actually using that as one of our decision criteria. So, no is the answer to the second one.
And on the vaccination policy part of the question, Galen, that's one of the ones that I'll defer to President Barron and his remarks. I know that is something that he is going to address. So perhaps I'll leave that-- defer on responding to that question until we've heard from the president.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Nick. Next question, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: The next question is from Joshua Kirby, Education. What is the cutoff date during the summer for when plan A or B or any plan change is decided for the fall?

Provost Jones: Yeah, so we don't really have-- that's a good question, Josh. We don't really have a cutoff date per se. Our plan is-- at this point, we are assuming that physical distancing of 6 feet is going to be relaxed and moving ahead with that plan. Last year, last summer, you recall June 15 was the critical date where we announced our plans for the fall semester.

And the plan this year is to-- we'll provide an update to the community on or about June 15 on this issue. Honestly, I anticipate that what we will be doing is saying that we are proceeding full steam ahead on the vector that we are on. But at that point, if there are possible changes to that direction that we need to share with the community, middle of June is probably the time that we would share that information.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Next question, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: This one's from Dierdre Folkers at York. Two questions, actually. First, could you please provide some sense of the timeline in terms of final decisions regarding a return to campus? You may have already addressed that. Course design for a face-to-face class is not necessarily the same as the course design for remote. Faculty need pivot time to accommodate a change in their teaching schedule. And then particularly given the undeniable fatigue, faculty fatigue, it's important to provide them with a meaningful time period in which to adjust their courses.

Provost Jones: Yes, I think I addressed some of that in my response to Josh's question, I think, that we're looking for-- just as we did last year, mid-June is a good time period for an update. Unless things take a turn for the worse or there is a new variant that goes a little crazy nationally, we're anticipating that we will stay the course with the current plan. But look to mid-June as a time where we would provide any updates on the institution direction. So that's a couple of months out from the start of the fall semester.

Bonj Szczygiel: And then there's a follow up-question. Given that the Penn State faculty and staff have shown their ability to keep the work of the University moving forward while working remotely, what are the plans for the University to provide staff members in particular with flexible work location options going forward?

Provost Jones: Lorraine Goffe and I are co-executive sponsors on a task force that is looking at remote work options for Penn State employees. It's going to take us-- it turns out that it's a more-- we knew it was a complex topic. It turns out it's even more complex than we thought it was. We had initially hoped that as early as next month we would be able to get some recommendations out from that task group. It's honestly going to take a little bit longer.

I think during the summer and fall period, this will be a transitional-- these will be transitional periods. So, it'll be different, slightly different, but transitional. And there will be opportunities on case-by-case
bases for people to take advantage of remote options. But we are certainly as an institution looking very seriously at how we could leverage work from home options for our staff.

Chair Seymour: Next question, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: Personally, I find that good to hear. We have a next question from Ira Saltz at Shenango. I think your comments on returning to campus in August contradict the message that many faculty are receiving from their unit head. Many faculties feel like they're severely disadvantaged if they prefer not to return in person to face-to-face teaching due to concerns over their health. They are also being told that there will be no more Zoom synchronous teaching, even though, in many cases, it serves a very strong pedagogical approach, especially for night classes or for students who work full time. These students appreciated Zoom classes.

Provost Jones: So, for this last academic year, as well as the tail end of the '19-'20 academic year, we were given a big pass by Middle States accreditation relative to our ability to offer pretty much whatever we wanted in remote mode in response to the pandemic. That pass that we were provided by Middle States is ending. And so, our flexibility to do whatever we wanted in this space is coming to a fairly rapid end. That is a constraint.

We do have a history of four particular courses in particular circumstances permitting remote instruction, synchronous or asynchronous. But it requires going through an approval process. But we look at that very carefully. There are many, many considerations that need to be thought through. And that process will continue.

But certainly, the message that is coming out centrally from the University is that we are returning primarily, and I mean vastly primarily, to face-to-face instruction for the fall with provisioning for exceptions for faculty members who have specific health concerns that preclude them from physically being in the classroom.

Chair Seymour: Hi, I see that we have a hand raised by Julio Palma. If we could bring him up. While we're trying to get Julio up, if we could go to the next Q&A, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: Sure. We've got a question from Paul Frisch at Scranton. How will budgets be impacted by having students complete a temporary change of campus to World Campus as a result of Raise Your Hand option? The fear is that smaller campuses having students do this could deeply impact their budgets and ability to retain employees.

Provost Jones: Yeah, Paul, that's a great question. Nice to hear from you. We are operating very much in a hold harmless mode relative to resource allocation at this point. Our focus always was and has been this past year and will continue to be on making sure that we are meeting the needs of our students in the most effective way possible, even given all of the challenges that we have that are associated with COVID.

So, we do not want to inadvertently be driving decisions or influencing outcomes at campus locations because they are fearful of the financial consequences. So, we're basically holding campuses harmless for changes in enrollment that are as a result of change of campus assignment decisions by students.

Bonj Szczygiel: Thank you. I think Julio's unmuted. You might be able to ask your question, Julio.
Julio Palma, Fayette: Yes, thank you. Well, it's following up I think some of the concerns that are already in the questions. I'm going to try to put a simple question there. So, I feel that there is still some arguments that are kind of like at least, if not contradicting, a little bit confusing. So, we want to be back in activities as if it were fall 2019.

But also, we hear that the virus is in the driving seat. We hear that we want to be back as if it were fall 2019. But there is a big assumption, and the assumption is that there's not going to be the social distancing. We are at the last week of classes of the spring semester. Some faculty are going to go into the summer. Staff is already planning the seating and assigning the classrooms.

So, my simple question is, why is plan A the best-case scenario where we are back to normal and plan B is not clear? Wouldn't it be better to have a plan A that is more flexible and not based on such assumptions? And if we are in a good situation, then we can accommodate easier. That is my question.

Provost Jones: Thanks, Julio. So, at every step of this process, starting from 15 months ago, what we've done is try to bring together the best ideas across Penn State and the best insights into how to plan for and navigate towards what has been a rapidly evolving and clearly still uncertain future.

I'm actually very proud of the work that so many people have done across the University, faculty and staff and students in many cases as well, in helping us think through and really make decisions, make operational decisions that we think are in the best interests of the University and support our students in the best way possible, but also mindful of the health, safety, and well-being of all faculty, staff, and students.

But by and large, that process has served us well. That same thinking and that same process went into developing plans for the fall semester. And it was the best collective judgment of all of those individuals, that the appropriate way forward and the default plan for the University should be that physical distancing will be relaxed by August of 2021, and we can return to face-to-face instruction.

Every Thursday, I meet with my counterparts, the provosts of the other Big Ten institutions. And, of course, many of us have connections with other provosts at other institutions around the country. I think the approach that we are taking, the planning and the thinking that went into that planning for the fall are quite consistent with what the vast majority of our peers are thinking. There's probably some exceptions out there. But I think our approach to this, home-grown nonetheless, is consistent with what most of our peers are thinking.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. For the record, too, Julio Palma is Fayette. Bonj, next Q&A.

Bonj Szczygiel: Yes, we've got a question from Allen Larson, New Kensington, about Raise Your Hand. As advisor, the message I received was that we were not providing much in the way of options. It basically goes back to the way it was pre-COVID where we could not easily accommodate requests except to, say, change location to World Campus, which doesn't work for students who are midway through a degree and need courses that World Campuses don't offer. Instead of resetting, shouldn't we be looking at fall as an opportunity to permanently offer more remote courses across campuses as per Penn State 2025 goals?
Provost Jones: I think we are offering more options than the limited ones that you suggest. I don't know if-- could I see if Yvonne or Renata are on here? We could maybe-- I would like to throw a lifeline to either of them to talk about the details.

Chair Seymour: Renata's a panelist now.

Provost Jones: OK. So perhaps Renata could speak to that. I do believe that our options are broader.

Renata Engel, Vice Provost for Online Education: Yeah, so I'm happy to share this. The way that we're approaching this is that it is true. The World Campus portfolio does not represent by any stretch of the imagination the portfolio for the entire University. Things that we are doing, though, is to identify-- there's a process that the associate deans and directors of Academic Affairs have, which they can-- and advisors, I think, can use this process as well-- fill out a form that will identify a course that a student needs. And then World Campus will work with that academic unit to see if there could be an opportunity for that course to be made available for one time at the World Campus. It really would be intended for those students who would normally be residential students but who cannot be here.

And with regard to the second part of your question, which is, shouldn't we be looking at the future, yes, of course. And it's such a great question. And Yvonne Gaudelius and I and Jean Younken and Madlyn Hanes are executive sponsors for a group that is going to be formed soon.

David Callejo Perez, Yvette Richardson, and Jim Nemes have agreed to co-chair a group that will look at how the University does, in fact, approach more of what we would consider these remote modalities for students that might be residential students otherwise and would like maybe some of these. So, yes, your question is combined, and it's a great question. And we are trying to address both aspects of that. Thank you for the question.

Chair Seymour: Bonj, next question.

Bonj Szczygiel: This is from Julie Fanburg-Smith, College of Medicine. Can you discuss the possibility of offering vaccination to everyone this spring as other schools are doing and/or mandate vaccine during summer to be completed two weeks before school starts?

Provost Jones: Yeah, well, again, on the issue of mandating versus not, let me defer to President Barron because he's going to address that broadly in his remarks. In terms of offering vaccines, I think certainly at University Park and certainly Hershey and a number of other locations around the Commonwealth where we have campuses, vaccine availability is really no longer an issue. And I do think that we're either at in some locations or rapidly approaching in others the situation where anybody who wants a vaccine is able to get it.

We, Penn State, from the beginning have been working, I would say, hand in glove with the Pennsylvania Department of Health, offering to facilitate vaccine distribution. And our use of the Bryce Jordan Center recently and also, on a limited basis, the Pegula Ice Arena in a collaboration with Walmart both represent cases where we have really made vaccine availability a priority and easy. And we will continue to do that. The issue, as I said, of vaccine mandate versus vaccine encouragement, I'll leave that to President Barron to address.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I think we have one more question, Bonj.
Bonj Szczygiel: One more question from Cindy Simmons, Communications. Will there be a mechanism for those with health concerns to request to teach remotely without having to explain medical conditions? Must such faculty who want to keep their condition private have a formal ADA accommodation letter?

Provost Jones: We have provided a mechanism for people who have COVID-related health concerns to make the case for not returning in the classroom. I don't have the details at my fingertips right now. But that process is in place. We may not be implementing it this far out because we have some weeks before the start of the semester. But certainly, we have the mechanism and the ability to grant exceptions to people because of personal health concerns.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I think we might have one more question, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: This is from someone named Star. I'm afraid we don't have a last name or a location.

Bonj Szczygiel: She's a student senator.

Bonj Szczygiel: A student senator that we know. Thank you, Star. Sorry about that. Can the University apply for an extension to Middle State Accreditation Board? Certainly, they see the issue.

Provost Jones: Yeah, I don't think Middle States actually works that way. I can talk to Lance Kennedy-Phillips about that. But I think Middle States are really quite firm about this decision. That's my understanding. And I would be doubtful that an exception would be granted certainly for the fall semester. But I am happy to check that with Lance Kennedy-Phillips to see what he thinks about it.

Bonj Szczygiel: And then we just have a quick follow up from Simmons clarifying the question was about privacy in requesting to teach remotely.

Provost Jones: I'm sorry, Bonj, I don't quite understand.

Bonj Szczygiel: Yeah, so let me go back to that question. So, a mechanism-- faculty who want to keep their condition private, do they need a formal ADA accommodation letter? And she followed up by clarifying that this was a request-- the question was about privacy and requesting to teach remotely. Is that going to be required?

Provost Jones: Well, we always will respect privacy issues, of course. I do not think that a concern about COVID vulnerability is considered an ADA issue. But we will have a process that parallels the ADA process that most people are familiar with that we can use in circumstances like this. But certainly, privacy is always a important criterion for our processes.

Chair Seymour: So, I think Kathy Bieschke’s raising her hand. We're trying to get her as a panelist.

Provost Jones: Yes, Kathy would be more informed than me on this issue.

Kathleen Bieschke, Vice Provost Faculty Affairs: --process that will go through the HRSPs but not the unit HRSP. It'll go directly to a central committee. So, for someone.

Chair Seymour: Kathy, we can't hear you well.
Kathleen Bieschke: OK. Let me try this.

Chair Seymour: That's much better.

Kathleen Bieschke: So, what I'm saying is that we will have people submit to their HRSPs. And then they will be reviewed by a central committee and not by unit leaders. And if you want complete confidentiality, you should go through AAO.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I think we have one more question.

Bonj Szczygiel: And, Kathy, this may be for you. This is from Charlene Gross in Arts and Architecture. Following up on Ira's question about face-to-face classes versus Zoom, where does hybrid classes fall? Is a hybrid class considered face to face if any part of it meets in person? Anyone can answer that question.

Renata Engel: I'll be happy to take that one. A hybrid class is a combination of in person as well as an online component. And the University has had these designations for hybrid courses for quite some time. They use them currently for monitoring purposes for the Department of Education in Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania Department of Education.

But the designations H are for hybrid courses. They are H2, H5, and H7. And the 2, 5, and 7 have, in particular, meaning with regard to the percentage of course-- percentage of the course which is remote. You can see what those-- the pieces of information of those are on the registrar's website, and that information is available a number of places. But H2, H5, and H7 indeed are hybrid courses with a component which is in person.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Renata.

Renata Engel: You're welcome.

Chair Seymour: Any other questions? I think that's everything. Thank you, Provost Jones, and thank you, everybody else, for helping to answer the questions.

Provost Jones: Welcome.

Chair Seymour: I have one quick announcement to make. Due to the tardiness of Berks' election, we were not able to record one of the senators who is also leaving us. So, I'd like to recognize the service of Robert Albert Zambanini, Jr., associate teaching professor in computer science, Penn State Berks, for his distinguished service on the Senate.

Bob's first term was in 2004, 2005, and he has served with only a few gaps until now. During his time on the Senate, he served on Student Life, Curricular Affairs, and spent quite a time on Curricular Affairs, University Planning, and Intra-University Relations. Thank you, Bob, for your distinguished service to the Senate.
COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Seymour: Well, our little shift worked. Thank you, President Barron. I understand you're back. So, let's go to item E, comments by the president of the University. It's my pleasure to recognize President Barron for his comments. Just be patient. We're trying to get him up as a panelist. Hi, President Barron. Are you there?

Eric Barron, President, Penn State University: I am. Can you hear me?

Chair Seymour: I can. It's nice to hear you.

President Barron: Oh, it's good to be back. And thank you for switching that so that I could have about 40 minutes with the governor. It's important to do my best to follow his schedule if I possibly can. So, I appreciate that.

So, a couple of things. First of all, I want to echo a lot of what you said, Beth, at the beginning of the meeting about diversity, equity, and inclusion. There's much in More Rivers to Cross and certainly the commission report that I feel very strongly about. Many of it-- many of the recommendations are in progress. Certainly, we are looking very hard at the organizational structure of what we do in this space. Last week, or it might have been 10 days ago, I received the first draft on a social justice, anti-racism institute that will be discussed with the President's Council as we move forward in that space. There is certainly a great deal in your own report about committees taking on these efforts as well as your being a co-chair in the commission report that make a considerable amount of difference.

Our police force, beyond body cameras, has come very far, very fast in terms of transparency and in terms of adopting their own policies that are there. I'm very proud of how the student code of conduct changed this process. So a lot there that can be found in the two reports that are in progress.

I have said before and I agree with it wholeheartedly that the greatest weakness that we have is in the hiring of Black faculty. In 10 years, it has not changed. We've had changes in the upper administration. We've had changes in the last couple of years in terms of the application, admission, and accepts. But we have not seen change in the faculty. And I have been asked for my commitment for further reports. I am working extremely hard to make sure that that is followed by action.

But I need your commitment as well. I need the commitment of the faculty. I do not hire faculty. I think it would be a mistake for me to reach into the English department and hire faculty or to reach into the chemistry program and hire faculty. That is a University faculty responsibility.

There is a long-standing commitment on behalf of the administration to offer financial resources, to hire faculty from underrepresented minorities. And I need the commitment of the faculty, not just the Faculty Senate, but the faculty to deliver out of search committees new faculty members that are from underrepresented groups. And I guarantee you that we will reach that commitment of what is the first key recommendation from the More Rivers to Cross report. It's something that I am very keen to accomplish.

But I can't do it without a commitment from the faculty that's equally strong as the commitment from the administration. I also think-- I'm certainly not asking for myself-- but there are an awful lot of people that are working very hard on this issue. There are a lot of senators that are working hard, just the list of
committees that Beth was talking about. There are a lot of people in the administration and in leadership that are working hard on it.

And we need to thank them for their commitment and for what they've accomplished as long as we don't use that level of appreciation as a statement that would stop us from keeping our foot firmly on the pedal to do more in this space. We have a long way to go, as you said, Beth. So, I wanted to make sure that I addressed that explicitly from my viewpoint. You have my commitment to get as far along the lines of these two reports as I possibly can.

I wanted to talk a little bit about the vaccine effort. I know that many, many people are asking about it. So, we have a cascade of actions. I don't know whether Nick mentioned this. But the first part of this is make it easy for our employees and for our students to get vaccinated.

We volunteered early to be a point of distribution for the state. That happened in the Bryce Jordan Center. We worked carefully and fully with Walgreens-- with Walmart so that we could be a site with them focused on the Penn State community. Again, that's an extremely important step. Other local providers. We got in line to buy freezers early just in case we might be a point of delivery. So, step one is make it easy for everybody to get that vaccine.

The next thing you will start to see us talk about is incentivizing employees and students to get vaccinated. We have a large number of incentives that have to do with housing and food service for students and other resources. We will certainly do the same thing for employees. I'm happy to have my parking spot be a part of that raffle to be-- whatever we can think of to be-- to incentivize vaccinations.

When we move more into the summer, we'll be watching carefully to see which of our students upload their vaccinations into their health portals. And we will contemplate whether or not there should be what I would call greater incentives that would basically really encourage involuntary activities like entering a stadium to be able to get vaccinated. And come the middle of June, we'll have an update on that. And in July, we should know whether or not that we need to take any other additional action here.

But our whole goal is make it easy and incentivize it because it makes a tremendous difference. We see that in our hospitals in Pennsylvania that the age group that's being admitted is getting younger and is a population that's not vaccinated. And the population that was in the hospital, especially as they got vaccines, disappeared from being in hospital. So, we know this works, and we know this is incredibly important. So, I encourage, I encourage, and we will incentivize everything we can to move forward.

And the third thing that I would put on my list is really focused on the fact that we're in a critical moment as we look at our budgets. The University took about a $400 million hit in the process with a considerable amount of money-- exceeded $50 million in direct COVID-related expenses like testing. Obviously, everybody's safety, health and safety is extremely important. So, we do not begrudge that payment, that cost at all.

We worked hard to be ready for it, and we took upon the key issue of keeping everybody in this University that we could employed. And I think that despite the stresses, despite how easy it would have been to dismiss people, overwhelmingly, we managed to keep everybody employed. And I believe the future outlook here is rosy in some ways, with rosy being defined by coming out of a pandemic year, as opposed to a boom year. The state requests from the governor is for a flat budget.
But we know there's significant stimulus dollars there. We feel that there is perhaps some opportunity for Penn State to have good ideas perhaps for one time money. We will see how that emerges. We will certainly be arguing about it. Our enrollment numbers, after a slow start at UP but a strong start at the campuses, are reaching the point where we're more and more comfortable that essentially, we're back.

And this is incredibly significant because this really does govern the revenues of the University. We will have considerable discussion with the board on tuition rates. We now rank seventh among flagships in controlling tuition. And we've worked hard at that. But it is very important that this University continue to be able to invest in innovation and, more important than that, to take good care of our employees. So, from our viewpoint and my expressions to the Board of Trustees is that a faculty raise, not just maintaining employment, but a faculty raises is the very highest priority that we have for the coming year.

And so those three areas in terms of state support, tuition, and enrollment in my mind suggest either stability or some level of opportunity. And, of course, it becomes awfully important that we yield those students that we've accepted and that we maintain the students that are now in paid accept status so that they don't melt. And a huge part of that is their expectation that they will come here and have a Penn State experience. So, I may have already taken up too much time, Beth. I'm happy to answer questions in any of those categories if you want or for any other issue if I can.

Chair Seymour: Thank you so much, President Barron. I think we've got a couple of questions in Q&A. Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: Yeah, thank you. President Barron, we've got two questions that were asked earlier, and I'd like to paraphrase them both so they both get your attention. One is from Galen Grimes at Greater Allegheny and the other from Julie Fanburg-Smith, College of Medicine. And they're both talking--referring about similar issues.

So, beginning, Grimes is asking or stating that there are over 60 colleges and universities that will be requiring all students to show proof of vaccination before returning to classes in the fall, including two Big Ten, Rutgers, Purdue. And so, is Penn State ever going to consider this mandatory requirement? And then from--Fanburg-Smith is posing the question about mandating vaccine possibly during excuse me--during the summer to be completed two weeks before school starts.

President Barron: So, for the Big Ten, Maryland, Rutgers, and Michigan have made those statements. I hadn't heard that Purdue had made it a requirement. And I am hoping that by making it easy and incentivizing and having the significance of the incentives grow through time that this will create an environment, especially as more and more data is available, that it will create an overwhelming population that realizes the significance of that. The reason why I picked July, or we picked July is to make sure that we have 28 days prior to the start of the semester if we have to think of more significant requirements here.

This is something that the board wishes to have a say in. And so, I have briefed them on this cascading level. And so, I would say we're not ready to make any announcement today other than the fact that it's easy. You should do it. And we're incentivizing it. And you will hear more and more about the incentives over the next couple of weeks and. And then we will see how it goes from that point and decide whether we need to do more.
Chair Seymour: Thank you. I think we have another question, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: This one from Kim Blockett from Brandywine. President Barron, I appreciate your commitment to the hiring of Black faculty. What are the current incentives beyond statements and mechanisms of accountability for academic units to both hire and retain Black faculty? As much as I agree that my colleagues bear a lot of the responsibility for diversity and equity in hiring, I very much agree with Dr. Allen's reminder to you and other University leaders that culture change begins from the top.

President Barron: So, I am doing my best on the culture issues. It's demonstrable that those areas for which we have control that the diversity in this University has changed significantly. All you have to do is look at the membership of the President's Council and the membership of the deans as an example, and you see significant change. Many of the things we've implemented for students have also created significant change.

The place that has not changed is the faculty. And the hiring in individual disciplines is the area that I have the least control over because it is so important in terms of shared governance and that expert faculty hire expert faculty into their ranks. And so, the dollars are there if the faculty committees put forward candidates. For the upper administration, it is not a statement. It is a fact that we're there to help financially.

So, there is no roadblock in this particular process. And the top of University has been quite clear. Faculty committees have to commit themselves to changing the diversity of this University in terms of faculty rank. They're the ones that are in charge of this hiring process. We're in charge of the support financially for this process. But we are not sitting there in the room when we decide on who to hire. So you have my commitment as long-- and it's not just words. You have my commitment as long as the faculty are committed to take this issue seriously.

Because as much as we want to tell the administration to do something, this is one category where we absolutely have to have your help, or it's not going to happen. It is no mistake that the one area that lags behind all others is basically the hiring of fellow faculty members. And so that's not to say staff is not an issue. But staff is many times much more dependent on the local population at any rate. So, you have that commitment from me, but I need yours right back.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I think Greg Shearer has his hand raised. He should be a panelist now. Greg, are you there?

Gregory Shearer, Human, Health and Development: Hey, thank you. Greg Shearer, HHD. Hey, I want to just comment on what you just said. And I want to tell you thanks for your words of support, and you have my commitment. I've said before that one of the confusing things is exactly what our role is when we're sitting on those recruitment committees. So, I just wanted to, A, remind you guys that more clarity on that would be helpful.

But I actually wanted to comment on something the officers of the Faculty Senate said a little earlier. They made a statement that I thought-- I took it as being somewhat dismissive of the value of religious activities when supporting our community members who face hate and oppression. They essentially equated prayers to empty promises. And I think such an attitude is incredibly offensive and attempts to invalidate religious activities and exclude the religious from participation in solutions.
And, frankly, history suggests that the religious are the most consistent in bringing solutions to societal equity. And we see prayer as a major source of our effectiveness. Well, I affirm the statement expressed by the officers is the height of irony to engage in academic anti-religious bigotry in order to fight community racial bigotry. And I'm hoping to hear your take on the value of religious activities in bringing solutions to our crisis.

**President Barron:** If you're asking me about that particular role, this is going to take us all. And I don't minimize anyone's contribution in this space. And I would like to celebrate it, actually. But I had someone say, it's hard to celebrate when there's still so many issues and problems.

And I agree with them, that if we move forward and say, look, that was great, we accomplished that, that people will take their foot off the gas. We just have to commit ourselves to thanking those who are supportive and who are working hard to take steps from whichever direction that occurs as long as we don't forget how far we have to go.

**Gregory Shearer:** Thank you.

**Chair Seymour:** And thank you, Greg. That was not the intent of that statement. So I do apologize if it was read that way. It was definitely not the intent.

**Gregory Shearer:** I get it. And I want to just affirm that I know you guys did that last minute. So I get that that wasn't your intent, but it's the way I take it.

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

**Bonj Szczygiel:** This is Allen Larson, New Kensington. Do you see a commitment to anti-racism and diversity pedagogy as related to the need for more hiring and commitment to arts and humanities across the University and especially at the campuses?

**President Barron:** Absolutely. So first of all, I think a scholarly focus on anti-racism and anti-bias across Penn State is not just really important. It should be a part of our mission. And I know that there is this continuum from having some level of bias to unfortunately a level of structural racism and then outright hatred is all I can say. And understanding this way-- understanding this in a profound way is extraordinarily important.

I remember taking a course related to a book, Why So Slow-- The Advancement of Women in STEM, in which the social science experimentation that was done by examining this in a scholarly manner was so eye-opening for me and for a whole group of other academic leaders who said, look, there's no bias in what I do. And, in fact, it's nonsense.

And one of the things was go back and look at every letter you've written of recommendation for a student and take the key words out of letters for female students and male students. And you're going to see a difference. And it's changed the way I write letters. Well, in terms of race, in many ways, this is truly, truly a level of bias that many, many people don't think that they have.

But, in fact, if you were to carefully examine and understand this as a scholarly issue, it might be eye-opening for people even who think that they are unbiased and then to take it all the way to an understanding of the structural conditions, all the way to a focus on, unfortunately, which is outright
racism. In my mind, this is what we should be doing. It brings in a different level of-- a different opportunity for scholars. It brings in a tremendous amount of opportunity for our students.

And I think that whether it's humanities and social sciences, which are extraordinarily important in this particular topic, this is the opportunity for this University to take a problem that is severe and have an impact that goes way beyond the walls of this institution. So, in my mind, this recommendation for More Rivers to Cross and from the commission is one of the most important that we need to accomplish because it has so many different benefits, not the least of which is to bring in a new set of scholars in this space.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you. Bonj, next question.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** This is from Steinn Sigurdsson, Science. Would it be useful and permissible to offer a modest tuition discount to students who COVID vaccinate? It would likely be a net cost benefit to the University.

**President Barron:** Yeah, I think nothing's off the table. I think you'll start to see an interesting list of things that save significant resources for students. And housing and food services as another example that's very similar is offering some significant incentives. And I got a lot of people that are sitting there working on what are good incentives both for employees and for students. So hopefully, just like the questioner has suggested, we'll see things that would have a significant financial impact on a student who might win that particular part of the lottery.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you. I think Julio has raised his hand. I think we've got him as a panelist. Julio, are you there?

**Julio Palma, Fayette:** Yes. Julio Palma, Fayette. In the betterment of campus and the University environment on issues with diversity and inclusion, to fight in general racism, we need to be all committed, and we need to hold each other accountable. That, I agree, includes we faculty keeping each other accountable, the administration keeping the faculty accountable, and also faculty keeping the administration accountable.

So, it's more complex than just hiring committees, because the faculty can be very committed for diversity, but the policies are implemented at the top. The policies are implemented and written at the top. So we can actually write antiracist policies, hiring committees, and support for faculty. And I'm just going to share a couple of anecdotes.

I am in my fourth year-- fifth year in Penn State. I am in the tenure-line. For example, support for underrepresented communities. For a few years, I was the only Hispanic in my campus. And I have served in six search committees, in six search committees, five of them in search committees of faculty. So, talking about support for faculty, that is very time consuming. My fellow faculties didn't ask me to serve in those committees. That was the administration. So, the practices of the policies are also the ones that reduce the chances of success or reduce the chances of-- and reduce the chances of hiring committee. So, I have been in those five search committees with faculty.

And sometimes we have had only two months to find someone. That reduces immensely the chances of hiring a diverse faculty, a faculty from a different group. That reduces-- and then blaming the faculty that we are not looking into a diverse new member. I feel, again, the responsibility comes also from the top.
And we need to keep everybody accountable for this. So these are the practices that actually-- the policies, we can change those policies. We can give faculty time to search for new faculty.

So, I know this is a space for questions. So, I do have a question. Keeping each other accountable, we had this report, part 1 and part 2. They specifically talk about support, retention of Black faculty at Penn State. The second report was released in March 25. And there was a University response. And in the first sentence of the University's response says that the administration shares the spirit but not the pessimism.

Words are important. Statements are important. And I think calling our Black faculty, our colleagues, our friends, our family pessimist is not helping diversity, is not helping to diversify and feel supported by the administration. When the University calls pessimist the authors of this report, actually that facilitates systemic injustices.

So, my question is-- you have already, and I appreciate that you have reinforced your commitment to fight racist acts. So, my question is, I will really ask you as a favor to reconsider this statement by the University because these words were hurtful.

Calling pessimist our fellow faculty was hurtful to me and to many others. They were dismissive words. So, I will ask you if you could please join me in the fight against racism and institutional and systemic injustices, and if you could possibly retract that response and release a new response supporting the recommendations that came from the More Rivers to Cross, part 2 report. Thank you.

**President Barron:** Well, so first of all, there is very little I disagree with in what you just said. It should be everybody's job, not just your job to sit on so many search committees. And a good portion of the reports has been also to look at policies and to scrub them and to understand where in those policies there is the signs of bias or structural racism that we can adopt and change.

And in the committees that are looking at some of these trainings, for example, they're proposing such things as how to write a syllabus so that it doesn't have those signals or issues. So, I agree with you. That's incredibly important.

Now, perhaps the word pessimism should not be-- should not have been said in the reaction. But I would like you and everyone else to also understand the number of people in this University who feel like they have been pushing hard to create change, whether it's change in the composition of deans, the composition of the president's cabinet, whether it has been the changes in student applications and some of the things that have occurred to change that.

And so, this use of the word pessimism, although perhaps ill-advised, was largely because there was nothing that suggested to all of the people that are working so hard and making progress that they've accomplished anything and that they have begun to create a level of change. And so, it felt that way.

And to say that what the University has done is platitudes when clearly there are some demonstrable things that have happened actually were very hurtful for a lot of people that are more than advocates in this space. They're spending a considerable part of their time and energy to create change. And so we perhaps both made a mistake in terms of our choice of words here.

Because I think that on both sides of this equation-- and, really, even to just say both sides, which unfortunately it feels that way if you're an administrator, that you are the person that is the problem that is
stopping things from happening when we know that this is a shared governance circumstance. And we work together on policies, and we work together in this space.

So, I will tell you that I deeply appreciate the fact that you are being very direct in terms of a failure in this administration to communicate effectively. But there are a lot of people that also felt that, how could all the things that I'm doing not be recognized? And instead, just to have it be described as a failure or a platitude.

So, we need to do better here in this particular space. And I'm sorry pessimism was interpreted as something personal as opposed to, why can't we comment on the successes and then at the same time say, but it's not good enough, and we have to do more, and here are the places that we need to do more and to do it together? But the fact that you would be so direct, I much appreciate.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Bonj, another question.

Bonj Szczygiel: Beth, should we stick with this topic, or should we just take them as the questions have arrived? What's your preference?

Chair Seymour: Take them as they arrive.

Bonj Szczygiel: We have a question from Cindy Simmons. What fears are beneath reluctance to require vaccination? Is it liability, offending anti-vaxxers, those whose politics make them opposed to vaccination?

President Barron: Well, it's a good question, and there's probably a lot of-- there's probably a lot of factors in there. There are a number of people that have other health conditions or pregnancy that they feel like the level of analysis and testing are insufficient for them to believe that they're not at risk. There are certainly people that have other reasons.

I would say that I know of no other health condition for which there is such significant polarity on what people believe is the right way to address it. So that polarity is definitely a challenge. So, I am taking the tact-- we are taking the tact, let's make it easy, and let's incentivize it, and let's see if we can reach a level of herd immunity that changes what the landscape is. And we'll have to see how it goes. And we have time to watch the evolution of this, and then we will decide what actions we might have to take.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Next question, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: Sure. This is from Nathan Tallman, Libraries. If people know incentives will increase over time, isn't that motivation to hold off on getting vaccinated to get the best incentive?

President Barron: Well, the incentives become more limiting people's ability to do things. So, I don't know why people would forego the incentive that was a positive and exchange it for an incentive that actually limited what they were allowed to do and what events that they could participate in. So hopefully people will see these incentives in two different categories.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I think we have a hand raised. Ira?
Ira Saltz, Shenango: Yes. Saltz, Shenango. I know you have said a lot of times that now it's up to the faculty. And I agree. But I have some caveats. One, I've been on many search committees. And in one search committee, we had a Black candidate that we liked very much. But the committee did not rank that person number one.

So, I mentioned to the committee and in an email in which I included the administrators, we value diversity. We should bump this person to number one. No one agreed. But this is typical. Search committees have always said, we want to hire the best candidate. And their argument is, we never know when we're going to get another opening, get another chance to hire a faculty member. So, I think that's one issue.

But another issue that we also face is the lack of good candidates in some of these small rural areas where the hate crimes are going to be prevalent. And so, I think there needs to be some other ways in which we can promote the hiring of more Black faculty in which departments feel like, one, that there will be opportunities to hire more faculty. And two, what do we do in our communities where there aren't many minorities and it's not going to be a particularly welcoming place?

President Barron: Well, I think you need to start somewhere. And there has to be the beginning where there is a decision that in the balance of things, this is the person that needs to be hired. Their contribution goes, in my opinion, far beyond what is the printed characteristics of the individual in terms of how they support our academic community. And we simply have to make a choice that this is the right person to hire. And with time, regardless of the community, I think you begin to change the community. But if you don't begin, I don't see how you can possibly change the community.

Ira Saltz: I think the administration needs to—

Chair Seymour: Ira, Ira, Ira we have a lot of questions. Let's—

Ira Saltz: OK.

Chair Seymour: I'm sorry.

Ira Saltz: All right.

Chair Seymour: Thank you.

Bonj Szczygiel: Next question is from Mark Stephens, Medicine. Data from one young population suggests that 40% of US Marines presently declined vaccinations given the emergency use authorization. Would Penn State strongly consider mandating vaccination as an issue of force readiness once EUA expires?

President Barron: OK, so I do think that if that expires, that it helps improve the potential both voluntarily and another factor in terms of our decisions on how to move forward. I do believe that given the vast number of doses and what the outcomes are, the clear outcomes, that it protects the people who are vaccinated, that the emergency use authorization, in my mind, shouldn't be a roadblock. But certainly, if it's gone, if it's not there, if it expires, it does make the path easier for a lot of people.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Next question, Bonj.
**Bonj Szczygiel:** Well, I'll summarize this one. This is from Doug Bird, Liberal Arts. Greatly appreciate the ease and incentivizing for vaccinations. Why is it better to only incentivize and not include some requirements?

**President Barron:** Yeah, well, so there may be some requirements. But I was trying to give ease of getting it and incentives a chance first.

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

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Kim Blockett from Brandywine-- excuse me-- asking a question about a phrase that was used, mechanisms of accountability. What happens to units that do not increase their diversity of faculty and staff?

**President Barron:** Well, so both reports have an effort and discussion about increasing accountability. And the notion of a chief diversity officer reporting to the president is enabling the opportunity from the top to force a higher level of accountability. We know that there will be some resistance to this. I have many department heads who tell me that they have resistance sometimes from search committees in terms of their choices.

But I do think that by actually having accountability, not just report and metrics, but a level of accountability and pressure to be applied at different units who are not meeting the objectives that they have set is certainly a step in the right direction. So that is also something that I've publicly committed to as a part of the portfolio of a chief diversity officer.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you. We're trying to be mindful of time. So Bonj is going to-- she's trying to find pieces that are new questions.

**President Barron:** OK. Happy to respond in any way I can.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** We'll try this. Tai-Yin Huang from Lehigh and Charlene Gross from Arts and Architecture are basically asking questions about will the upper administration-- how can they demonstrate hiring support faculty at the unit level? And how does that happen when monetary support is needed? Supplementing salaries or what?

**President Barron:** So certainly, there is the potential to financially supplement hires. And in my mind, this should be a significant incentive for any particular unit. And I think we add a level of accountability there. And I think the one individual who has said that there may be commitment in an upper administration, but it needs to pass down through the ranks, that is certainly something that we can work on both from policy and the level of accountability. But we need to all be on board in this effort. And we have to make choices that support the objectives of the commission and More Rivers to Cross.

**Chair Seymour:** Bonj.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Jennifer Nesbitt from York is asking; what resources are available specifically to help faculty search committees to train committee members to identify diversity?
President Barron: Yeah, I don't know whether Kathy Bieschke wants to specifically comment on that. But there are significant resources and training that is available. If there needs to be more, I will push for it.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: We're sort of repeating some of the issues in questions. So, I'm going to be-- just skip down to Felecia Davis from Arts and Architecture. This is not a question but a comment. Perhaps an improvement in increasing Black faculty can be made by hiring cohorts of underrepresented faculty cohorts, not one at a time, and putting resources in departments to do this in tenure-line positions.

President Barron: Yeah, I think this is one tool in the toolbox. When I was a dean of the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, I created something called AESEDA that was focused on education and research in Africa and resulted in a significant opportunity for hiring and sent a signal that Earth and Mineral Sciences was a welcoming and inclusive college. And it made a difference.

And we know that areas of scholarship and hiring in cohorts can make a difference here. I'm hoping that a social justice institute, antiracist institute also is an attractor for scholars. And so, I think this is one of the important tools we have in our toolbox to make a difference in this space.

Chair Seymour: Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: This is a question from David Smith. President Barron, thank you for your ongoing efforts to support and move Penn State forward on so many different levels. You indicated that the work of yielding the incoming class is critical work for the coming summer months. Faculty, but also staff, play-- faculty and staff play a large role in the efforts to successfully yield and retain students till graduation. Are there any discussions underway to more visibly acknowledge the considerable and significant efforts that staff consistently have contributed through this year of pandemics? Again, thank you for your leadership.

President Barron: Yeah, so this is very important. And although we say thank you a great deal for the tremendous effort that people are putting forth despite circumstances, it's probably not good enough. It's one of the reasons why raises are so incredibly important to me at this particular stage.

But we see over and over again that it's when this big University gets personal that we have a huge impact in terms of getting people to the finish line and having people come in the door. So, whatever I can do to say thank you, I will happily do-- I will happily do that. But I got to find as my first priority the thank you to say that despite the fact that we've gone through quite a budget squeeze, I need to make sure that your salary changes to reflect that, all that effort.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I think we may have about one more question.

Bonj Szczygiel: Yeah, this one is from Amy Linch from Liberal Arts. While I appreciate the efforts of the University and understand that people want to be recognized for their work and feel a sense of accomplishment, the response to Julio and others who share his view is ultimately unsatisfying.

Antiracist communication tells us that when we use words that offend, we should apologize to the offense because we are not the final arbiters of the meaning of the words we use. To express regret that the other
interpreted our words in a way that caused them injury is not the same as to apologize for the injury. It blames the interpreters for the harm they experience.

**President Barron:** OK, well, then I apologize, OK? Because in no way, shape, or form am I suggesting that it's someone else's fault because they didn't understand what the intent was. I wanted to express what the intent was. I wanted to have people understand what the intent was. But I don't want to blame anybody for it. And so, I apologize.

So many times-- and, of course, the individual that just made that statement knows it. There are so many times in which what I would call failures in my ability to be a decent administrator, despite the fact that I work hard to be very straightforward and honest and not play games. I would say 95% of the things that I wish I could change had something to do with levels of communication. And so, I was trying to describe sensitivity. But I happily apologize in the way that that word was taken because that's not my intent.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, President Barron. Thank you for that. One more question, Bonj.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Sure, yeah. There's a question from Huang in Lehigh Valley. I've served on an American Geophysical Union Award Committee. Every member on the committee has to go through implicit bias training before they can evaluate the nomination packages. I think Penn State should require all search committees and decision makers to do this similar training to minimize implicit bias.

**President Barron:** So, I believe that Kathy put into the chat the training requirements that are associated with our committees. But whether or not-- yeah. I know what she put in there in the chat. If it's not good enough, we should look at it.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, President Barron. And thank you for standing for this many questions. I think you hear from the faculty a lot of desire to really engage in this work. So, I think you have a very willing partner here. So, let's see how we can move forward and make meaningful change in the space.

**President Barron:** Thanks.

---

**FORENSIC BUSINESS**

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you. All right, let's move on with the agenda. Item G, Forensic Business none.

---

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**Chair Seymour:** Item H, Unfinished Business, None.
LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Seymour: Item I, Legislative Reports. Now we're coming to the part of our meeting where speakers will be voting on reports. It's time to go to TallySpace. Erin will put up the link on the screen, and we will also post the link in the chat so that you can all sort of warm up your TallySpace.

I'll give us a second to do this. Just a reminder to everyone, we will hold the votes and report them out at the end of the agenda. But I'm going to give everyone a time to sign in. Anna, are you there?

Anna Butler, Senate Office Staff: Yes, I am.

Chair Seymour: Is there any way you can see how people are signing in? It's really just a question. I don't know what you—

Anna Butler: No, I can't see how people are signing in. That's not—

Chair Seymour: All right, we'll give them a couple of seconds, and then we'll move on to our first report.

Chair Seymour: Go home.

Bonj Szczygiel: Go home.

Chair Seymour: To the home. So anyway—

Chair Seymour: So, I think people might need to keep refreshing if you're having trouble. I think Sarah's going to be posting a lot of things in chat to give you helpful hints. So, let's move on.

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules' revisions to Senate bylaws, Article II, Senate Council Section 1(e) and Article IV, Committees, Section 6(a)

Chair Seymour: The Senate Committee on Committees and Rules' revisions to Senate bylaws, Article II, Senate Council Section 1(e) and Article IV, Committees, Section 6(a) can be found in Appendix B. This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Because this is a change to the bylaws, we present this report at this meeting, and we'll vote at it on the next regular plenary meeting. Chair Brunsden will present the report. Chair Brunsden.

Victor Brunsden, Altoona: Thank you, Chair Seymour. So, the reason for this piece of legislation is that for many years, faculty governance units have had to submit any changes to their governance documents, such as their constitutions or their bylaws, to a subcommittee of Senate Council.

Typically, this subcommittee is able to guide the units and make sure that their updates are appropriate for a faculty governance organization.

And every so often, there is a question about interpretation of our governance language that needs to be made. That means that the committee then has to report out and ask a question of the Committee on Committees and Rules. Typically, this is brought to Committees and Rules by the secretary.
So, this subcommittee, although it is a subcommittee of Senate Council, really doesn't interact with Senate Council. And it would make organizationally a great deal more sense to relocate it as a subcommittee of the Committee on Committees and Rules. So that is what this legislation accomplishes. It modifies our bylaws so that this subcommittee is moved.

The procedures are a little different because Senate Council gets the final say. Once the subcommittee reports out to Committee on Committees and Rules, the Committee on Committees and Rules will vote and then move it to Senate Council for their final say. So, in essence, Senate Council still has the final say, but all the deliberations will typically-- and where all the technical questioning back and forth will happen as a subcommittee of Committee on Committees and Rules.

Because this is a change to the bylaws, as Chair Seymour mentioned, we will not be voting on this at this time. This will happen in the fall. And somebody else will be standing here to present the vote. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Senators, if you have any questions, please put them in Q&A. We'll wait a second. You can ask questions at this point. You don't have to wait till we vote. Seeing none, thank you, Victor.

Removal of Gendered and Binary Terms from Course and Program Descriptions

Chair Seymour: Next up is the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs, removal of gendered and binary terms from course and program descriptions. Whoops, we've got some feedback. Appendix-- Sorry, people, we got fix the feedback. Is it still there? No, I think we're good. Sorry. Let's start over.

Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs, removal of gendered and binary terms from course and program descriptions, Appendix C. This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second.

Committee member William Kenyon will present the report. William.

William Kenyon, Arts and Architect: Yes, hello. Thank you, Chair Seymour. The Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs is proposing this legislation to remove terms from our course and degree descriptions that are typically male-centric or binary in nature or refer to European classist distinctions. This is hopefully the first step in many to ensure that our words throughout the University are inclusive and welcoming.

And the proposal is an administrative proposal. We are not asking that everybody submit new course proposals across the University. What we are asking is for permission to essentially administratively replace these gendered terms as of listed in the proposal with gender neutral terms. There are some examples, if that can be put up on the screen. Is that available?

Chair Seymour: I think Erin's working on it.

William Kenyon: Oh, OK, great.

So, in the first example, it's actually a class that I teach. And it says in the description of the course that the class will focus on helping each student to develop a design process that takes him or her from script to stage. So that would just be administratively changed to them. Whereas courses where a gender term is core to the pedagogy of the course, such as the second example, those terms would remain in place. So,
in no way are we looking to substantively change the subject matter of any courses that do refer to any gender topics.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, William. Bonj, are there any questions?

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Not right now.

**Chair Seymour:** We'll wait a second, see if there's any questions. If you have any questions, raise your hand or put your question in Q&A.

**William Kenyon:** Would you be able to put the proposal itself back up just so we can call attention to the other suggested edits?

**Chair Seymour:** I think Erin's working on it.

**William Kenyon:** Sure, great. Thank you.

**Chair Seymour:** If you have them handy, William, you might be able to share your screen.

**William Kenyon:** Sure thing. All right. Are you seeing that OK?

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

**William Kenyon:** So, in addition to gendered terms, we would replace things like freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior with first year, second year, third year, fourth year and beyond. Also, we would remove things like underclassman and upperclassmen and replace them with lower division and upper division. There's a few other variations on those themes if you have had the opportunity to read through this already.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you. Any questions in Q&A or hands raised?

**Bonj Szczygiel:** No hands and questions, Beth.

**Chair Seymour:** Seeing no, are you ready, William? Yep.

**William Kenyon:** Sure thing.

**Chair Seymour:** Then why don't we-- let's go ahead and vote. So, Anna, if you could get the vote ready. Senators, you may cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B. And as we get used to voting, Anna, could you let us know how the votes are going? Just not what the votes are, just if they're voting.

**Anna Butler:** There are many votes coming in now.

**Chair Seymour:** We'll give it a couple of seconds just so that people get the opportunity to vote if they're having any problems. And just a reminder, Anna will record all the votes and report out at the end of the agenda.
Thank you, William, for your work on this. It's very important. So, thank you.

William Kenyon: Thank you very much.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Chair Seymour: Next, let's move on to Advisory, Consultative Reports.

Mandated Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Annual Report

Chair Seymour: The Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment Mandated Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Annual Report can be found in Appendix D. This report is brought to the floor by the committee and needs no second. Committee member C Libby will present the report. C. Oh, it's going to take a second. So, we're transitioning, I think they're joining us. So, thank you.

C Libby, Liberal Arts: All right, I made it.

Chair Seymour: Yay! Congratulations.

C Libby: That was probably the fastest my heart's beat in a while. Anyway, thank you so much for having me. OK, so I'm just going to give you a little bit of background on the report to start out. This report is the result of a charge that was given to the Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment by Chair Seymour. The report responds directly to recommendation four from the More Rivers to Cross 1 Task Force, which called for the establishment of an annual DEI report.

In addition, the report incorporates recommendations made by the Select Presidential Commission on Racism, Bias, and Community Safety. The recommendations presented in this report were developed in collaboration with Faculty Affairs and in consultation with the Office of Educational Equity and the Office of Planning Assessment and Institutional Research. The committee also looked at Penn State's 2025 vision, Penn State's strategic plan, and the goals for DEI outlined in Penn State's diversity statement for guidance when drafting this report.

So, taking all these resources and goals into consideration, the committee puts forward the following recommendations. First, we recommend that the University develop and maintain a public-facing dashboard that contains the six DEI categories outlined in the report. These categories include DEI initiatives; University reports on racism, bias, and safety; integration with the Penn State Community Survey; data on faculty representation; equity centered curriculum; and reconciliation reports as they become available. An annual report will be generated from the dashboard.

The second recommendation is the creation of a Faculty Senate subcommittee that will work directly with OPAIR and the Office of Educational Equity to implement the dashboard. We've already spoken with both of these offices, and they have indicated that they're willing to assist us. So, they know. The third recommendation is that every standing committee in Faculty Senate be involved in the development and maintenance of the dashboard, meaning more specifically that each standing committee should report out on actions, challenges, and opportunities for enhancing DEI.
So, these three recommendations work together to achieve the larger goal of having a more accessible, robust, and centralized hub for DEI reporting at Penn State. The annual report and the dashboard will go beyond required federal government reporting to implement a process that consistently reviews, updates, and communicates our progress towards creating a more equitable institution.

As you may imagine, there's many reasons why Penn State needs a DEI dashboard. For one, the dashboard provides a way to track, measure, and communicate Penn State's progress in achieving its stated DEI goals. Additionally, providing information on faculty demographics and University initiatives will highlight areas for growth, increase accountability, and help us identify our successes so that we can celebrate them.

Looking at our peer institutions, the creation of this dashboard will allow Penn State to catch up in order to match the type of the DEI reporting and implementation already occurring elsewhere. And it is the hope of this committee that the creation and implementation of this dashboard will be just one of many steps made by the University in response to the recommendations from the More Rivers to Cross Task Force and the Select Presidential Commission on Racism, Bias, and Community Safety. So, thanks for your time. Of course, now I'm happy to take any questions that you may have.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you so much, C. Bonj, are there any questions?

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Well, none so far.

**Chair Seymour:** And if you have a question, please put it in Q&A or raise your hand. We'll give it just a second. Thank you for the work on this report, by the way. Are we ready to vote, do you think?

**Chair Seymour:** All right, let's say it is now time to vote. Senators, you may cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B. We'll wait a couple of minutes. Anna, if you could let me know when it looks like we're getting a good number.

**Anna Butler:** OK. I think you can go ahead and move on now.

**Chair Seymour:** All right, thank you, Anna. And thank you, C and everyone, for your work on that report.

**Joint Subcommittee on Parental Leave**

**Chair Seymour:** Next up is the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and Faculty Benefits, Joint Subcommittee on Parental Leave. The report on parental leave can be found in appendix E. This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Chair Bishop-Pierce and Chair Saltz with Vice Chair Costanzo will present the report.

**Ira Saltz, Shenango:** Denise, you have the presentation.

**Chair Seymour:** I think we're making the transition, Ira.

**Ira Saltz:** OK.

**Chair Seymour:** Here comes Denise.
Denise Costanzo, Arts and Architect: Good afternoon, everyone. Can you hear me?

Chair Seymour: Hi. Yes, we can.

Denise Costanzo: Great, thank you. Thank you, Chair Seymour. So, I am here, as was just said, representing a subcommittee formed by-- from members from both the Committee on Faculty Benefits and on Faculty Affairs. Both were charged with looking into uneven administration of parental leave across the University. And so, in the course of that investigation, we developed the report, which you have access to.

I've also prepared a presentation because the issues involved are somewhat complex. So, I can share my screen or that can be shared. Whichever is fine. While that's going on, I will just add that the subcommittee benefited from very generous participation from both the vice provost and assistant vice provost of Faculty Affairs, Jennifer Wilkes, the vice president of the Commonwealth campuses, and an extensive circle from Human Resources. And so, their involvement in helping us understand the kind of complex policy was very much appreciated.

And there is a sort of general agreement that this is a policy that was in need of updating. And so what I will share here is, first, a summary of the policy as it exists and then our group's observations and thoughts regarding that policy, as well as a little bit of data that we brought to bear to make sense of it, and then, finally, our set of recommendations. So, thank you. We can proceed to the next slide. Perhaps do that as a full screen presentation.

So, the current policy is laid out in HRG18 entitled Paid Parental Leave for Faculty, which was approved in 2004. And so, the policy sets out a series of benefits, some of which are designated specifically for all full-time faculty under defined conditions. So, in the event of childbirth, a faculty member who bears a child is given six weeks of maternity or postpartum or post-childbirth leave. In addition, a faculty member whose partner has had a child is offered two weeks of leave within three months of the birth. For faculty who adopt a child, the benefit is similar-- six weeks of leave for an adoptive parent immediately following the child's placement in the home. In the event that we have two faculty parents, they are given eight weeks of total combined leave that they can share. And there doesn't seem to be the same calendar limit.

There are, in addition, benefits that are offered specifically to tenure-line faculty only. Again, in the event of childbirth, the policy specifies that female faculty who bear a child may take either one semester teaching leave at full pay-- that's on the condition that research and service continue-- or one semester of unpaid leave in which no duties are required to be performed.

The timing is not given a firm definition. But it does say in the policy that leave may take place the semester following birth in special circumstances. So, it's implied that the leave is meant to apply to the semester when the birth takes place. In the event of adoption, any faculty member who adopts a child will receive a semester free of teaching within a year of the adoption. In addition, it states that couples who are both faculty adoptive couples may share a semester free of teaching immediately following the child's placement.
If we can go to the next slide, please. Just a few other points about the policy as written. Next slide, please. I can speak from my own reference if advancing is an issue. The policy also specifies the coordination process, that arrangements for the specifics on leave are supposed to be reached through discussions between the faculty member and that person's unit head. And if there are challenges reaching that agreement, faculty are told that they must appeal to the provost.

The faculty also specifies that faculty who do accrue paid vacation, personal holidays, or other time off must use that instead. And we also bring in as a point that last year, the University approved HR106, which is a parental leave policy for staff. That established four weeks of paid parental leave, which replaced the prior policy of requiring staff to use their accumulated sick leave, which maxed out unless they had special permission at six weeks, or the 12 weeks of unpaid leave available under the Family Medical Leave Act.

So that's essentially what is in the current policy and how that compares to the latest policy for staff. I don't know if we can make it to the fourth slide or not. But what I can do is just describe what we observed regarding this policy as it exists. The first is the obvious disparity which is set up in the flexibility offered to adoptive versus biological parents, all faculty who are, say, couples expanding their families.

In the case of adoptive parents, they share those six weeks versus a very clear division of six and two between biological parents. It's also interesting to note that the policy for tenure-line faculty extends a semester's leave only to biological mothers, whereas the semester's leave is available to either/or of two adoptive parents.

There's also more scheduling freedom extended to adoptive parents. Their leave can be taken within a year is the language versus the semester of or immediately following childbirth. So that was one observation. The second is obviously the extreme inequity between tenure-line and fixed term faculty as laid out in the policy for everyone.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, Denise. I'm sorry about the technical difficulties on our end.

**Denise Costanzo:** Are you able to hear me now? Would it be easier if I shared my screen?

**Chair Seymour:** Yes.

**Ira Saltz:** Yes.

**Denise Costanzo:** That's fine. Happy to do that. So here we are. Great. Can you see the slide with issues, concerns with HRG18?

**Chair Seymour:** Yes. Yes

**Denise Costanzo:** Thank you. So, the extreme inequity was another point that our subcommittee observed right away, that tenure-line line faculty are offered not only the six weeks to eight weeks, depending on the situation of leave available to all faculty, but this additional semester of teaching leave, paid or unpaid, depending on circumstances.
The policy also has a very unclear relationship with the academic calendar. Reports came to various members of our group about being expected for winter break, spring break to count toward the six weeks or whatever number of weeks they're dealing with their leave. So that part is unclear. It's also unclear how leave is intended to fall regarding summer and the academic year in general. So those are points of vagueness within the existing policy.

We also noted the highly inequitable coordination process. Obviously, administrative heads have authority over faculty course and service assignments, evaluations, salary. For non-tenure-lined faculty, reappointment can be an issue. And so that can make those conversations less than equivalent.

In addition, HRG's language guarantees that there will be no adverse impact for taking leave on the employee's standing or salary. But we couldn't figure out how anyone would actually verify that. And we also received reports of faculty being told that if they took parental leave, they would have some sort of employment consequences. Those ranged from being expected to teach more before or after their leave or losing long-standing preferred teaching assignments, et cetera.

Another issue of concern is that there are highly unequal resources to support leave across the University. Units have varying abilities to absorb and cover requests for leave. You can have demographics and staffing, as well as budgets, that come to bear if you happen to have a large number of faculty that need leave all at once. So that was an issue.

And then something that's not in the language of the report but is something we were all conscious of is the sort of informal pressure that can come to bear because the arrangements to cover leave often involve burden sharing from colleagues who have other kinds of career authority over faculty in the form of teaching evaluations, P&T committees, et cetera. That can constitute a form of pressure to not take leave. Another might be just a general culture of sacrificial commitment to privileged University duties over what might be family or family well-being or personal health.

So, with that in mind, those observations, we noted a few other things. One is we did some benchmarking with the Big Ten. The Penn State parental leave policy for faculty is quite generous vis-à-vis our peer institutions. The only school that seemed to offer something more is the University of Indiana. Most others offer substantially less. So we really appreciated as a group the leadership, actually we could say national leadership, being shown by the policy as currently formulated in many respects. We also appreciated that it's designed to be flexible and its clear intent at equity across a range of family situations.

HR was very cooperative and helpful in gathering data regarding use of parental leave in recent years. And we have a simplified summary of that here, and there's more extended information in the report itself. But what we see from that is generally what looks to be quite a low use of partner leave, in particular parental leave by parenting partners. Only 20 males across the entire system faculty have made any use of this in the last three years. There's no way to know exactly how many of our colleagues have had expansions to their families during this time. But that seemed quite low to us.

So, our committee in general saw an immense opportunity for greater clarity and equity within the policy. And to that end, we drafted a range of recommendations to revise the policy. And I'll just go through those very quickly. The first is to explicitly eliminate disparities in flexibility between birth and adoptive parents. While the medical value and crucial importance of postpartum leave is obvious, we do think that all faculty co-parents should have equal freedom to share leave.
Second is to provide greater clarity on how the leave policy relates to the academic calendar. Our position is that it should not-- those six to eight weeks or two weeks should not include scheduled breaks during the academic year. We also think it's important to clarify that parental leave should not in any way appropriate any negotiated research leave that faculty may have as part of their contracts.

A third point, one we feel very strongly about, is we believe there should be equivalent benefits for all full-time faculty independent of tenure-line status. So, one semester of teaching leave to be available, which would be paid if other work is performed, unpaid if not. We will note that this is consistent with the recently approved and more uniform Commonwealth campus faculty leave policies.

Another is to work to ensure a consistent minimum benefit is offered, available, and clearly understood across all University units. So, some of this would involve ensuring that administrative heads are aware of the benefits provided under parental leave policy and that there are University level resources made available to support the cost of leave as needed in the event of those perfect storms.

Another factor that would support this, as well as deal with some of the asymmetry in arrangement conversations, would be to include HR at an early stage in the process. That would make sure that both faculty and administrators are fully aware of what benefits and standards are available. If there are challenges in working out arrangements that go beyond what HR can provide, we think it's important to bring Ombud’s people into the process. And then the last resort, rather than the provost, should be the Office of the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs, and this is something that they've confirmed.

Point six, that this policy does establish a minimum benefit. It's a floor, not a ceiling. In the event that units are prepared to do more, this should not in any way truncate that. Some minor details-- one minor detail regarding language, that the leave is currently described as being available on request, which we think would be better expressed with upon notification. This would emphasize that parental leave is a faculty right, not a concession by the University.

Speaking to the earlier point that William was making, we believe all the policy language should be gender neutral to reflect all the potential parenting partnerships and circumstances that could arise. Another point, finally, is that HR, as in the case with DEI concerns, should be able to track usage data on parental leave use with a particular attention to equity and greater use of partner leave.

I will add one final point that came-- a colleague in Libraries pointed out yesterday that information that we were given, which you see in the report, is that faculty and librarians-- so clinical and research faculty as well as librarians who do accrue various kinds of vacation and personal leave, we were informed that they are now very much covered under this policy.

Apparently, there is a little bit of confusion over the way HR-106 and HRG18 intersect. So that is a question that HR is seeking to clarify. And I just wanted to let those folks know that we are looking into it or they are looking into it, and we are awaiting a question on that. So, I'm happy to-- I can stop sharing. And I'm happy to answer any questions. And we have Ira and Renee as well.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Denise. Bonj, are there any questions?

Bonj Szczygiel: We've got a few questions. Denise, this is question from Roger Egolf at Lehigh Valley, and I think you've answered it. But just to clarify that in his situation, Lehigh Valley campus generally
allows a full semester of paid maternity leave, and that would still be allowed, would it not? It's a minimum, not a cap.

**Denise Costanzo:** Precisely.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** And then a question from Kat Phillips, Libraries. Can you clarify how the policy changes will impact faculty who vacation? There seems to be a catch-22 here.

**Denise Costanzo:** Bonj, I'm having a hard time hearing. I'm not sure if your microphone—

**Ira Saltz:** Yeah, yeah, there's something wrong with your audio.

**Denise Costanzo:** But to Kat's question, that is precisely the question that was brought to us. And we do not have a clear answer yet. Our committee's understanding was that librarians and, again, that class of faculty would be included under this policy. But we are seeking clarification on that. So, I'm afraid that's the best answer I can give right now unless-- I know Greg-- maybe President Greg Stoner-- if anyone from HR has better, more updated information, that'll be great.

**Chair Seymour:** We'll work on seeing if they're here and want to speak. Bonj, are there any other questions?

**Bonj Szczygiel:** No other questions. Oh, there is one now. This is Deirdre Folkers from York. Thank you. I want to thank the committee for their work on this policy and for working to eliminate the inequity between the leave provided to tenure-line faculty and staff versus teaching-line faculty. Extreme inequity is indeed an appropriate identifier.

I've often felt that the ideal University employee has no family to distract them from their Penn State responsibilities, and this is aptly illustrated by the University's long-standing approach to childbirth. As you've noted, women are told both subtly and not so subtly that their pregnancies are a sign that they are not serious about their careers to the point that I know of more than one woman who took little or no time off following childbirth. I would hope that the University would seek to be a leader among its Big Ten peers on this issue.

**Denise Costanzo:** Thank you for that. You definitely captured the spirit of the subcommittee's thoughts as well. And we will add that the notion of our colleagues who are, for instance, primarily teaching faculty who maybe are not as actively engaged in research or other activities, the notion of curricular revision, refreshment, course renewal, there is so much important work that powers their important contributions to the University that can be included as part of this. But this would obviously be as appropriate per situation. But, yes, we feel the same way.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you. Are there any other questions, Bonj?

**Bonj Szczygiel:** From Carley Gwin in new Kensington-- how would this policy apply in the case of a stillbirth?

**Denise Costanzo:** That is very-- that's a great question. As the policy exists, which is not always understood, any faculty member who bears a child is actually supposed to have a medical authorization before returning to work. I think there would probably be some kind of overlap between-- now I know
staff have bereavement leave. So, I hope there would be some kind of accommodation as well. But that seems like a great question to take to HR or to any final policy that gets proposed.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Any other questions, Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel: None right now.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, everybody. Those were some great questions. Are we ready to vote? I think we are. So, senators, you may cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B. Let's give it a few minutes. And, Anna, let me know when I can move on.

Anna Butler: OK. I think you can go ahead and move on now.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Anna, and thank you, Renee, Ira, and Denise. That's fabulous work. Really appreciate it.

Statement Opposing Racism Against Asian, Asian American, Asian Pacific Islander Communities, and Support for our Penn State Community

Chair Seymour: Next up, we have the Senate Committee on Global Programs. Statement opposing racism against Asian, Asian American, Asian Pacific Islander communities, and support for our Penn State community can be found in appendix F. This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Chair King and Committee Member Susan Fredricks will present the report. I think we're getting everybody up.

Susan Fredricks, Brandywine: I am here. Thank you very much, everybody. And this report came out of-- and support has come out of a number of incidences that have occurred throughout the United States, as we can see, and acknowledging that at Penn State, one of the biggest international groups of students that we get on our campus is from China and from India.

And in acknowledgment and in line with the US Senate that has just passed an anti-Asian hate crimes bill on April 22 almost unanimously except for one person that did not vote for it, the Global Programs decided to put together a consultative positional report where-- the last statement I will read to you. It says, "Be it resolved that the Penn State Faculty Senate opposes racism in all its forms, including racism against those of Asian descent. We stand in support of Asian, Asian American, and Pacific Island students, faculty, and staff at Penn State University." And that is all I have. Other questions or comments?

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Bonj, are there any questions?

Bonj Szczygiel: No questions and no hands have been raised yet.

Chair Seymour: Let's give it just a minute, and then we'll move on for a vote if we don't get any questions. Just to remind everyone, please put your question in Q&A or raise your hand. Seeing none, I think it's now time to vote. Senators, you may cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B. Anna, please let me know when we can move on.

Anna Butler: I think you can go ahead and move on now.
Chair Seymour: Thank you, Anna.

**It's a Response to More Rivers to Cross-- Black Faculty and Academic Racism at Penn State University, part 2.**

Chair Seymour: Our final Advisor and Consultative Report is brought to us by the Senate Self-Study. It's a response to More Rivers to Cross-- Black Faculty and Academic Racism at Penn State University, part 2. And it can be found in Appendix G. The report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Chair Shapiro, Committee Member Julio Palma, and Senator Jay Precht will present the report.

Keith Shapiro, Parliamentarian: Thank you, Beth. First of all, I'd like to say that the Self-Study Committee in the Senate sponsored the report because we feel that this is directly applicable to our charge. However, the foundation of the report was written by two senators from Penn State Fayette, Jay Precht and Julio Palma.

Given that, what I would like to do is turn this over to them because I think they'll be able to speak to this more eloquently and directly than I will. Senator Palma.

Julio Palma, Penn State Fayette: Thank you. Thank you, Keith. Well colleagues, senators, today we have been discussing these initiatives about diversity and inclusion. Also, we have mentioned several times the report from More Rivers to Cross and accountability. And Jay and I, from Penn State Fayette, we wrote this resolution days after the More Rivers to Cross Part 2 was published.

This report included-- the first part included the Black faculty in University Park, and the second part of the report included the commonwealth campuses. There were some very disappointing results. Right? For example, more than 60% of Black faculty do not want to use the bias report. 8 out of 10 Black faculty have experienced some kind of racism, macroaggression, microaggression. This is something that, we thought that we as Senate, who represent all faculty, Black faculty, we need to take a stand. So, we have this resolution, again it can be found in Appendix G. But that's the rationale.

So, we want to re-new our commitment against institutional racism. And I ask everyone here in the Senate to endorse this resolution. The resolution has three items. The first one is we want to acknowledge the importance of this report. And we want to thank the authors and every single Black faculty that participated or maybe decided not to participate in these surveys and in this study.

Some of them choose to remain anonymous because they don't feel safe. So, we want to acknowledge that importance of this report. Second, we want to stand in solidarity with our Black faculty of Penn State, of all campuses. And we want to acknowledge that some of the initiatives have fallen short to date. With respect to recruitment, retention, and your support for Black faculty.

And third one, the authors of the report published specific recommendations. So, we want to endorse those recommendations and we urge the administration to adopt them in their efforts of diversity and inclusion. Those are the three items that this resolution is asking. And I think we as faculty Senate need to take a stand in solidarity.

This is just an advisory position not resolution. This just can be a symbolic resolution, but I think it's important to take a stand against racism and be in solidarity with our fellow faculty, and then take steps after this resolution in order to fight against racism and end the act of white supremacy. So, if there is
anything, my colleagues, that endorse-- this resolution has been unanimously endorsed by the University College Caucus.

This was also passed in our local governance body in Penn State Fayette. And this resolution was also unanimously endorsed by the Commonwealth Campuses Caucus. So, with that, if there is anything my colleagues want to ask, please feel free to do so. And if there is any questions about this resolution we will be happy to answer.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Julio. Does anyone else have anything they'd like to add? Thank you, Jay. Thank you, Keith. Bonj, do we have any questions?

Bonj Szczygiel: No questions. No hands.

Chair Seymour: I'm going to give it just another few seconds but thank you all for your work on this. I really appreciate it. Seeing the questions. It's now time to vote.

Senators, you may cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept the motion, press a. To reject the motion, press b. Anna, when we've got a good number, let me know.

Anna Butler: I think we're good to move forward.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Anna. And just to remind everyone, we'll see the votes at the end of the meeting. Thank you, Julio and Jay, for the report, and Keith for you and your committee for sponsoring it. Thank you all so much.

______________________________________________
_____________________________________
INFORMATIONAL REPORTS
Auxiliary and Business Services Budget Report

Chair Seymour: Let's move on to Item K, Informational Report. The Senate Committee on University Planning is sponsoring two reports. The first is Auxiliary and Business Services Budget Report and can be found in Appendix H. Sara Thorndike, Senior Vice President for Finance and Business and Treasurer, and John Papazoglou, Associate Vice President of Auxiliary and Business Services will present the report.

John Papazoglou, Associate Vice President of Auxiliary and Business Services: Good afternoon. All right, let me share my screen. Hold on.

All right, can you see my screen, OK?

Bonj Szczygiel: Yes.

John Papazoglou: All right, and you just see the presentation screen, correct?

Chair Seymour: Yes, we do. It looks good.
John Papazoglou: Excellent. OK. Well, good afternoon. My name is John Papazoglou. I am the Associate Vice President for Auxiliary and Business Services. As many of you already know, A&BS is a self-funded business unit and receives no funding from tuition.

The Bryce Jordan Center is the University-- it includes the Bryce Jordan center which is the University's multi-use facility for academic programs and sports and entertainment. Hospitality services, which includes the Penn State hotel and conference center, as well as the Nittany Lion Inn.

Our biggest unit is housing and food services, which operates student housing and dining at 11 Penn State campuses and food operations at an additional three locations. It includes the Multimedia and Print Center, which provides printing, copying, and mailing services for the University.

Transportation Services, which oversees parking and fleet. We have bicycle and mass transit services. And the University Park Airport, which supports the commercial air service at the terminal and serves as the fixed based operator. Also, several other business units, as far as like the ID office. We also serve as the primary liaison for The Penn State Bookstore and the University's pouring rights contract.

I'll go directly to the slides. As you can see here, total income for Auxiliary and Business Services has grown incrementally each year since 2017. In 2020, you can see a significant drop of approximately $75 million directly related to the pandemic. On the following slide, you'll see how these declines break down along the various individual business units, along with the decline in revenue.

There was a $33 million dollar decline in expenses, which include the variable expenses for things such as food, cost, and labor. Other expenses, such as planned deferred maintenance expenses, were postponed due to the lack of available funds. Overall, out of the $75 million in income, in total A&BS lost 41.6 million in that margin.

For fiscal year 21, this includes the reductions in fall and spring semester occupancy, and the lack of on campus activities and increased expenses due to COVID. And as you can see, what we are projecting through the end of the spring semester is off by more than 50% versus 2019, which we consider our last normal year. And that's $200 million in income and $84 million in net margin.

All right. On this slide, you can see the breakdown in the different revenues for the airport. This is owned and operated by Penn State in a cooperative Town-Gown arrangement with the Center County Airport Authority. The airport saw a 75% decrease in air travel. It receives its revenue from fuel sales, aircraft repairs, operations and charters, and from the airport authority.

These revenues don't reflect the $1.9 million that the airport received in the FAAs CARES Act grants, which is intended to pay for projects which would have been covered by passenger facility charge revenues. Housing and food service declines of $54 million in FY20 and another $85 million in fiscal year 21, reflect the $52 million room and board refunds in fiscal year 2020.

And the impact of decreased occupancy and a shorter residence semester of fiscal year 21, where room and board fees were prorated down by about 18% due to the shorter number of days. Hospitality services is our hotel group. And that includes Nittany Lion Inn and The Penn Stater. The revenue in fiscal year 20 dropped due to the summer statewide shut down in which the hotels were closed.
And then in fiscal year 21, the Nittany Lion Inn was repurposed for student’s single occupancy room housing, as the hotel occupancy industry wide experienced historically low levels of occupancy. This is also a direct reflection on the impact that the football season had on the hotels, which are typically sold out throughout the season.

Transportation includes parking revenue as well as fleet services revenues. These declines reflect the decline in student permits, the drop in parking revenue for on campus events, such as concerts and sports, and as well as a significant drop in vehicle fleet rentals. And then other business services include things like mail, print, the ID office, and the Bryce Jordan Center. These decreases also reflect the overall reduction in on-campus activities, as well as the volume reductions due to working from home.

For all A&BS units, personnel costs account for between 30% to 33% of our expenses. You can see that there was a significant reduction in personnel expenses in fiscal year 20 and fiscal year 21 related to our very variable labor expenses, such as temporary and wage personnel, a significant reduction in student employees and then we had furloughs and layoffs. Non-personnel expenses include variable costs of goods.

Primarily food costs, which were reduced due to the closures and the ramping down of our food locations during the pandemic. And again, expenses, such as the planned deferred maintenance, were postponed due to the lack of available funds.

And this last slide, I think, just is the summary and it just shows the net expenses. This is a repeat of the first slide.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, John. That was an excellent job and you kept within your time limit. I'm really impressed. Very good. Do we have any questions?

If you have a question, please put it in Q&A or raise your hand.

Bonj Szczygiel: No questions and no Q&A yet.

Chair Seymour: I think you did such a good job that they don't have questions. But thank you so much. This was really important that we saw this report, so thank you.

John Papazoglou: Thank you very much.

Intercollegiate Athletics Budget Report

Chair Seymour: Our next report from University Planning is the Intercollegiate Athletics Budget Report and can be found in Appendix I. Sandy Barbour Vice President for Intercollegiate Athletics, Lynn Holleran Deputy Director of Athletics and Rick Kaluza, Senior Associate Athletic Director will present the report.

Sandy Barbour, Vice President for Intercollegiate Athletics: Excellent. Thank you, thank you very much. Appreciate this opportunity. Similar to my colleague John, we are here to give you an update on the impacts of COVID to intercollegiate athletics. So, if we could go to the table one overview. This is just really talking about the next table, which is really showing our 16-17, 17-18, and 18-19, which were not impacted by COVID.
And then we began to see the impacts from a financial standpoint in 19-20. However, as you can see here, our operating revenues were minimally impacted because it did come towards the end of the year. Our spring sports are not typically our most heavily revenue producing sports, so there was minimal impact or minimal loss on the revenue side. And frankly with our programs shutting down, from an expense standpoint, we were able to have some natural savings there.

And then FY21 is where the heavy hit comes in, from a revenue standpoint. But you will also see we were able to reduce our expenses significantly, which we'll go into some more detail. What you see at the top is our beginning reserve balance at the beginning of each year. And then obviously with the revenues and expenses and major maintenance, primarily major maintenance but major maintenance and capital projects section, that then impacts our ending reserve balance each year.

You'll also notice-- and again I'll go into some more detail so that this makes more sense-- but you'll notice in 2021 the borrowing on the University line of credit of 25 million to make sure that our ending reserve balance is positive. We hope that number is somewhat less than the 25 million, but obviously we have not completed the year yet. Next slide.

So, in the yellow you've got the pre-COVID, or un-impacted by COVID, and then the next slide. You've got the COVID impacted years there. And then you have-- yeah, let's stay there. Thank you-- as I said, based on the timing of the onset of COVID, our revenues were not significantly impacted.

There were NCAA basketball tournament revenues, ticket revenues for spring sport, but they were also offset by decreases in expenses due to lack of activity. Our total projected revenue for FY21 does have major COVID related impacts and here are some of the numbers that I talked about. Generally lost revenue 84 and 1/2 million total projected expenses of about 19. Now that's our operating budget plus about 10 million in major maintenance, for a loss of about 35, which is being covered by 10 million that we had in our reserve, and then that borrowing that I referenced before.

Next slide, please. This is, just for context, this is something that I presented in August 2020 to campus leadership and to the board. Our worst-case scenario could have been a revenue loss of about 116.5 million. And that would have resulted in about twice what we're looking at right now, in terms of a borrowing.

The moderate case was about 103 million, with essentially a similar amount of borrowing at 48 million. And then where we ended up is about the best case. Football was played. That enabled us to access the media rights, the television revenue, which then gave us about a $73 and 1/2 million revenue reduction and that $20 to $25 million debt service that we are currently projecting.

Next. The next charts really look at our increased expenses, kind of categories of increased expenses and loss revenues. Please note that this crosses over two fiscal years, FY20 and FY21. So, it will not necessarily tie back to some figures that you have either already seen or that you will see here later in the presentation.

Our testing costs are a combination of what we are paying for through the Big Ten, as well as campus. So, a little over $6 million in terms of testing for student athletes and staff. Facilities infrastructure, a little over 300,000. PPE and sanitation, about three quarters of a million. Student athlete health and wellness, housing and nutrition needs, due to the pandemic, 100,000.
Many of you, I'm sure, have read about our cardiac protocols that include EKG, Echo, blood troponin, and finally a cardiac MRI. I think we're looking at the higher side of about half a million there. And then based on NCA changes that allowed last spring's senior student athletes to come back and get another season of eligibility, that's about three quarters of a million there.

On the lost revenue side, ticket sales is about 45. Big Ten media rights, that's primarily around some lost football games because we did not have a full season. Other Big Ten revenue sponsorship, game day, Nittany Lion Club donations, and then other miscellaneous, of which the largest were Ticketmaster fees. And we were supposed to host Olympic wrestling trials, that both impacted intercollegiate athletics and AB&S.

The next slide will show us the expense reductions that we did undertake. And again, these are across both fiscal year 20 and 21. Operating budgets of a little over 30 million, that hit both the administrative non-sport units, as well as the individual sport units. Personnel a variety of ways that we look to decrease our expenses, and the top one there is we did undertake a salary reduction.

It was mandatory for all non-contract employees and it had to be voluntary for our contract employees. But I can tell you, we had about 98% volunteerism, as it relates to those salary reductions for our contracted employees. We did undergo a small furlough plan. We have done without a number of our part time and kind of wage payroll positions, particularly as they relate to events.

Our staff have stepped up unbelievably and have been ticket takers and checkers in with the health screening and the temperatures and those kinds of things, so that we don't have to hire part-time help. And that's been a huge help, a huge cost savings, expense savings there.

And then, not unlike others on campus, we have held positions open either for some period of time, or until FY22. We have refinanced a certain amount of our debt, to have about a $2 million savings. And then other expenses, which happened to include summer school expenses.

That brought us down to 109 million projected savings for FY21, with again every dollar that we can realize from an operating revenue standpoint. Which, you look at that 84 million number there compared to what we typically are, that's significant. But every dollar we can garner from a revenue standpoint and every dollar we can save on the expense side helps us to reduce our need, our reliance on borrowing. And that concludes the report, thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you so much, Sandy. Any questions?

Sandy Barbour: And I apologize. I didn't realize my dogs were in the background.

Chair Seymour: Your dogs are adorable. You should not apologize for your dogs. They're beautiful. Let's just see if we got any questions. If you have any questions, please put them in Q&A or raise your hand. Looking at the back up, Lisa.

Lisa Mangel: Nothing yet.
Chair Seymour: I think we're good. So, thank you so much Sandy, and thank you Lynn, as well as Rick, for your support because I know they were behind the scenes. Thank you all so much. We really appreciate the report.

Sandy Barbour: Excellent. Thank you.

Annual Report on High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree

Chair Seymour: We have two reports from the Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid. The first report is the Annual Report on High School Students Enrolled Non-Degree. The report can be seen in Appendix J, and this report is presented web only.

PIE Taskforce Recommendation on Alternative Grading for Summer 2021

Chair Seymour: The second report from ARSSA is the PIE Taskforce Recommendation on Alternative Grading for Summer 2021. This report can be found in Appendix K. This report will be presented by Chair Phillips. Kat?

Kathleen Phillips, Libraries: Hi everybody. Good afternoon. I am happy to present, thank you, the PIE recommendation on alternative grading moving forward into the summer of 2021. As it stands, the PIE Committee does not recommend that we move forward with alternative grading into the summer of 2021. This will be announced, and the information will be spread across Penn State to all parties, including our faculty advisors getting the word out to students.

And this then leads into the rollout of the pass/fail updates, the pass-fail policy updates that the committee has been working tirelessly on for the past several months. And hopefully that recommendation and legislative update will come forward to Senate in September. So, if you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them. And I know that was very short and brief, but that is our recommendation, to not move forward with the alternative grading this summer. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Kat. Let's see if there are any questions. If you have any questions, please put them in Q&A or raise your hand. Bonj, are we doing on questions?

Bonj Szczygiel: I don't see any yet. And no hands.

Chair Seymour: Perfect. Thank you, Kat. Let's move on.

Kat Phillips: Thank you all

Sustainability Across Undergraduate Curriculum

Chair Seymour: The next report is the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs, titled Sustainability Across Undergraduate Curriculum, which can be found in Appendix L. This report is presented web only.
Faculty Tenure Flow Annual Report

Chair Seymour: There are two reports from the Senate Committees on Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations. The first is the Faculty Tenure Flow Annual Report and can be found in Appendix M.

Chair Bishop-Pierce and Karen Vance, assistant Vice Provost for Institutional Research Office of Planning Institutional Assessment and Research will present the report. Karen, are you there?

Karen Vance, Assistant Vice Provost for Institutional Research Office of Planning Institutional Assessment and Research: I am here. I was waiting to see if maybe Renee wanted to say something, but I'm ready to go.

Thank you for having us here today. I would like to begin by acknowledging the work of the Faculty Affairs Office and the Institutional Research staff who contributed to this report. Karen Parkes-Schnure and Kathy Bieschke’s office and Michelle Stein and the Institutional Research Office were instrumental in collecting and aggregating the data for this report, as well as summarizing the result. I appreciate Kathy Bieschke’s leadership and expertise in guiding us in this report and providing feedback.

The tenure flow report is a cohort-based report that captures snapshots of tenure line faculty from the time they enter the path to tenure through the awarding of tenure. And during the path of tenure, faculty may exit for various reasons. The report does not examine the reasons why faculty may leave their tenure track position or why faculty were denied tenure.

The University does conduct a faculty exit survey and exit interviews to capture reasons for leaving Penn State, or reasons for leaving a faculty position. And in that exit survey and in the exit interviews, satisfaction and experiences with Penn State are captured. The report does not assume any cause-and-effect relationships.

The data that you will see in the report are purely descriptive in nature. To give you an overview, in fall of 2020, 14% of faculty at Penn State were on path to tenure. When considering only the population of tenured and tenure track faculty, 30% were on path.

Over the past 10 cohorts who have or had been at the University long enough to progress through the tenure process, 59% of the assistant professors achieve tenure after seven years. For the most recent cohort, the 2013 cohort, 65% had attained tenure.

Please know that at this time, we can only report on gender identity on the binary because those are the data that we have available. So, as you read the report, you will see statistics for male faculty and female faculty. At this time, those are the options we have for reporting based on gender identity. We hope to be able to report on more granular or more appropriate gender identities in the future when we have the data available for us.

So, the attainment rate was higher for male faculty at 63% than it was for female faculty at 53%. In addition, more males than females entered the pipeline for tenure status. Over the course of the last 13 cohorts, roughly a third more males than females have entered that tenure pipeline.
Regarding race and ethnicity, the collection and reporting of race and ethnicity has evolved over time due to changes in HR information systems and reporting requirements. Substantial effort was made by the analysts to resolve the issues in order to provide population statistics and attainment information by race and ethnicity.

Recall the tenure average attainment rate I mentioned earlier at 59%. The average attainment rate by race and ethnicity categories varied from 44% for Black faculty entrants, to 64% of entrants who did not declare race or ethnicity. You'll see in the report that we have attainment rates for every race and ethnicity that we capture at the University.

The report also includes the outcomes of each review milestone, that is at the second, fourth, and sixth year. The vast majority of the faculty who go up for review are awarded tenure. So, we're looking at greater than 90% rates in most cases.

With that being said, by the sixth-year review, you'll see in the report that approximately 30% of the initial cohorts, regardless of cohort, have exited the pipeline by the time they're up for that six-year review. The full report, again which includes the details regarding the methodology, is available in Appendix M.

Renee Bishop-Pierce, Scranton: Thank you so much, Karen. That was fantastic. I'm sorry, I couldn't unmute my mic quick enough last time. Thank you for helping us out and preparing that report for faculty affairs in the Senate.

Chair Seymour: Thank you both. Any questions? If you have a question, please place it in Q&A, or raise your hand.

Bonj Szczygiel: We do have a question from Karen Keifer-Boyd from Arts and Architecture. What are the stats for Black women and intersectional view?

Karen Vance: That's a really good question. In this particular report we did not look at intersectionality, but we will consider that-- we will include that, not just consider it, we will include that in the next report.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you, everyone. And thank you the committee and Renee and Karen as well. Thank you so much for your work.

Non-Tenure Line Promotion Flow Report 2019-2020

Chair Seymour: The second report from Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations is the Non-Tenure Line Promotion Flow Report 2019-2020 and can be found in Appendix N. Chair Jones and Abby Diehl, Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs will present this report.

Maureen Jones, HHD: And I too will be turning this over to Abby to present and want to thank the Vice Provost's office as well as Karen Vance's office for their help in continuing to improve this report. This is our second year presenting it and Abby and them have done an excellent job in taking our suggestions and improving the report overall. Thanks Abby.
Abby Diehl, Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs: Thanks so much. I am really pleased to have the time today and I'm pleased to briefly present this non-tenure line promotion report. The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs worked with OPAIR to collaborate with the IRC and Faculty Affairs Committees to make some enhancements to this year's report, which include gender and race and ethnicity data. Data on whether or not those promoted had a terminal or non-terminal terminal degree. And we provide separate tables for those.

Length and type of previous contract, which we use to determine whether the length of the new contract offered with the promotion differed from the length of the individual's previous contract. And so those are the three main enhancements that we made to this year's report, and I'll briefly provide a summary here of some of the highlights.

164 non-tenured line promotion dossiers were put forward University wide. And 91%, or 150, received a promotion. Of those, 73% were promotions to the second rank and 27% were promotions to the third rank. Of those promoted, 65% had a terminal degree and 35% had a non-terminal degree. Female faculty comprised about 60% of the promotions across terminal and non-terminal degrees.

In terms of salary increases, we found that all of those faculty who were promoted received a salary increase and those are separate from the general salary increase, GSI. The mean salary increase was 7% and the median was 8%, both at University Park and the campuses. And the increases were similar both across and within ranks.

In terms of contract length, across all campuses, 81% of those promoted received multi-year contracts. A higher percentage of faculty promoted to the third rank. 100% of faculty promoted to the third rank received a multi-year contract and 75% of those promoted to the second rank received a multi-year contract.

Of those with a terminal degree, 83% received a multiyear contract. And of those with a non-terminal degree, 79% received a multiyear contract. And then finally, the data suggests that faculty both with and without a terminal degree received a longer contract than they previously held. And this is new data that we were able to obtain for this year's report. Prior to the promotion, multiyear contracts were just over half of the total, but after promotion they were about 80% of the total.

Thanks again for your time and I'm happy to take any questions.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Abby. Are there any questions for Abby? If you have a question, please put it in Q&A or raise your hand.

Bonj Szczygiel: No questions and no hands. We've got-- so we're back to no questions and no hands. Chair Seymour: We got excited there for a minute. Thank you. Thank you, Abby. Thank you, Karen, and everyone else, Kathy, everybody involved in the committees. You all have done fabulous work. And so, thank you for continuing to build on this report. So, thank you.

Abby Diehl: Thank you.
Developing a Faculty Teaching Assessment Framework

Chair Seymour: All right. From the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, Intra-University Relations, and Educational Equity and Campus Environment, Developing a Faculty Teaching Assessment Framework, which is in Appendix O. This report will be presented by Chairs Bishop-Pierce, Jones, and Blockett.

Renee Bishop-Pierce: And now I can't get my camera to come on. Maureen, I assume you want to take it away.

Maureen Jones: I am ready. Chair Seymour, would you like me to share my screen?

Chair Seymour: Yes, that'd be perfect.

Maureen Jones: Awesome, thank you. All right. So, what we're here to share today is a culmination of many months of work. We've been working on this all year. You've heard from us hopefully before in our listening sessions and today we'd like to share the work that's been done to prep us for what will eventually be the recommendation to all to receive in the fall around faculty teaching assessments.

And so, to begin, we want to start with a conversation to let you know that we are thinking about now, but we are also thinking into the future. We are working to assure that this process continues an ongoing process improvement format in which we will be requesting permanent subcommittees in faculty affairs EECE as well as IRC, to continue this work beyond the subcommittees. We would like these three committees to be responsible for shepherding this project from here on out and find it to be really important to make sure that there is a stable set of committees that can partner with the University and continue to evaluate how well this process is working and never allow it to be un-shepherded again.

The last time we worked really hard was in the 80s around this, and so we never want that kind of gap to occur again. We are suggesting, as we move into the presentation, in the fall that we have a three-year initial implementation cycle. With the first year of implementing it, the second year of gathering data around how well it's working, and then the third year to revise and suggest revisions as we move forward. After that, looking at a five-year review cycle.

Feedback loop. We want to establish reports that provide us with ongoing understanding of how well each one of the pieces of the framework are working so that we can continue to improve. Looking at established metrics when the implementation begins, and continually engaging the faculty and feedback. Making sure that the lines of communication are open long term.

As well as thinking about best practices. They change over time. We have incorporated best practices in our work. But we know that additional work will be done after this. And we want to make sure that we include that.

A quick sense of who is involved in this. Our three committees for sure. Members from our committee in the subcommittee, as well as the full committees, as we look at making sure that we had a lot of input around this. And then we had a sub-subcommittee, because who doesn't need another sub-subcommittee, to help us out with the student feedback questions.
And then, frankly, we got tons of input from a variety of sources and we just want to send a special thanks to everyone who we asked to help us out. Joined in and helped us with no hesitation. So, thank you, all of you, that will not get named personally today.

OK so, in our process we wanted to make sure we were as equitable as we could be. We wanted to consider and figure out ways to reduce bias on a number of levels. And that consistent framework across all colleges, campuses, was important that we considered everyone that would be impacted by this. So over 8,000 faculty, every major, every class, every campus, is a pretty big swath to consider.

A huge, huge point for us was developmental. We wanted this feedback to really help us support faculty in their endeavors to improve their pedagogy and in the end improve teaching here at Penn State. This is developmental in getting the feedback, as well as interpreting it, and then implementing it.

And until now, we have had certainly concerns shared with us from across the campuses that sometimes this is not developmental. So, we wanted to make sure that was a cornerstone of what we proposed. Multiple inputs, we certainly make sure that we have more than just the student feedback that it was important that there be more than one variable in a faculty member's performance evaluation. And you'll see that in the coming months.

Here's our timeline. We began in looking at-- would you look at that? I have a wrong date. I apologize. We had started last August and September in looking at benchmarking, seeking our peers out to figure out what they were doing, and informing what we were planning to do. We started with looking at best practices through a survey that we sent to all of the senators to push out to their faculty. Asking and listening sessions for a wish list around what we wanted this to look like as a faculty body.

And we met with Senate membership, academic leadership, as well as student government representatives. We then moved on and did some revisions and started to fill out that framework and met again with Senate members and academic leadership to share where we were and to get additional input into where we should end up in the final framework.

The last phase focused on student feedback, as this is a huge part of what we're interested in. And again, because we love a good listening session, added additional listening sessions in which we sought the Senate membership to help us think about refining those questions. Our sub-subcommittee did an excellent job in creating that foundation for us. We also sought out the help from Angela Linse in the Schreyer's Institute. And then sought out survey research experts here at the University to help us refine those elements.

Next steps. So, our committees met today, are moving forward with an advisory and consultative report for the fall. We will continue to think about feedback. However, we're ready. We're ready to come back to you in the fall and provide you with a recommendation for where we go.

We have really thought about how to include all of the voices in this. So, we looked at raw campus issues. We looked at fixed term faculty, tenured line faculty, campus faculty, College of Medicine, you name it. We tried to include all of those voices. We hope everyone had an opportunity to give that input. The survey got us a lot of information and a ton of support from our faculty members.
That is what we did in our information gathering and the developing of our framework. As I said, this is just the informational report, and you will get the advisory consultative in the fall. Would Chair Blockett or Chair Bishop-Pierce have anything they'd like to add?

**Renee Bishop-Pierce:** I do not. Well done.

**Kimberly Blockett, Brandywine:** Thank you.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you all. Are there any questions for the Chairs? Ira, I see you have your hand up.

**Ira Saltz:** Yes. I noticed I couldn't write a question being a panelist, but—

**Chair Seymour:** Just move straight into it, Ira.

**Ira Saltz:** Yes. You mentioned about collecting data on how successful the new plan is. What will be the metrics on how successful the new plan is?

**Maureen Jones:** Well, we haven't gone there yet. This report is informational. The next report are the recommendations. And then hopefully with the inclusion of this as a permanent subcommittee, that next group when we work towards implementation will take on those roles to develop that dashboard, that framework around evaluation.

**Chair Seymour:** Any other questions for our chairs? Please put them in Q&A or raise your hand. Looks like we might have some. Oh no, those are in chat. Sorry, I got distracted.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Tim Robicheaux.

**Chair Seymour:** I think Tim Robicheaux has his hand raised. So, if we can panel him.

**Tim Robicheaux, Liberal Arts:** Super quick comment. I know it's getting late. I just want to point out—

**Chair Seymour:** Robicheaux, where are you from?

**Tim Robicheaux:** Oh, sorry. Tim Robicheaux. Liberal Arts. I had to think where I was. Liberal Arts. Real quick comment. Very small gesture. I'm not seeking awards here. But when I did my annual evaluation this year, when I had to write my personal statement, I wrote a comment that until there are changes and data supporting that these things are gender neutral, racially neutral, et cetera, that I'm not going to use SRTEs to support my own teaching and will find other ways. And that's in addition to the alternative. I'm talking about previous years.

I hope that administrators understand where this is going-- and it sounds like many do-- and why. And I hope my colleagues will consider something similar. I'm a white guy that stands in front of the class and I co-taught with a woman. And the gendered language in the SRTEs was unreal.

So, until we see data-- I know it's still going to be used. I know it's still going to be looked at. But I will not use it to support my own teaching. Thank you for what you all are doing.
Maureen Jones: Thanks Tim. So, here's the thing, we definitely considered bias. In the advisory consultative, you'll see that we address bias in each one of the framework pillars. And we spent a lot of time considering the issues you bring up in the student feedback questions.

We received advice on how to neutralize some of those pieces and have benchmarked the inclusion of a bias statement in the student feedback questions. And certainly, there is pros and cons with all of it, but we feel that we have worked very hard to make it as neutral as we can, considering all of those pieces. So, we hope that you'll keep an open mind as you see the advisory and consultative coming in the fall and that there is no way to make this perfect, no way to make this perfect, but we will continue to work on that.

And getting that feedback will be helpful when we work through the metrics. And Paul has reminded me that we are getting rid of the letters S, R, T and E. We are chucking them out and it will be Student Feedback instead. You'll see that in the Advisory and Consultative as well.

Honestly, we have worked very hard to create a framework that decreases and hopefully gets rid of much of the trauma surrounding the SRTE process in the past. Again, not placing fault on anyone, it's just been a long time that it has been unattended. So, we hope that it helps.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Are there any other questions? Any questions in Q&A or any hands raised? Excellent.

Well thank you Renee, Maureen, and Kim for your leadership on this important topic. It has been-- and all reports are important-- this particular work has been a long time coming in the Senate and I wish to thank you all for your leadership in this space. Thank you so much.

Renee Bishop-Pierce: Thank you, Beth.

Spring 2021 Report on Faculty Salaries

Chair Seymour: The next report is from the Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits, Spring 2021 Report on Faculty Salaries, and can be found in Appendix P. Chair Saltz and Karen van Santz-- Karen Vance, sorry. Assistant Vice Provost for Institutional Research Office of Planning Institutional Assessment Research will present the report. I'm so sorry, Karen. I think it's the end of the day.

Karen Vance: No need to apologize.

Ira Saltz: Go ahead, Karen. Yeah. You had something you were going to present?

Karen Vance: Sure. I will spare everyone a demo of the dashboard given the time. But I do want to make you aware that these dashboards have now been placed online and we have expanded access to the dashboards at the request of the committee. We have several sets of dashboards, when you have a chance to peruse through them.

We have some dashboards that are for tenure line faculty, that include salary comparisons for UP faculty against our AAU peers and our Big Ten peers. These are very similar to the comparisons that we've had in the past in the PDF format, but now you have them online. And we have these comparisons for the past five years.
Please know that the dashboards that contain the AAU information are available to senators and executive leadership only, per our data sharing agreement that we have with AAU. So, we've used some access roles in limiting access to the AAU, but everyone on this call does have access to the AAU comparisons.

There are some tenure line faculty dashboards for the commonwealth campuses that are available by division and rank. I do want to note that with the implementation of SIMBA some of the longitudinal data for some categories are not available at this time. We're going to have to do some backward conversion to get some of the longitudinal data. For some instances, you'll see 2020 data but not 2019 data.

For the non-tenure line dashboards, we have those at the college and campus level by rank. And again, as I mentioned earlier, we have gender binary data at this point in Workday, but we hope to make those more granular and more respectful gendered identities when we have the data available in Workday. Please don't hesitate to go in and look at some of the medians and the percentiles. Toggle from various years and gender. And we do have data available for Medicine and for libraries-- you'll see those in separate dashboards-- that we want to thank the College of Medicine, the libraries, for providing that data so that we can build these dashboards.

Ira Saltz: I just want to thank Karen for all of her work on this report every year and in helping to make the data more readily available. I want to repeat that now the data that has the comparisons with the other institutions is available to the senators only, but the other dashboards are available to all faculty. So, if faculty are logged in on their Penn State account, they can now access the dashboards.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Thank you both. Are there any questions? I think we have one. Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel: We've got a comment from Tommen at Libraries. Just wanted to share how much folks appreciate this data being opened up. The interactive dashboards are helpful for analyzing the data and it brought up lots of questions in our unit, good questions that should be addressed. Kudos.

Chair Seymour: And I would like to-- I'm sorry. And I would like to also thank Karen. I know Ira and your committees worked with her, but I've had conversations. I really appreciate the work you've done to open this up.

Ira Saltz: I just wanted to add that those questions, for example that the libraries want to ask, certainly send them along to the committee because we also want to ask questions and try and find answers.

Chair Seymour: That's a good point Ira, thank you. Are there any other questions?

Bonj Szczygiel: No.

Chair Seymour: Excellent. Thank you both. Thank you, Karen. Thank you, Ira. Thank you for your work.
Penn State First Report

Chair Seymour: The next report is from the Senate Committee on Global Programs Penn State First Report and can be found in Appendix Q. It is a web only report.

Chair Seymour: We have four reports from the Senate Committee on Libraries Information Systems and Technology.


Chair Seymour: The first is titled Overview of University Libraries COVID-19 Response for Enabling Increased Access for Remote Teaching and Learning. And the report can be found in Appendix R. Dace Freivalds, Interim Associate Dean for Strategic Technologies Penn State University Libraries will present the report.

Dace Freivalds, Interim Associate Dean for Strategic Technologies Penn State University Libraries: Good afternoon, everybody. I will take just a few minutes to talk about the libraries' COVID-19 response. And like everyone else, we had to alter our approach to providing resources and services to the University community while minimizing risk and inconvenience to our users as well as to our library’s employees. And since you have our full report in slides, I'm going to highlight just a few of the adjustments that we made during the pandemic.

The pandemic disrupted direct physical access to our physical resources, including our print course reserves, and this prompted us to obtain more e-books and other electronic resources with multi-user licenses. Fortunately, the libraries were able to secure one-time financial support for the purchase of electronic resources, ebooks, streaming, video, et cetera. And we will continue to enhance electronic access to our library’s collections, while continuing to acquire print and other resources as needed.

We also took advantage of free access to various electronic resources that would normally require subscription services. Unfortunately, these offers were available only from March through May of 2020. But one service that continues to be particularly important for Penn State students and faculty during the pandemic is the HathiTrust Emergency Temporary Access Service, or ETAS for short.

HathiTrust is a repository of digital content that has been created collaboratively by academic and research institutions. This service provides Penn State users with access to approximately 8.4 million digital volumes, including about 1.7 million in copyright items from our own print collections. And as a result, Penn State users have had access to about one half of the library's print collections through HathiTrust ETAS. And usage of the ETAS has been significant, with about 300 unique checkouts per day during fall semester.

Another particularly successful service that we introduced in August 2020, was the curbside pickup of library materials. Initially, this service was truly curbside at the Curtin Road patio of Pattee Paterno Library. The service transitioned to indoor self-service pickup in January 2021, and that allowed us to eliminate the need to schedule pick up times and to also offer extended pickup hours into the evening.

Our users rely heavily on our Interlibrary Loan Departments to borrow materials from other libraries, scan materials from our own collections, and deliver materials to faculty staff offices and residential
addresses for distance patrons. Despite the challenges resulting from the disruption of these physical services in March, the department was able to continue to provide a high number of materials to Penn State users by scanning from electronic resources. And at this point, the operations have for the most part returned to normal despite limited staffing.

The University Libraries was also a valued instructional partner during COVID remote teaching and distance learning. In addition to offering remote synchronous and asynchronous workshops to over 700 course sections, the Libraries Instruction and Reference faculty and staff quickly built an integrated web-based learning objects, such as information literacy badges and original Canvas modules into more than 60 course sections by the end of the spring 2020 semester. And by the end of fall 2020, we had supported our students by offering more than 1,600 information literacy and research skills workshops, the majority of which were remote.

When the library buildings closed in March, our existing virtual Ask A Librarian service became an even more important way for students, faculty, and others to get assistance with library collections, databases and other resources. This service is staffed for 81 hours per week by libraries employees from nearly all Penn State campuses and provides reference consultation via chat, email, text message and phone.

In addition, our welcome desk service moved to a virtual environment for the fall 2020 semester. So, while employees may not be in the building physically, patrons who come on site are able to converse with staff by a Zoom connected computer screens at the Pattee Library and Paterno Library entrances and exits. And the staff continue to offer the same level of service for library users as they did in person. And as our students gradually returned on site, as did everybody else, we reconfigured our library spaces to put social distancing and masking measures in place. And we’re trying to be responsive to user needs.

For example, based on student feedback, we have gradually expanded Pattee Paterno's opening hours and are now also open on Sundays. And we are continuing to assess hours as we transition into summer and then fall, so that we can meet our users’ needs.

Finally, I want to end by noting that we are evaluating how best to provide our services as we transition to being back on site in the fall. During the summer, we hope to compile lessons learned, review data we have collected, and think about which services are worthwhile to carry over into our new normal. So, thank you. And I’m happy to answer a question or two if there’s time.

Chair Seymour: Thank you so much. I think we do have a question. Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel: This is from Star Sharp student. Dr Ellysa Cahoy had online Zoom hours and created personalized instructional videos. I cannot say enough about the value of our subject matter, librarians. If you are not utilizing their services, you are truly missing out.

Dace Freivalds: Thank you. That was a wonderful comment. And yes, as I said, because of the time constraints there was only a few services that I could mention. And I'm sure all of our librarians across the entire state at all of our campuses are providing similar services. So, thank you for that.

Chair Seymour: Thank you Star Sharp and she's a graduate student senator from the College of Education.

Dace Freivalds: OK. Thank you.
Chair Seymour: Any other questions, Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel: Seeing none.

Chair Seymour: Well, thank you so much for that report.

**Penn State Go mobile application**

Chair Seymour: All right. We have another list report, the Penn State Go Mobile Application, and it can be found in Appendix S and it is a web only report.

**Digital Fluency Project at Penn State Greater Allegheny**

Chair Seymour: Next from the LIST is the Digital Fluency Project at Penn State Greater Allegheny and is in appendix T. Megan Nagel, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Associate Chief Academic Officer, and Honors Coordinator at Penn State Greater Allegheny, will present the report.

Megan Nagel, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Associate Chief Academic Officer, and Honors Coordinator at Penn State Greater Allegheny: Hi, good afternoon. I guess good evening at this point. Thank you for allowing me time to talk about this important initiative at Penn State Greater Allegheny, which is a campus just outside of Pittsburgh.

In August of 2018, which at this point goes about two decades ago, we launched the digital fluency project which is a project where we intended-- well I guess I'll describe it on the next slide. Prepare the next generation of students to not only have a particular knowledge of a particular tool, but to use digital tools to embrace problems and solve them. Be ethical consumers and producers of knowledge that will address social changes as they arise.

This is not digital literacy, which focuses only on the development or creation of information. This is something deeper and growing and changing as the digital platform grows and changes. And so, what this amount to is that every student, staff, and faculty member on our campus was issued an iPad in August of 2018. So why were we given iPads? Probably the most practical reason is that these are a low-cost device that allows us to all have a shared experience and a shared digital platform.

This is funded with a mix of campus and donor funds. And the goal is to be 100% donor funded and sustained. The iPads were chosen because these are familiar. Most students have at least had some experience with an Apple device. I have to admit this was the first Apple device that I had ever used, but it became just part of my everyday way that I did my work.

Every student was also given a Logitech pencil. So, everybody also had the ability to use the touch screen and manipulate the pen online. IPad has a high-quality camera, has the opportunity for mouse and Bluetooth keyboard. It also is important for ADA accessibility issues. Those features are baked right into Apple products.

And you might be thinking, well don't you need a desktop to do a lot of the things that we ask college students to do? And it turns out that we can use the Citrix Virtual Desktop to run a lot of even pretty heavy lifts, in terms of bandwidth required to run. Like engineering software and SolidWorks, and things
like that. Sort of a lesser opportunity here is to become an Apple distinguished school, which is sort of just a little star we could put by our campus's name.

The impact on teaching was immediate. This is back when things were normal. We were in person printing a lot of papers. And just for some context, by fall of 2019-- I was someone who was printing and giving handouts constantly. By fall of 2019, I gave a presentation called The Paperless Classroom. People were ready and eager to jump on this tool. These are just some examples of students using apps in their engineering courses, students being able to give their answers and get feedback.

I know historians were doing digital timelines on their iPads. Our English faculty were grading papers and giving feedback from Canvas digitally. It really transformed the way we were doing things before we were forced to transform the way we were doing things.

And so, when we were forced online because of COVID, it was a-- it wasn't an easy shift. But we had an easier time than a lot of other campuses because we had these tools, and this shared experience already in our students' hands. There are also opportunities for increased engagement.

These are screenshots from my own classroom from this past fall when I was teaching in person. It's also a nice device for using Top Hat. Students can-- which is the free software that we have at Penn State-- so students can toggle back and forth between the notes they're taking on one note using their pencil and between Top Hat. It's a highly engaging experience.

And this is also-- again, I want to reiterate that every student, staff, and faculty member has an iPad-- so this is also impacting what students and staff and faculty are doing beyond the classroom. On the left is a picture of a student at The Learning Center engaging in their office hours with a tutor via Zoom. And on the right is a student that is using their iPad as a low-cost spectrometer in an undergraduate research lab.

We've collected some data on the digital fluency project from both faculty and student’s surveys, so you can get a quick idea of some of the types of questions we were asking them. And the common themes that came back when we were probing those questions was that the iPad allowed access, which is so important on our campus where we have a large population of underserved and first-generation students. They addressed themes of affordability, the ability to collaborate, which was especially important in this past year.

Even pre-COVID, we had faculty holding office hours at home. On days where we weren't able to come to campus, we would be able to still connect with our students before it was the thing that we did anyways. They're easy to use and they're so thankful to have this device. We have some students who have never had such a nice device. I mean, just an iPad, but they carry it around literally in the box that we hand it to them in because they're so nervous that they're going to break it.

You can see that they comment on having an iPad allows them to use digital books. They recognize that it levels the playing field in terms of access for students. And you can see a comment from a student who is hearing impaired and how they're able to use the iPad with the Bluetooth technology when they have to attend class via Zoom.

From the faculty side, you can see how faculty are using it for library research skills. They don't have to worry about-- if you ask students to do something, you don't have to worry about some students having a
really nice laptop and other students trying to do everything on their phone. This shared device allows us to see an even playing field.

All right and I will stop there to see if there's any questions, but just one final thing before I end is that this quickly became part of the fabric of our campus. You see people with their iPads all the time. And the small size of the iPad allows us to be quickly stowed in a backpack or even a purse and so they're just sort of something that's just part of what we do at Penn State Greater Allegheny. And I'm so thankful that we're a campus that was able to pilot this project. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Thank you so much, Megan. Do we have any questions, Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel: No. But that's such a cool project. No questions, no hands.

Chair Seymour: If you have a question, please put it in Q&A or raise your hand. But I agree with Bonj, thank you, that's a fantastic initiative you're doing at Penn State Greater Allegheny. It's really, really awesome. I think we have a Q&A.

Bonj Szczygiel: We do. Michelle Stein from HHD. How much campus-wide training was needed for faculty to be able to use the iPads on the fly in class?

Megan Nagel: So, we're a small campus. We didn't have a ton of campus-wide training. We did have Apple come a few times to-- but of course they're trying to show us how to use Apple products, which isn't always the best fit for what we're trying to do.

But our local IT was really, really helpful. And quite honestly, we just formed pods of faculty who had shared questions and we've really supported each other in that way. I've learned more about using an iPad from my fellow colleagues than any other resource.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Bonj, are there any other questions?

Bonj Szczygiel: Another question from Josh Kirby, Education. What resources were given to faculty to modify course materials and redesign courses?

Megan Nagel: None. And we didn't-- there was no expectation. There are probably some faculty who still have their iPad in a box and don't use it regularly. But I would say the vast majority of faculty and students use it.

Chair Seymour: Good questions. Do we have any other questions?

Bonj Szczygiel: Well, this is a leading one. This is from Jacob Moore from Alto. How would this work alongside the laptop initiative that is being discussed later today? And I think that's coming right up.

Megan Nagel: I mean, to me this serves a different function than an iPad-- or than a laptop. Unless you have a really nice tablet that you can ink on. I mean, that's really one of the best advantages. And the small size of the iPad. I mean, if it turns out that every Penn State student at our campus also has a laptop, I think we use both devices for different purposes, but that waits to be seen.

Chair Seymour: Any other questions?
Bonj Szczygiel: That's it.

Chair Seymour: Well, thank you Megan. Thank you for the presentation. We really appreciated it.

Megan Nagel: All right. Thank you.

The Student Laptop Initiative

Chair Seymour: Next, the final report from LIST is the Student Laptop Initiative and can be found in Appendix U. Jennifer Sparrow, Deputy CIO and Associate Vice President for Teaching and Learning with Technology will be presenting the report. Hi Jennifer.

Jennifer Sparrow, Deputy CIO and Associate Vice President for Teaching and Learning with Technology: Hey there, everybody. How are you this afternoon? Or this evening, I guess. And thanks for the leading questions into this presentation because I do think that we get great information from this project that's going on at Greater Allegheny and it will inform what we're doing with student laptop initiative and the recommendations that the committee makes.

We've been working closely TLT and Penn State IT have been working closely with Jackie Edmondson and the teams there at Greater Allegheny and the IT groups to understand what's working, what's not working, what are the challenges, and how can we go from there.

But just to give you a little bit of background, the student laptop initiative is a pilot project right now that's looking at the potential of a student laptop requirement. And we're working with the College of IST with a cohort of about 250 students this fall to begin to think about what does it mean to have a student laptop requirement?

How does it address those things as you just heard about, access and equity? How do we ensure that students have the tools that they need in order to do the work that they're doing? And how does it lead to digital fluency? Which again is this idea that we're creating 21st century digital citizens that are able to utilize the technology and use it to be creators of new knowledge.

You've heard that from me before if you've been sitting at Senate. We're looking right now at several computer models that right now for the pilot are being defined by the College of IST. But as we look at what this would look like on a larger scale, we're looking at what different college and campus needs would be in place.

What we want to be able to do is have a strong enough computer that gets students through all four years of their undergraduate education-- four or five-- but also would allow us to, if a student switches majors, that it would be flexible enough to meet those needs. So, we're working very closely with our vendors and the colleges and campuses as we begin to roll this out, what this looks like. To understand what are those questions that we need answered as we move forward.

And then finally we're able to get some better savings for students and some extended warranties and additional benefits because we have these strong vendor partnerships. And by defining a smaller subset of computer models, we're better able to serve student needs in that space.
You might be asking why we're talking about this now. Certainly, through One Penn State 2025, this is a foundational, or as Nick Jones said a necessary condition of getting to a single student experience for One Penn State 2025. Both guiding principles one and guiding principles three have discussed the student laptop requirements, so we're moving forward with this.

As we mentioned before, there's some equity and access issues that we're hoping to address. So, what does this mean for our students with the greatest need? We don't want to be adding on to student loan debt, so are their opportunities to include development and alumni relations and some potential fundraising here?

But again, we want to ensure that every student has access to the technology they need in order to be successful in their degree program. Obviously, with a continuity of operations-- and I appreciated the Greater Allegheny case here-- they were able to shift maybe a little bit more smoothly because they knew that every student had the technology necessary, and the faculty had access to the technology necessary for students to continue remote learning when we had to make that shift.

We are looking at pedagogical affordances. So, I appreciated Josh's question about what support was given to faculty as we move forward here. In the College of IST, they're looking at specific courses that will leverage these laptops within the coursework themselves. So, students will be asked to bring these laptops to their classes.

And certainly, we're looking across the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence, TLT, the additional faculty development groups within the colleges and at the campuses. If this were to rollout, what kinds of supports would we need from both an instructional design and from an information technology perspective?

And as we continue to think about the digital delivery of textbooks or additional resources that the library has available and our work with open and affordable educational resources and potential delivery of digital textbooks, this is one more enabling factor for that. We have four task forces or as Maureen was saying, maybe some sub-sub-sub-task forces here. I thought maybe I should develop some more just to one sub her in this.

We've got four task forces that will be working as a part of this larger group. Technical specifications. So, we'll be working closely with faculty in this, college and campus IT directors. If you're interested in volunteering for that technical specifications group, please reach out to me after this presentation. We're happy to get more faculty into those conversations.

The most complex and probably where we have the most questions is the financial aid and purchasing piece here. So, we've got at equity undergraduate ed, obviously, D dots, corporate relations, desktop support, and hopefully additional faculty that will help us think about these equity issues and how we best leverage the resources of Penn State and student access to financial aid. To make sure that if we were to roll this out University wide, we would be able to do so in a way that didn't add on to student debt and make this a more significant burden.

From an infrastructure perspective, we're looking at what kinds of things do we need to have in place in terms of Wi-Fi. How are we ensuring that we have a laptop loaner program that's easy and accessible for all students at all of the campuses? What would this look like long term in terms of remote charging capabilities? Because we know we don't have enough charging capabilities within our classrooms.
And so, we're looking at that piece of it. And then finally, and for the most exciting part for me, is this pedagogical affordance that happen. And you heard a very great example of what happens when faculty have access to these technologies, and they're ensured that all students have access to these technologies. So, I couldn't have planned this better if I did by having that Greater Allegheny presentation immediately before this.

And again, we're looking for faculty and particularly Senate representation on all of these committees. So, we have not had our kickoff meeting yet. I'll talk about that timeline in just a moment. But the goal is that we've got this oversight committee here that will work through the College of IST pilot and then be able to make some recommendations.

Our timeline, as you can see here, we're already well into March and actually nearing May. But we've got the project team formed. We are working closely with Chris Milito, who's on this call, the College of IST IT director, and the dean and additional members of the College of IST, to plan for this fall implementation for 250 incoming freshmen. We're going to be identifying those laptop specs, pricing, and the financial aid piece of this.

We're about 2/3 of the way through with that. So, the laptop specs and the pricing have been set. And we're working on how do we get students that exhibit the need within this pilot the financial resources necessary in order to get this in place. And then we'll gather more data as we go through the fall semester. Obviously, April, we're presenting this plan today to you and faculty Senate, so we made that timeline. The project kickoff is actually happening on Monday. So that needs to be moved to May, a sub-bullet. But we're getting there, and we will have an initial kickoff.

And then we envision throughout June, July, and August that we'll be working extensively to identify the questions and begin to gather the appropriate resources to understand what questions we have in place. We'll begin the pilot in the fall of 2021 and begin again to gather the data and start to assess the pilot so we can make a recommendation in early spring on whether or not this is something that would be recommended for a full University rollout. And if so, we think we would be able to have that in place by the fall of 2022.

If not, we obviously would need to go answer more deep questions. We had a question this morning at the LIST subcommittee. Is this just for undergraduates? Could we leverage this for graduate students as well? And certainly, we're looking initially at undergraduates, but the graduate and professional students, if there's an interest, we would be willing to explore that once we've got through this pilot phase.

I know it's the end of the day. Any questions, comments, or concerns? And I will stop my video.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you. Thank you, Jennifer. Any questions?

**Bonj Szczygiel:** We have no hands, no questions.

**Chair Seymour:** Give it just a minute in case we got one coming in. Thank you so much for the presentation though, Jennifer.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** We do.
Chair Seymour: And I appreciate your patience. Oh, we have one.

Bonj Szczygiel: We do. We have a question from Randy Haluck from communications. Do you know what percentage of current students own and use a laptop? It seems that most would already.

Jennifer Sparrow: Great question, Randy. We are gathering information on that. We have some informal information that we got from when we made the shift to remote, and we made loaner laptops available to students. So, we know that that's a pretty small number. We are also getting data rolling in on our incoming class of first year students through new student orientation, that 93% of students have a laptop that has a webcam that they think is good enough to do the work that we're doing.

We will continue to delve into that data to ensure that that's actually the case. And then we will be working closely throughout the fall semester on the best ways to do these assessments at our campuses and within the colleges, to understand are the computers that students are bringing truly powerful enough to do what they need to do.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Are there any other questions, Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel: None popping up.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Jennifer. I appreciate your patience waiting this long to present. Thank you so much.

Statewide Continuing Education Presentation

Chair Seymour: The Faculty Senate Committee on Outreach has a report titled Statewide Continuing Education Presentation to the Faculty Senate on Outreach and is in Appendix V. This report is web only.

Anticipated Changes in Policy AD77, AC80, and RP06 Due to New Federal Regulations and Guidance

Chair Seymour: Thank you everybody for hanging in there. Just a couple of more reports. Next, the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity sponsors a report entitled Anticipated Changes in Policy AD77, AC80, and RP06 Due to New Federal Regulations and Guidance in Appendix W. Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Debra Thurley, Assistant Vice President for Research Protections, and Clinton Schmidt, Director of the Conflict-of-Interest Program, Office of Research Protections, are here to present the report. Thank you all for being here.

Debra Thurley, Assistant Vice President for Research Protections: Thank you, Beth. This is Debra Thurley and Clint, and Kathy are here in case we have some questions that they can help me out with. But I'm going to go ahead and take us through the slides today. So, if I can do this correctly.

All right. Just a brief agenda. I want to just talk to you a little bit about the policies that we're talking about today and sort of where we were and thinking about some potential changes with those policies, even before the federal government started making some changes on us that would impact these policies.

So, I'll get a little bit into what those federal changes are. Not a lot of time to go over them in any kind of detail, so if anyone out there wants more detail and would like to have a further conversation, I'm always
happy that to engage in that outside of the Faculty Senate meeting. And then talk about what our ideas are for next steps to accomplish these necessary policy changes.

So, what does the current environment look like with policies? And specifically, I'm talking about three policies that our office, the Office for Research Protections oversees. And there's RP06, which is Financial Conflicts of Interest. And this is specific to research. This is focused on disclosures of significant financial interest that are related to University research.

And then there's AC80, which is time spent on Outside Business Activities. So those could be financial or non-financial activities that faculty-- this is specific to faculty-- engage in outside of their University time. And then there's AD77, which is the Conflict of Commitment policy, which has a focus on outside teaching and academic activities.

As you can see, all three of them require disclosures of some kind and they have some common themes. Typically, we're getting a lot of confusion about the disclosure requirements among the three policies. What was required, which policies required it. We also knew that there was similar information being disclosed at different times and in different forms and that felt redundant for faculty.

We, for some time, had this goal to try to streamline the disclosure process to reduce the multiple reports of similar information. As we were discussing this and discussing how to make improvements, the federal government started making some changes as well that impacts our policies. It really started in 2019-2020, from agencies like NIH, Department of Energy, Department of Defense, NSF, who said they were just making clarifications to current policies which required researchers to disclose activities that they do related to their research, but outside of the institution that was applying for the funding.

This was really a big change because most people listed other support, other activities that they did as part of their role with the University, but typically didn't list things that they did outside of their time at the institution. So, this was a really big change back in 2019-2020. Although the federal government didn't see it as a change. They saw it as a clarification.

And we've really been kind of stepping up those changes, all the way up until January when there was a National Security Presidential Memorandum issued and some recommendations that came out of JCORE. I'm going to talk about those in a minute. But also, more recently, since I made these slides, we had some further clarifications from the NIH on this issue.

You can kind of see the changes and the clarifications and things kind of keep coming from the federal government. It's a little bit of a moving target right now. But we have a law, the 2021 NDAA, which was expanded to include financial interests and non-financial resources. This law is saying that those applying for federal funds for their research need to make sure they're disclosing both financial kinds of interests, like income and gifts, as well as non-financial things, like equipment, lab space, affiliate appointments, and things like that at other institutions.

And we have a few more things on the screen there and the one I want to point out is the National Security Presidential Memorandum which requires all federal agencies to establish both conflict of interest and conflict of commitment policies within 12 months. So that would be January of 2022. Most of the major agencies like NIH have conflict of interest policies, but there are some, like DOE and DOD, that don't. Those are still forthcoming. We haven't seen any movement on that.
And then there was the JCORE recommended practices that came out at the same time as the security memorandum. And it was sort of a companion document to go along with the memorandum to really make recommendations to institutions. And the big thing about the JCORE recommendations, is that it was the first time that most of the federal agencies came together and were able to agree on a set of recommendations.

And I sort of had some highlights there. But you can see, what the highlights really are is that it really shows the federal government's desire for researchers and institutions to increase their transparency, increase disclosures by researchers, and increase responsibilities on part of the institutions for making sure that the researchers are disclosing as required to the federal funding agencies. And this also really comes from sort of the focus that we've seen from the federal government on foreign affiliations or undue foreign-- what they would call undue foreign influence on federal funded research.

As you can see from the highlighted area, really the focus there on things that institutions should be doing. To increase their oversight, to make sure it's clear, expectations about openness and transparency, to increase training in these areas, to really make sure we're being effective with our compliance and our organizational policies, and to make sure we're managing potential risks appropriately.

What are some potential policy changes that we see that Penn State may need to do in response to the federal government initiative that I just summarized for you? One thing-- and we were considering this already, too, before the federal government started acting-- but we were considering whether we could remove the requirements from AD77 that apply to faculty and move those over to AC80.

AD77 and AC80 cause a lot of confusion for folks. AC80, like I mentioned, only applies to faculty. So, we thought we could take those requirements from AD77 that apply to faculty and just add them to AC80, so there's only one policy that faculty need to look at when they're looking at conflicts of commitment outside activities, outside teaching.

And then, we know that there are some activities that different colleges have instituted under AD77, to say these things will always require pre-approval. And there was a lot of consistency there. So, we thought we could take those consistent things and also put them in the pre-approval list under AC80.

And then some of the things that we think we likely need to do to our policies, based on the federal developments, is expanding the list of activities that require disclosure and more frequent disclosures by our faculty. Required disclosures of some non-appointment period activities. Right now, AC80 just applies to the academic appointment period. So, we may need to go beyond that.

And then possibly changes to RP06, which I mentioned is the research focused conflict of interest policy. And again, that may depend on what we see coming out of the agencies that we haven't seen come out yet. We're a little bit in a holding pattern there for that. But really these things are all about meeting the requirements from the federal government, like I mentioned before, that are really expanding those things that they want researchers to disclose when they're applying for funding.

So, what are our next steps? What we'd really like to work this summer, we'd like to form a committee and we'd like to have some faculty senators and faculty participate in that committee with us. With people like Clint from our office, the subject matter experts, participate on a committee to make some changes and make some possible recommended changes to the policies I was just talking about. We'd like
to do that over the summer because our hopes are by the fall, when faculty Senate starts meeting again, that we'd be able to come and bring those recommended changes to the faculty Senate.

I think that's all I want to say. I know I talked really fast. Again, if there are any questions now, I can take them, or if people have questions offline, I'm always happy to respond to email.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Debra. Do we have any questions, Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel: We do not.

Chair Seymour: Just a reminder, if you any questions, please put them in the Q&A or raise your hand. Give it just a second in case someone's typing furiously.

Bonj Szczygiel: That was a lot of information.

Chair Seymour: It was a lot of information. Thank you. This is really important. So, thank you, all senators, for your patience, and for the presenters for waiting to this point in the meeting.

Debra Thurley: Thank you for your time.

Chair Seymour: It looks like we're good. No questions. Thank you everybody. Thank you, Kathy, Debra, and Clinton.

Debra Thurley: Sure. Take care.

University Counseling and Psychological services, CAPS

Chair Seymour: The Senate Committee on Student Life sponsors the report on the University Counseling and Psychological services, CAPS, which can be found in Appendix X. Chair Robicheaux will present the report.

Tim Robicheaux: Hi, everyone. I have five minutes to present a 13-page report after 6:00 PM now. I'm going to do it quickly. I'm going to give you some background. And then I'm just going to say please read the report. That's the main goal.

We're talking about issues of mental health with our students. I don't know if my internet is unstable. I'm going to go off camera to see if this works. All right.

Hopefully you can hear me now. We're talking about mental health among our students. It's one of the most important issues in general here. And so, I want to give you a little bit of background for my involvement in this and then what we've learned.

Prior to me to joining Faculty Senate, a former student gave a talk in one of my classes about stigma she experienced as a result of her mental illness status. And during the speech, she made a statement reflecting dissatisfaction with CAPS. Other students chimed in with the primary concern as being that they couldn't get appointments, they were put on waitlists, et cetera.
At the time, because I knew this student well, I was hurt. I was angry. And I wanted to advocate for students. And so, I took my concerns to a forum, a listserv, that was much, much larger than I realized. I had really good discussions with a lot of my colleagues, but my decision to air it publicly was hurtful to individuals who work extremely hard for our students' mental health. And felt and still feel some residual guilt for doing that.

Fast forward several years to last year, my first year chairing the Student Life Committee and one of the charges was to broadly examine student mental health and services at Penn State. Now we had a proper venue to look into this.

Over the past two years, our committees had full cooperation of CAPS. I'm particularly thankful to Dr. Ben Locke, the director of CAPS. Kate Staley, who is no longer at CAPS, she went on to a different position, but was extremely helpful in this process. And I appreciate CAPS staff across the commonwealth campuses who replied to a brief survey that I sent to them outside of University Park.

Ben met with me and met with the committee multiple times. And I will just say that Ben met with me for well over an hour several years ago, in what was not an ideal circumstance. He's been extremely transparent, very helpful. He's met with our committee more than once.

And I am able to serve now on CAPS Advisory Board, a mental health task force that Ben leads. And I have just learned a ton about CAPS and what they do. And the experience has taught me things that I wish I knew before.

A common misunderstanding of many faculty, students, parents, is just what CAPS is intended to do in the first place. So, the majority of students visiting campus counseling services have already seen a counselor or therapist, which you can find more stats in the report. Many students and faculty and staff might be used to weekly or biweekly hour-long counseling sessions for an unlimited number of sessions. You have insurance, it's awesome.

And even people who aren't familiar, who have not received treatment, it fits the stereotype. You go to a counselor when you want to, as many times. So, some students have experienced a level of dismay when they call CAPS and they're told, you're going to be on a waiting list right now. Or when they learn that the number of sessions are limited.

Maybe they're told that they're going to go to a group session or they're able to go into group session, when prior to attending college, they're used to one-on-one attention. This is the main thing that our committee learned about CAPS that sort of changes the entire viewpoint of what CAPS does. CAPS has the capacity to give direct counseling services to approximately 10% of the student body during a given period. This is thousands of students right. And this demand has nearly doubled in the past decade. So sometimes demand outweighs supply.

Direct CAPS counseling services are effectively divided into two categories. The first is rapid access or urgent care. This is for students who are in crisis.

Defined as people who are presenting a threat to themselves or to others, or those whose mental state causes difficulty with normal functioning. These services typically include a 50-minute same day or next morning service and there could be other crisis appointments within. The goal is to evaluate and to stabilize the student.
The other category is short term, emphasis on short term, treatment. This is treatment offered in a limited capacity as serving the prior population allows. That is the prior population, the at-risk people, the crisis people, get priority.

The average number of treatment sessions ends up being about 4.5 sessions per student. While the waiting list fills up very quickly at the beginning of the semester, sometimes within a couple of weeks, CAPS tends to see all students on the waitlist who eventually choose to attend. They give people offers, sometimes students just decide not to go, or maybe they found community care. But students who want to be seen typically are seen during the semester once the waitlist starts.

In the meantime, group counseling is available. And anyone who's on that waiting list, and if things go poorly if things go in a direction that puts them into crisis, you're not stuck on a waitlist. CAPS will re-evaluate. And this is actually one place where students need to be advocates for themselves, but faculty can also be because if a student calls CAPS and says, I'm experiencing these things, and it doesn't fully convey a level of crisis, a faculty member might be a good person to step in and say it's maybe worse than they're saying it is.

CAPS has been heavily supported by the University, by the administration, by our students. In the past five years, CAPS has received increased annual funding at both University Park and at the Commonwealth campuses. There were donations from President Barron, Vice President Sims, and Vice President Haynes. Student fee increases at UP and on campus locations went directly to CAPS. These were student-initiated fees, just to be clear.

The most recent graduating class is dedicating their class gift to CAPS. Lots of people want to see this work. One of the biggest concerns of CAPS staff at campus locations, back before the pandemic, was student access to psychiatric service. Several wish for telepsychiatry access. Lack of psychiatry care or access is a national issue, particularly in more rural areas.

At the start of the pandemic, the University committed funds to contract with telepsychiatry services, making sure that students at campus locations do have access and continue to have access to telepsychiatry. The contract with Mantra Health will allow this to continue during the next year and likely beyond.

CAPS had to quickly react during the pandemic because licensing rules limited counseling for out-of-state students. Read the report, but they did that. And they did so quickly and efficiently. Very impressive work.

Mental health is not merely therapy and treatment. Overall wellness is important. CAPS offers a variety of tools, virtual tools. From YOU@PSU to Life Hack Kits, which you can use in a classroom, to drop-in discussions, and support groups and a whole lot more. CAPS staff have worked hard to make these accessible for faculty to utilize in their courses particularly, Life Hack Kits. But it's worth checking out YOU@PSU. Lots of helpful videos, et cetera.

Services will return to something closer to normal in the fall, barring a change in conditions. However, CAPS will continue to offer many virtual services. YOU@PSU will continue to grow. Manta Health will allow campus location students access telepsychiatry, and if needed will provide overflow care through telemedicine, telecounseling when necessary, If CAPS fills up quickly, which may happen. Because this
upcoming year might be particularly difficult for student mental health, it is a concern when speaking with representatives of CAPS and from parent groups and others in a recent meeting that I had.

There's concern among rising sophomores in particular. They will have a lot more adjustments than other students. Students who have only had access to alternative grading in their college career will not have that anymore. Open book tests and similar things, being able to watch a recorded lecture, will become less common. There may be more work, more stress. Plus, there will be some strange social conditions to navigate, as some students are setting foot on campus for the first time, whereas others have been here for part of the year.

Faculty play a large role in mental wellness of students and empathy in the upcoming year is something that CAPS staff assures will be helpful to them. The Red Folder is still online at redfolder.psu.edu. It is a guide to help faculty staff and others who interact with students to recognize, respond effectively to, and refer distressed students at Penn State. It will continue to be useful during what, hopefully isn't, but could be a temporary crisis of sorts.

I beg you to read the full report. Do more research if you wish. I feel strongly that our students are in really good hands at CAPS. And I now would advocate for them in a heartbeat. One thing that Ben Locke told me early on is if faculty don't believe everything negative students say about CAPS, then CAPS staff will not believe everything negative that students say about people who teach them. And I think that's kind of a good way to end this.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, Tim. Are there any questions for Tim?

**Bonj Szczysgiel:** There are no questions right now.

**Tim Robicheaux:** Thank you all.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you for that, Tim. I agree CAPS does phenomenal work. It's exceedingly important for our students. It looks like we don't have any questions. Thank you so much, Tim.

**The Elections Commission Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2021-2022**

**Chair Seymour:** Let's move on to our last couple of reports. The Elections Commission Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2021-2022. This is a web only report.

**The Report of Senate Elections**

**Chair Seymour:** And finally, the Report of Senate Elections can be found in Appendix Z of your agenda. Thank you to everyone who stood for elections this year.

Anna, could you give us the vote? Could you put it up?

**Anna Butler:** Can you see it?

**Chair Seymour:** Yes, we can see it. Thank you.
Anna Butler: The first report, Removal of Gendered and Binary Terms from Course and Program Descriptions, appendix C, was accepted by 125 to 13. Mandate a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Annual Report, appendix D, was also accepted by 115 to eight. Report on Parental Leave, Appendix E, also passed by 120 to three. Statement Opposing Racism, Asian, Asian-American, Asian Pacific Islander Communities, and Support for our Penn State community passed by 113 to one. And the report about the More Rivers to Cross and Academic Racism at Penn State Part 2, passed by 114 to four.

Chair Seymour: Thank you everyone for voting today and taking part in our work.

______________________________
COMMENTS FROM THE OUTGOING CHAIR

Chair Seymour: Now we come to the very end. I'll make this very brief. It's been my privilege to serve as Chair of the Senate for the past year. The Senate has accomplished much this year due to our collective efforts. It has been my honor to lead us, and I thank you for this opportunity.

Chair Seymour: During these extraordinary times, the University faculty, instructors, staff, students, and the administration have risen to the occasion, doing a fabulous job. Thank you for all your efforts and I hope you have time to take a break this summer. As I noted at the beginning of our meeting, there is much hard work and important work ahead of us.

I now turn to Bonj and offer her my full support as she leads us forward. At this point, it's a tradition that the Chair-Elect and Chair exchange gifts, so we're going to do that.

Bonj Szczygiel: Thank you, Beth.

Chair Seymour: These might seem like interesting gifts. Let's just say Bonj and I have worked closely together all year and so we know the perfect gifts. Do I go first? I go first. I get first hopefully.

For those of you who know me, I Like Beer and I like IPA and—

Bonj Szczygiel: Further clarification, these will be artisan crafted beer mugs. Not just your beer mug from Walmart, sorry.

Chair Seymour: Oh boy. Look.

Bonj Szczygiel: Well, this seems really odd. I know. Some of you may know I was in a crash of sorts. My bike bolted, reared up against a curb. The helmet was crashed, bike took a hit. Somehow, I managed to come out OK. Thank you, Beth, I've got a bike helmet and it will serve me well.

Chair Seymour: And Bonj did break a few things.

Bonj Szczygiel: Yeah.

Chair Seymour: Let me just finish a little bit more. Thank you. Seating of the new officers. It is now time to seat the officers.
Maureen Jones, as the new Chair-Elect, will take Bonj Szczygiel’s place. And Bonj, as the new Chair, you’re now taking my place. Lisa Mangel will continue to sit in the same place. Let us all congratulate Maureen and Lisa.

Bonj, it is now-- It is now my honor to pass you the gavel. You're a phenomenal leader and we are lucky to have you serving in the role of Chair this year. Bonj, it's your agenda now.

Chair Szczygiel: This is exciting. Well, thank you all for however many of you have remained because listen, what you'll find out about me, you give me a microphone and I can talk. But I will not do that tonight. We will make this very, very brief.

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

We have L, New Legislative Business. Is there any new business for the floor? And it is weird standing up here talking about information. something Q&A.

Victor Brunsden: Q&A. It's a comment from Judy Ozment.

Erin Eckley: Some artisan crafted beer mugs for Beth and then an even bigger receptacle for Bonj.

Chair Szczygiel: Oh, that Judy. She knows me well. Oh boy. Any other? Item M, comments and recommendations for the good of the University. This is where I get to just talk to you all a little bit.

COMMENTS FROM THE INCOMING CHAIR

Chair Szczygiel: It is such an honor and privilege to be here. It's been such a delightful year to work with so many of you this past year. And Beth, hands down this has been one of the most, if not the most extraordinary year of Senate history. And she led her way, she led all of us, with calm and dignity, extraordinary insight, humanity and, thank God, a lot of humor. As you all should know, so thank you, Beth. Where are you? Thank you.

It's been a trip. As you all should know, being elected to the Senate represents many things, but mostly it represents the respect and trust that you've earned and gained from your colleagues. And such a respected position comes with it, rights and responsibilities. And you've all had a taste of that this past year in spades.

But I do want you to understand that our scope of influence goes beyond our essential commitment to our curriculum and our students. It is really quite vast and it's very impressive and we do good work. You've just seen it today. And we will continue to do good work, COVID or no darn COVID.

It is often in email postscript that you see this quote, "2020, the year created to make all other years seem awesome." And it's true. We are looking at an awesome upcoming year. There will be a continuation of lots of initiatives that have already been set forth this year.

In particular, I've been able to hang out with the Senate self-study group. This will be a very interesting report that we will-- an initial report, I think. Keith? Oh, yes. Thumbs up-- that we'll be hearing in the
fall. At this time, I just want to give a quick tip of the hat to Michelle Duffy, Victor Brunsden, Martha, Julio Palma-- Martha Strickland, sorry-- and Mary Vollero, and Keith of course, the amazing Chair, who are shepherding this very complicated assessment and navel-gazing of our Senate body.

It'll be an interesting report close to my heart. I would like to give continued oversight and guidance to a more sustainable University. We had a great-- we were presented about a year ago, almost to the date, with the Climate Action Resolution. I would like to re-engage in those topics and to revisit those recommendations. The Times Higher Education place this University, that is to say you, the faculty, as leaders in sustainable measures at the top 3% nationally and in top 5% globally.

This comes, of course, because of exceptional advances in scholarship and applied research. But it's also because of the University and our commitment to innovative campus operations, both at the level of the Office of Physical Plant, as well as operating procedures of units all across Penn State. These efforts are energizing, and we will take them forward is my hope.

As we've seen today, significant steps toward the inclusion of DEI standards and we will be incorporating those standards into our committee work. Small baby steps in that regard, but important. And we will, of course, continue to focus on diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Roughly one half of our members come from academic units outside of University Park. I have been referring to this map all semester. This is a new printout, but it's a map I got from Penn State's website and it lists all of the campuses.

Now, I admit that prior to stepping into this role I was kind of aware of where we all were, but not as much as I am now. And I would wish, and I'm thinking that maybe some of you are in my same shoes, please take a map of this great state and of our great campuses out. Take a look at where these people are traveling from and some of the things that they are-- the ideas and the students and the inspirations-- that they are bringing here into the Senate every day, or every time that we meet.

I would like to find a way and any opportunity to celebrate this geographical diversity. And to celebrate all that you bring to University Park on a regular basis. I will look to you all to help me find ways to do this in the upcoming year.

Immediately we're going to have to have a conversation, folks. I know Beth said you could relax, and we will. What I really need is to get your feedback on this one issue, which is what are we going to do with Zoom? How do we embrace it? How do we use it to further engage at our indefinite benefit for inclusion across this vast state?

But we also don't want to lose this capacity for coming together. It is a very humanizing and binding experience when we do all gathers. I will be calling for a special topic’s forum-- we're not Un-used to this concept-- so that we can begin to discuss what our fall schedule, Don, may look like. And so we can start to plan.

Keep your eyes peeled on that and think about ideas. How best can we utilize Zoom meetings, while also maintaining the integrity of our plenary sessions. And the one thing-- where is Roger? Roger is here. And you might not know he was not only our Senate Historian, but he is our Senate party planner. And I've got some great news, because come hell or high water, we are going to have a party somewhere somehow.
We're going to be celebrating Senate's 100th anniversary. It's our birthday, folks. And we're going to celebrate. And I hear Roger is looking for people who have musical inclinations. Harmonicas, whatever, pick up an instrument, strum, I'm not sure if that's still part of the deal. But I tell you what, if you have any ability to hum a song at all, please let Roger know because we're looking for entertainment on the off chance that we'll be able-- on the hopeful chance that we'll be able to get together.

I look forward to a very productive year. Thank you all for an amazing-- and Beth, thank you and everyone in this room, thank you all for an amazing year and we'll be seeing you soon. Thank you. Bye.

________________________
COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Szczygiel: Now we have one more item I believe, which is are there any other Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the University coming from the floor? Lisa?

Lisa Mangel: No.

________________________
ADJOURNMENT

Chair Szczygiel: All right. May I have a motion to adjourn? Oh geez, the enthusiasm.

Beth Seymour: Bonj, we have a raised hand.

Chair Szczygiel: A raised hand? In support of adjournment?

Chair Szczygiel: All right, all right. Do we have more raised hands?

Beth Seymour: No.

Chair Szczygiel: Yes. Just say yes.

Female Speaker: Yes.

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, we do, and I believe that motion carries. Have a wonderful evening. And thank you all. We'll see you soon.
The following Senators were noted as having participated in the April 27, 2021 Senate Meeting via Zoom.

- Abendroth, Catherine
- Acharya, Vinita
- Amador Medina, Melba
- Anderson, Bryan
- Aurand, Harold
- Baka, Jennifer
- Barron, Eric
- Bartolacci, Michael
- Belhassen, Imene
- Bieschke, Kathleen
- Bird, Douglas
- Bishop-Pierce, Renee
- Blakney, Terry
- Blockett, Kimberly
- Blood, Ingrid
- Borromeo, Renee
- Breakey, Laurie
- Brunsden, Victor
- Calore, Gary
- Cardenas, Artemio
- Chen, Wei-Fan
- Coduti, Wendy
- Costanzo, Denise
- Czymoniewicz-Klippel, Melina
- Dare, Tyler
- Davis, Dwight
- Davis, Felecia
- DeFranco, Joanna
- Demirici, Ali
- Dube, Sibusiwe
- Eckhardt, Caroline
- Egolf, Roger
- Engel, Renata
- Evans, Edward
• Fairbank, James
• Farnan, Kaitlin
• Fausnight, Tracy
• Foley-DeFiore, Rainier
• Folkers, Deirdre
• Ford, Karly
• Fredricks, Susan
• Freiberg, Andrew
• Frisch, Paul
• Gallagher, Julie
• Gayah, Vikash
• Glantz, Edward
• Glenna, Leland
• Goffe, Lorraine
• Grimes, Galen
• Groome, Dermot
• Gross, Charlene
• Guadagnino, Frank
• Han, David
• Handley, Meredith
• Hanes, Madlyn
• Hardy, Melissa
• Hauck, Randy
• Hayford, Harold
• Hoffman, Robert
• Holden, Lisa
• Hoxha, Indrit
• Huang, Tai-Yin
• Hufnagel, Pamela
• Iliev, Peter
• Iyer, Anush
• Jaap, James
• Jett, Dennis
• Jones, Maureen
• Jones, Nicholas
• Jordan, Matthew
• Kadetsky, Elizabeth
• Karpa, Kelly
• Kass, Lawrence
• Kass, Rena
• Keifer-Boyd, Karen
• Keiler, Kenneth
• Kennedy-Phillips, Lance
• Kenyon, William
• King, Brian
• King, Elizabeth
• Kirby, Joshua
• Kitko, Lisa
• Kramer, Lauren
• Kranc, Stan
• Kubat, Robert
• Kunes, Melissa
• Lang, Dena
• Larson, Allen
• Le, Binh
• Lear, Matthew
• Libby, C
• Linch, Amy
• Linn, Suzanna
• Liu, Dajiang
• Liu, Xin
• Mahoney, Joseph
• Malysz, Jozef
• Mangel, Lisa
• Marko, Frantisek
• Mathews, Jonathan
• Maximova, Siela
• McBride, M.Scott
• McKinney Marvasti, Karyn
• Melton, Robert
• Michels, Margaret
• Mocioiu, Irina
• Mookerjee, Rajen
• Moore, Jacob
• Mulder, Kathleen
• Najjar, Raymond
• Nesbitt, Jennifer
• Noce, Kathleen
• Novotny, Eric
• Ofosu, Willie
• Ozment, Judith
• Page, B.Richard
• Palma, Julio
• Palmer, Timothy
• Pauley, Laura
• Perkins, Daniel
• Petrilla, Rosemarie
• Phillips, Kathleen
• Pierce, Mari Beth
• Posey, Lisa
• Precht, Jay
• Pyeatt, Nicholas
• Quinnan, Kaleigh
• Reichard, Karl
• Reid-Walsh, Jacqueline
• Rhen, Linda
• Riccomini, Paul
• Robicheaux, Timothy
• Robinett, Richard
• Robinson, Brandi
• Ropson, Ira
• Rowland, Nicholas
• Ruggiero, Francesca
• Rutherford Siegel, Susan
• Saltz, Ira
• Saunders, Brian
• Schiro, Noah
• Scott, Geoffrey
• Seymour, Elizabeth
• Shannon, Robert
• Shapiro, Keith
• Sharma, Amit
• Sharpe, Starlette
• Shea, Maura
• Shearer, Gregory
• Shen, Wen
• Sigurdsson, Steinn
• Sillner, Andrea
• Simmons, Cynthia
• Sims, Damon
• Sinha, Alok
• Skladany, Martin
• Smith, David
• Snyder, Stephen
• Specht, Charles
• Sprow Forté, Karin
• Stephens, Mark
• Stine, Michele
• Strauss, James
• Strickland, Martha
• Strohacker, Emily
• Subramanian, Rajarajan
• Suliman, Samia
• Swallow, Nicole
• Swinarski, Matthew
• Szczygiel, Bonj
• Tallman, Nathan
• Taylor, Ann
• Taylor, Jonté
• Thomas, Gary
• Tyworth, Michael
• Van Hook, Stephen
• Vasilatos-Younken, Regina
• Viramgama, Aakash
• Volk Chewning, Lisa
• Vollero, Mary
• Vrana, Kent
• Wagner Lawlor, Jennifer
• Wang, Ming
• Warner, Alfred
• Wede, Joshua
• Whitcomb, Tiffany
• Whitehurst, Marcus
• Williams, Mary Beth
• Williams, Nicole
• Wolfe, Douglas
• Wong, Jeffrey
• Yagnik, Arpan
• Yen, John
• Zambanini, Robert
• Zhang, Qiming
• Zilleruelo, Arturo
• Zorn, Christopher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected Students</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>