

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

THE SENATE RECORD

Volume 55-----May 12, 2021-----Number 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Appendices

a. [Attendance](#)

Appendix I

FINAL AGENDA FOR MAY 12, 2021

A. [ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR](#)

Page 2

Comments by the Executive Vice President and Provost Nicholas, P. Jones

B. <u>PERIOD OF DISCUSSION</u>	Pages 2-19
Resolution on Requiring COVID-19 Vaccinations Starting Fall 2021 Semester	
<u>For the Record Question</u>	Pages 17-19
C. <u>DISCUSSION</u>	Pages 19-32
Letter from the University Faculty Senate to the Board of Trustees	
E. <u>COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY</u>	Pages 32-33
E. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>	Pages 33-34

Chair Szczygiel, College of Arts and Architecture: Well, good afternoon, everyone. It is 2:30 PM, Wednesday, May 12, 2021, and the Senate is now in session.

Chair Szczygiel: Welcome faculty, students, and guests to a special meeting of the University Faculty Senate. My name is Bonj Szczygiel, and I am the '21 '22 Senate Chair.

Because this is a special Senate meeting, we'll be dispensing with most of the items on the usual agenda to focus our conversation. Before we start, I'd like to announce that Nicholas Rowland, a recent-- very recent-- past Senate Chair was confirmed as the academic trustee at the Friday meeting of the Board of Trustees. Congratulations, Nicholas.

And breaking news, we just learned he's just been appointed to the Presidential Recruitment and Selection Committee. Best of luck, Nicholas. We know you will represent us well in your capacity as academic trustee. And on that note, I would also like to thank David Han, who has served with distinction for two terms as our first academic trustee. Thank you, David, for your significant contributions in that important inaugural role for the Senate.

The instructions for this meeting are the same as a regular Zoom meeting. But since some of you are new to the Senate, let me go through those right now. So first, who can speak at the 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 in the Senate office if you would like to request to speak at a future Senate meeting. Our Zoom capacity is 500 people. And if we reach capacity, you may not be able to attend.

We do create a complete record of the meeting that will be available within three weeks of today. This meeting, like all Senate plenary meetings, is being recorded. We have brought you in with your microphones muted and your video off.

Just to point out one other thing-- chat is turned on for you to communicate with each other. But it's not closely monitored by the Office staff or myself. Use chat to post a comment to each other or to let us know if you're having a technical problem. Do not use chat to ask a question or to be recognized to speak and have the floor.

Because of the timing of the special meeting, we will not be taking a formal attendance. If you need technical support, please email Kadi Corter. And we'll put her email address in the chat. It's kkw2@psu.edu.

You have two ways to ask a question. You can raise your hand using the Raise Hand function, usually located at the bottom of your Zoom screen. Once I recognize you, your role will be shifted to panelist and then you can ask your question.

Remember, you must begin by stating your last name and academic unit. For example, Szczygiel, Arts and Architecture. Please speak clearly and slowly as the audio is not always crystal clear on Zoom calls. You can also enter your question into the Zoom question and answer. Again, please start with your name and unit, that helps us tremendously. Please scan the Q&A before posting to make sure you'll not be

asking a question that is similar to ones already posted. Just like in a fully in-person Senate meeting, we might not be able to answer everyone's questions, but we will capture the Q&A and pass along questions that have not been answered.

Because we have two issues on hand, we will be needing to obtain accurate votes. And in that regard, we'll be using TallySpace. You will need your Penn State 9-digit ID to be able to log into that voting system. And that address, that link will be posted when we get closer to voting time.

I want to thank everyone, visitors and senators alike, for being here for this special meeting. I want to thank our guests for attending and engaging in the work of the Senate. And I particularly want to thank the Senate office for their very hard work of recent days. Without their support, the Senate could not get its work accomplished.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Szczygiel: So, let's move on to the agenda. Item A-- Announcements by the Chair. I will keep them brief. As Chair, I called this special meeting because there was a clear and compelling need for an additional forum regarding the two emergent agenda issues. The proximity of this special meeting to our last plenary on April 27 causes additional stress on the normal transition process.

The Senate office staff have worked ceaselessly trying to update the listserv and membership roster to reflect the new election information that has trickled in. They are attempting to accomplish in just a few days what would normally take a few weeks. Thus, I ask that everyone please be patient.

Running a meeting like this has a lot of moving parts in normal times. Given the unusual nature of this meeting so close to our last plenary and so close to the elections, I especially request everyone's patience and calm today. Given the amount of interest generated by the announcement of the meeting's agenda from both within Penn and outside the University community, I'd like to start with a shared understanding of Senate's role.

Nothing we discuss and vote on today is a binding resolution. It is the position of the Senate. We are not making policy today. We are simply providing the opportunity for senators to discuss and potentially share their views with the Board of Trustees, and the administration, and with the public. A vote on other of the agenda topics does not create legislative mandate.

Additionally, based on our rules, only the documents on the agenda will be considered today. The Senate works through elected representation. Only current faculty senators, student senators, and administrative senators may speak on the floor without advance permission.

PERIOD OF DISCUSSION

Chair Szczygiel: As you can see from the agenda, we've got two items for discussion at this meeting, the first being a resolution regarding COVID-19 vaccinations for fall semester 2021. Before we address this, Provost Jones has been invited to this meeting to provide us with an update on the University's current vaccination plans. It is now my pleasure to recognize Provost Jones and offer him the floor.

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: Thank you, Bonj.

Can you hear me OK? Yeah.

Chair Szczygiel: I can hear you fine.

Provost Jones: Thanks. I appreciate the opportunity just to share with you with where the University administration is as regards our current vaccine strategy. I think it is important context for you all to have as you consider this resolution.

So, our general vaccination strategy has had and has, moving forward, several components. We are taking the same approach as we have taken in many other parts of the COVID-19 effort at Penn State. And that is to use a layered or a cascading strategy. And in this case, our focus has been on and will be on for the near future, providing incentives.

So, I'd like to just describe to you what our approach has been and where we see us going over the summer. If it's appropriate for me to say that things are changing very rapidly, I think, as you all know. If you're paying attention to the news, what was accepted standard this time a week ago, it was different by Monday, and it's different by Wednesday of this week, and it's likely to be different by Monday of next week as well. So, we're going through a period of very rapid evolution of the nation's strategy as well as the Commonwealth's approach.

And Penn State sits in the middle of all of that, trying to ensure that anything that we are doing is consistent with expectations of the Pennsylvania Department of Health as well as the CDC, which, by the way, are not always in complete alignment, either. So that's something else we need to navigate. So, from the very beginning of the discussion around the availability of a vaccine-- so this goes back as early as last fall-- Penn State, working through our Office of Government, Community, and Public Affairs, reached out to the State Department of Health and said, basically, we stand ready as an institution to help the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in whatever way we can to facilitate vaccine distribution.

So, this was strategy zero, if you will. From the beginning, we were ready and able to help the Department of Health. We deferred, of course, to the Department of Health for direction, but we're ready. Part of the next phase of that as vaccines started becoming available was continuing to make the case that we're available, and then looking for opportunities to specifically partner. And you've seen a number of those efforts play out over the course of the last month. We had the state clinic that was set up at the Bryce Jordan Center, I guess, starting about five or six weeks ago. We had a partnership in State College with Walmart, making vaccine available to Penn State faculty, staff, students, and affiliates. That was at the, again, at Pegula Ice Arena.

Of course, the availability continues to expand to different age groups. Just earlier this week, we had been made aware of the fact that there's approval for people younger than 16-- so 12 to 16, I guess, so more opportunity for vaccine distribution. We've partnered and supported efforts by CVIM, Centre Volunteers in Medicine, Mount Nittany Medical Center, Penn State Health, and Geisinger in Centre County.

Commonwealth campuses have outreach with local health systems and found, I would say, in many cases, very good partnerships with the health systems that serve those parts of the Commonwealth. And so that has been a very effective effort as well. We are continuing to aggressively message through

strategic communications about the importance of vaccination, and strongly, strongly encouraging people to be vaccinated.

And the University Health Services pharmacy has recently been approved to be a point of distribution for student vaccination. And so, working through the logistics on that, but that is either up and running or very close to being up and running. And we have facilitated the opportunity for students to upload vaccine data to UHS now, and the ability for faculty and staff to do that will be coming in the near future. So, this has really been being phase one of the strategy, and that is to make vaccine availability as simple as possible to faculty, staff, and students across all of our campus locations.

The second level, which we're in and approaching now, in the mid to late May range, is to provide incentives. And I'll just say upfront that when we talk about incentives, we realize that we don't want to be unfair to people who have already been vaccinated. And so, any of these incentives apply to currently vaccinated people as well as people who opt to get the vaccine.

So, for students, we're looking at opportunities to provide discount at Penn State Eats and the bookstore. We're looking for drawings for residence hall students for free housing, upgraded meal plans, pizza parties, concert tickets, gift cards for commuter students, drawings for a meal plan, pizza party, bakery, gift boxes, snack boxes, concert tickets, gift cards. Talking about employee incentives as well-- and I'll just point out that all of these sounds great and we're excited about the possibilities. There are a lot of complexities in this as they relate to aid, student aid considerations for our students or tax implications for employees. So as simple as these are in concept, there's a lot there's a lot of details to be worked through in order to facilitate these being effective as incentives and not carrying any burdens for our employees or students that they have to deal with. And then, again, we're using our improved reporting structure through Salesforce to upload data and keep track of how this is going.

The next layer, which we would anticipate considering in the June time frame is, I guess we would call them incentives, but they start to transition a little bit more into being restrictive. And this includes consideration of-- and I want to emphasize at this point no decisions have been made, but these are the types of things that we're talking about. For example, would we require evidence of vaccination before being able to obtain a ticket to a sporting event? Would we require evidence of vaccination to return to specific workplaces or moving into a residence hall?

This is later, and no decisions have been made, and we will be monitoring data over the next month or so before making any decisions about moving forward with those. And then, finally, these would be the most restrictive and we would not envision even thinking about a decision on this most likely until July. And this would really be driven by a change in the trajectory of the virus nationally and regionally. If the CDC or the Department of Health had to start introducing new restrictions due, for example, to a possible new variant that could be a trigger point or any other emerging complementary threats that would cause us to have to think about pivoting to remote status consistent with our fall planning.

This is, again, not something that we would consider until the July time frame, and all based on data. Our real emphasis, again, is just to make vaccination as readily available as possible, provide incentives to get people to participate in the vaccine program, and then, later in the summer, give consideration to being more restrictive as necessary as circumstances dictate. So, I know at this stage that's a little loose for the future. And that's really because this is all based on the data that are coming in and our assessment of how well the vaccination penetration is going.

The emphasis is on the end rather than the means. So, the end is getting as many people vaccinated as possible. That is the end, driving that number as high as possible. And as you can see from my description, we're trying to use many and varied means to get us there, starting with one set really more carrot-based rather than requirement-based. So, Bonj, let me stop there. And I don't know if you've got time for me to answer questions, but back to you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Provost Jones. Maureen, do we have any questions?

Maureen Jones, College of Health and Human Development: We do. We have a question from James Fairbank from Erie. Several of my fellow faculty members have expressed serious concerns about the University's plans to require students, faculty, and staff to have documented COVID vaccinations. Instead, they and I would suggest the University encourage rather than require vaccinations due to their safety and efficacy. We should be mindful that these vaccinations are mostly emergency approved rather than fully approved by the CDC and many-- particularly students and younger faculty and staff who are healthy-- have legitimate objections to them. Maintaining our current counter measures such as masks, social distancing, and frequent hand sanitizing should be continued.

Provost Jones: Certainly, agree on the last part. The first part, I think, Maureen, suggested that we do have requirements, because we do not yet.

Maureen Jones: Right. Jim says he just has concerns about the plans.

Provost Jones: OK. Yes, so we, at this point, we do not have any definitive plan to require at this point.

Maureen Jones: It's all we have in Q&A. And I don't see any hands currently.

Chair Szczygiel: I see Michele Stine. Can we promote Michele to speak?

Michele Stine, College of Health and Human Development: Hi.

Chair Szczygiel: Hi.

Michele Stine: Thank you, Provost Jones. We appreciate you being with us today to speak to us. The Health and Human Development caucus has been soliciting input from our faculty in preparation for this meeting. And what has emerged is a deep concern about how and when decisions are being made.

Quiet, frankly, our faculty are worried. They're worried about the process for exemptions to continue to work remotely, worried about how they will manage a mandate to be back in-person if their young children are not able to be back in school full-time, worried about the nature of fall instruction and how the, as yet to be decided, safety precautions will impact classroom teaching.

Above all else, our faculty would like to know how the decisions are being made, and that they are being guided by the best scientific evidence. As representatives of the faculty and HHD, the HHD senators feel an obligation to represent the concerns of our colleagues. And so, we are requesting the following.

We request that the Provost resume the town hall style meetings with the Faculty Senate that he held last summer. And we are requesting these meetings happen once a month in June, July, and August, and inform the faculty on plans that are being made, as they are being made, for return to campus across the

University. We ask that Faculty Senate be updated each month on what safety measures and policies are being discussed and considered, and we would like to hear what data are being used to inform these decisions, what experts are being consulted, and what the recommendations are.

We ask that the administration work with the Faculty Senate to ensure there's meaningful Senate input on these committees by including multiple faculty senators on the committees and task forces, making decisions about the return to campus. Additionally, we respectfully ask that the University impose a deadline of July 1 on the Raise Hand function in Starfish for students to give notice that they do not feel comfortable returning to campus. We hope a deadline for this decision will give the administration and the faculty time to plan for any currently unanticipated large numbers of students who may decide not to return to campus in the fall.

We hope to avoid any last-minute need to pivot to hybrid instruction and give faculty some measure of predictability in planning how their fall classrooms will run. Our faculty were asked to take on Herculean tasks last summer in an effort to adapt instruction before fall semester. It is our sincere hope that increased transparency and predictability will help alleviate the pervasive anxiety and weariness that we are hearing from our colleagues and will allow all of us to return to campus again in August with a renewed sense of community and optimism. Thank you.

Provost Jones: Thanks, Michele. I would be more than happy to resume those town hall meetings over the summer. In fact, the only reason they stopped is that we pivoted back to using the Senate council meetings and the full Senate plenary meetings to provide updates. But I am more than happy to do that. In fact, I welcome the opportunity.

Those were great dialogues. It gave me an opportunity to share not only descriptions of the sausage, but also the sausage-making process that was being used. And the input that I got on those meetings was very helpful.

On the Raise Hand deadline, I'm not sure if we actually have one, explicitly said at this point. But I can find out. At some point, obviously, we have to place a limit on how long that could go. So I think the notion of having a deadline is unreasonable at all.

The process that we have been using for decision making, really, is the same one that was established back in February of 2020. We have a large number of task groups focused on all aspects of managing University operations. We have the COCC operation up and running, managing the operationalization of those, there's an Executive Leadership group that meets once a week, the Coronavirus Management Team, which is the co-leads of all of the different task groups which constitute literally dozens of people across the institution. They've been meeting twice a week.

President's Council meets every Monday. And the executive leadership of the institution meets once a week as well. And good portions of most of those meetings are focused on the decisions that need to be made around the University trajectory with respect to COVID.

We communicate through strategic communications on a regular basis. The virus info website is our main information vector. We would welcome suggestions as to how we can more effectively get our communications out. And I think we'd certainly welcome opportunities to gather additional feedback from people about the process. I think I got most of what you said, Michele, but I could check after the meeting if I missed some stuff.

Michele Stine: Thank you, Provost Jones.

Chair Szczygiel: Maureen, I see we have a few more questions in the Q&A. But I'd like to recognize Brandi. Brandi, who's had her hand up for a while, if you could identify yourself and please give us your unit. And Brandi, are you available?

Provost Jones: She said it was an accident.

Chair Szczygiel: It was an accident. Let's go on. Maureen, do we have another question?

Maureen Jones: We certainly do. Christina Grozinger, College of Agricultural Sciences, is there data available on the percentages of people who are getting vaccinated, and data on why people might not be getting vaccinated that can inform efforts to encourage vaccination?

Provost Jones: That's a great question, Christina. We don't really have Penn State data. The only way we would get be able to get those data is by conducting surveys of faculty, staff, and students. And we are certainly considering doing that as we move forward. The data that are, I would say, not driving but informing our approach, the aggregated data that we are getting from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which brings us down to the local level, but not to the Penn State level. And sorry, what was the second part of the question, Maureen?

Maureen Jones: I think it was, is there any data suggesting on how we could encourage them to get vaccinations?

Provost Jones: Yes, we've got groups, groups of people looking at that issue. Certainly, incentives is the thing that we are focused on at this point. But we are looking at any and all ideas that we can get and thinking about how they would work effectively in the Penn State context to try to encourage people. The general theme of your question, anything we can do to be nudging those numbers up is to our advantage for a whole host of reasons.

Maureen Jones: Ready for the next one?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, please, Maureen.

Maureen Jones: All right. Josh Kirby from Education, what is the role of the University's Board of Trustees and decisions related to COVID mitigation and the fall '21 return to campus policies?

Provost Jones: Well, the administration of the University meets with and fully informs the Board on a regular basis. I should be able to quote from the commencements I did on the weekend, that the Board is responsible for all interests of the University, financial and otherwise. So, they are deeply engaged in what we are doing, and have requested that we keep them apprised on a regular basis.

We share our thinking, our strategy with them. They provide input into that process; just as other constituencies do across the University. And we value that input. At the end of the day, the person who makes decisions on behalf of the University is the President.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you. Maureen, keep on going with those questions.

Maureen Jones: All right. Hold on one second. Sorry. Richardson, who-- I'm going to have to go with this. Just Lewis Richardson at this point, how will the University maintain social distancing with near full capacity classrooms? Any contingency planning for large classrooms?

Provost Jones: Is that referring to the fall?

Maureen Jones: Yeah, I believe-- I mean, it doesn't specifically say fall, but it suggests that in the event vaccination requirement is not implemented, how will we maintain social distancing with near full capacity classrooms?

Provost Jones: We have been respecting the physical distance guideline that has been issued by the CDC and the Pennsylvania Department of Health. And for a year or more, that has been six feet, and the two have been consistent. I think most of you are aware that the governor recently, in a news release, indicated that all requirements were going to be relaxed except for masking, which includes the physical distancing requirement.

The CDC, to our knowledge, has not yet relaxed that requirement. So now, for the first time, we're dealing with the CDC saying six feet and the Pennsylvania Department of Health not requiring physical distancing. Our fall planning was predicated on the expectation that by mid-August 2021, that the physical distancing requirement would be removed.

The Commonwealth has now removed it. And we are anticipating that at some point over the next three months that may well be relaxed by the CDC as well. If that is the case, then we won't have mandated or required separations in the classrooms as we have for the last 2 and 1/2 semesters. So that issue will be rendered moot.

Maureen Jones: Donaldson, Penn State Dickinson Law. Is there any concern that providing incentives will send the wrong message? Namely that these vaccines are particularly unsafe and less safe than vaccines that are required?

Provost Jones: So, providing incentives, on the surface, seems like it is a very benign and constructive and positive action for us to take. But as I said when I described it before, it's complicated. There are many, many considerations.

And we do need to be mindful of any unintended implications that any program that we stand up might create. So yes, in general terms, this is a concern. And it's something that we need to think about. And it's always a tradeoff between what you described and achieving the positive outcomes that we seek.

Maureen Jones: Folkers, Penn State York. Jim Fairbanks indicated that plans such as masks and social distancing should be continued. However, it should be noted that we cannot return to campus if we continue social distancing, as we would not be able to accommodate full classes with our classroom. The University plans assume that there will no longer be a requirement to maintain that six-foot distance. Can you please reiterate the specifics of the conditions that you assume will be in place as faculty and students return to campus in August?

Provost Jones: At this point in our planning, we have assumed that by August the six-foot physical distancing requirement will no longer be in place. But we are assuming, also, that faculty, staff, and students on campus, particularly in buildings, will continue to mask.

Chair Szczygiel: Maureen, if I could interject, also, that just a reminder to everyone that the questions being presented should be presented only by the current body of elected Senators. The senatorial terms as representatives ended on April 27 for some people and transitioned to a new Senate composition. So only the new composition of the Senators should be submitting questions at this point in time.

So, if you are a current member, then that's great. Keep the questions coming. But if you are not, please hold off. We have a hand raised by Rose Jolly. Rose?

Rosemary Jolly, College of the Liberal Arts: Rosemary Jolly, Liberal Arts. I have just some very specific questions. My first one would be the definition of a trigger point. So, my understanding is that guidelines from the CDC should bump state provisions, since that is where the experts reside.

My second point is that we are sending, potentially, a contradictory message. So, on the one hand, we are deeply encouraging, as I understand it from you, Provost Jones, people to vaccinate. And on the other hand, we are shying away from a situation in which there will need to be vaccinations.

I am concerned and wish to state two things. I've already lived through and have been affected by a number of pandemics in which decisions between personal preferences, or ideologies, or politics run up against public health decisions. So, my concern is that there is a proper balance between the politics of individual choice and a robust public health response by the University in terms of the fact that the University is responsible for the workplace safety of its employees and their families. To this end, I am concerned that we may not have enough time if we use a trigger point later in the year, to make sure that everybody is vaccinated.

Even if everybody is vaccinated, it's very unlikely that the children of faculty members will be able to be vaccinated if they are below the age of eight, especially infants. And so, I'm worried about the contradictory message. I am concerned about what constitutes a trigger point, and I wish to point out that the current situation is not neutral, in that it is extremely stressful for people who have potentially vulnerable family members to be facing what appears to be an order to return to the classroom without the necessary safety provisions for people's individual and family health.

I do not agree with the notion that the way this decision should be made is through threatening legal appeals to individual rights. On the other hand, there is, I believe, a commitment to public health and community workplace safety that extends beyond the individual in the same way that we have always required MMR, smallpox, and so on. Notwithstanding the experimental dictates of the vaccine, there's very clear medical evidence that the vaccine is beneficial. Otherwise, Old Main and the University as a whole would not be encouraging the vaccine. It's this contradiction that I wish to address. Thank you.

Provost Jones: Thanks, Rose. Appreciate your comments and insights. As I think you intimate, this is a complex issue, and it is very much a balance. I couldn't agree with you more. In fact, I'd appreciate it if you could write that down and email it to me because you articulated it about as well as I have heard it articulated by anyone.

Our priority from day one of the pandemic, our first priority has been the health, safety, and well-being of our community, our faculty, staff, and students, and getting that balance right. The public health aspects versus the individual freedoms and the personal health aspects as has been, really, the challenge every day of the pandemic for us, and we continue to try to get that balance right. And of course, the balance is time-dependent, because as I said at the beginning of my remarks, what the situation was a week ago is different from Monday, and that is going to be different from what it will be next Monday.

So being able to track that and navigate what is a very large ship, the Penn State University, to be where it needs to be, at the right location, at the right time is a particular challenge. So, there's not an easy answer that I can provide to the balance issue that you raise, except to say that the balance issue is what it is all about. And so, I agree with you completely, and we do our very best to get that right.

The issue of the Department of Health versus the CDC, this is actually something that was just dropped on us within the past week. We haven't had to really deal before where we had Department of Health or state-issued requirements that have been different from the CDC. So, the issue of which ones we follow, we're trying to resolve that at a number of levels. My general sense is that the Pennsylvania Department of Health holds, really, the trump card for us versus the CDC, that this is a state responsibility rather than a federal one. But that's something we're trying to sort through as we speak.

Rosemary Jolly: Thank you.

Maureen Jones: You're on mute.

Chair Szczygiel: I'd like to recognize Julio Palma. He's had his hand raised for a while. Julio?

Julio Palma, Penn State Fayette: Yes, Julio Palma, Fayette, just trying to be conscious of the time. So, a couple of things. One question is regarding the message that we're sending.

I mean, ideally, what I would prefer is a really serious public health campaign, which every public health campaign includes an educational component. Which, to be honest, I think as a public institution, we should have been on top of it. And I mean a public health campaign that is educational and not just marketing. I really think the mask up back up campaign was just a marketing tool.

So, a couple of mixed messages that I think is, maybe I misunderstood, but are we requiring or is the idea of maybe requiring vaccinations for football games but not for classrooms? Is that what I understood? And the second question is, what about testing? So, if we may not require the vaccinations-- we have this resolution, I expect, to discuss soon-- we're not going to require vaccinations.

What about testing? What I have here is that we're not going to have any kind of testing for the fall 2021, which I feel that that is risky, because we are bringing people to the campuses. And I think we should test 100% everyone, staff, students, and faculty prior to the beginning of the semester, unless they are vaccinated. So that can be an incentive to take the vaccine.

But having everybody tested prior to the beginning of the semester and continuous surveillance testing, unless they are vaccinated. So again, I think if we want to assume best-case scenario, we also want to prevent unintended consequences of a possible outbreak. So, again, can we implement testing prior to the semester to everyone, and continuous surveillance testing unless they show proof of vaccination? Thank you.

Provost Jones: Thanks, Julio. On the football question, no, I did not state that was the plan. I gave it as an example of a focused and potentially more restrictive requirement. But at this point, there has been no decisions made about any mandatory, or any circumstances where vaccinations would be required for fall participation in events like that. It was just put out as a general concept and example. On the testing side, we do have plans for testing in the fall, but it is more limited. We have more robust testing in place, a testing strategy in place over the summer, less than we had in the fall and spring, but a testing program, nonetheless. But really focused on the residence halls where students are in congregate living facilities.

And there is a requirement that if you are not vaccinated that you will be tested each week. The plan for the fall is we do not feel-- [COUGHS] excuse me-- that we are going to need to be doing surveillance testing given the anticipated level of vaccination. Well, actually, I should say immunity induced by vaccination or having had COVID that will exist in our population.

But we are making testing available, obviously, for students who are symptomatic. That will be available on campus through Student Health. And we will be making testing available for students who need it by virtue of their chosen discipline.

There are some majors where the participation of students in various activities requires them to be tested. So that will be available. And as a result of having that functionality, walk-up testing will be available. But we will, at this point, are not planning on continuing our surveillance testing, considering what we anticipate will be much lower numbers of positively tested personnel in our communities.

Julio Palma: Thank you.

Provost Jones: That may change depending on circumstances. But that is the plan at this point, but that's subject to change, of course.

Chair Szczygiel: And for the record, that was Julio Palma from Fayette. Maureen, back to you.

Maureen Jones: I have Dennis Jett from the School of International Affairs. I'd like to express the other side of the issue. I think vaccines should be required and it is absurd to fill a classroom with students who may not have found a slice of pizza sufficient reason to get the shot. If emergency authorization of the vaccines becomes full authorization, will they be required?

Provost Jones: At this point, as indicated in my presentation, we do not have plans to impose a vaccine requirement.

Maureen Jones: Thank you. Cindy Simmons, College of Communications. You have no doubt had an opportunity to read the resolution backing required COVID vaccination. Will passage of this resolution impact the decision on whether to require vaccination? And if so, how?

Provost Jones: Yeah. So yes, I have read the writ resolution. And I will say that we always take seriously, give serious consideration to resolutions that come from the University Faculty Senate. That's how shared governance works. We value your collective input into these issues, and we acknowledge that the resolution is a strong expression of the Senate preference, and the Senate is the duly elected representative body of Penn State's faculty.

Our focus, as I said in my remarks, is on the end at this point, rather than the means. We are thinking about how we can maximize the vaccination rate within our community. And we are using as many vehicles as possible in advance of having to give further consideration to a vaccine mandate. But absolutely, the resolution is something that we take very seriously.

Maureen Jones: She has a second part to her question. Again, Simmons, Communications. Some people, including those with chronic health problems and people who are pregnant may have medical reasons not to get vaccinated, but may have good reasons not to disclose why. When asked about this in the last meeting, you had no specific answer. Can you guarantee privacy for those who need or want to keep private their reasons for non-vaccination?

Provost Jones: Well, given that at this point, I think I was probably nonspecific in the last meeting perhaps because we are not, at this point, mandating vaccination, that issue to some extent is moot because we're not going to be asking people that question.

Maureen Jones: Yeah. Duffey, College of Health and Human Development. Thank you, Provost Jones. Could you lend some insight to help us understand how many faculty sit on each of the groups that you described, meaning those groups that are currently making decisions? Thank you.

Provost Jones: I have no idea, honestly, what the numbers are. We have about a dozen task groups, and then within each of the task groups there are task subgroups. The COCC has a number of standing committees as well.

I honestly do not know who is on all of those committees, but they are pretty broad and far-reaching into the institution. We're tapping into all of the expertise that we can get our hands on. So, while I don't have specific numbers, I can tell you that one of Penn State's greatest resources is its great minds. And we are taking full advantage of as many of those minds as we can get our hands on.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. And Maureen, I'd like to jump in and recognize another raised hand. This is Greg Shearer. Greg, could you please identify yourself and identify your unit?

Greg Shearer, College of Health and Human Development: Yeah, hey, this is Greg Shearer. Let me see if I can share my screen here. I don't know if I can. I just have a, first—

Chair Szczygiel: Greg, could you tell us what unit you are with?

Greg Shearer: Oh, the Health and Human Development.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you.

Greg Shearer: First a point of order, and then dependent upon your answer, a comment. Are we discussing the resolution right now, or is there going to be time to discuss the resolution?

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Greg, for that question, clarifying it. We are in the middle of a discussion with the Provost. We have not introduced the resolution yet.

Greg Shearer: OK, then. I prefer to speak then, thanks.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Duly noted. Let's go on to Noah Robertson, please. Noah, could you speak and identify your association?

Noah Robertson, College of the Liberal Arts: Yeah, of course. Thank you. So, Noah Robertson. I'm the UPUA Vice Chair of Academic Affairs, and I'm representing the College of the Liberal Arts. I put my question in the chat as well, but my question is, the purpose, the end, as you've mentioned, of a vaccine against COVID is to generate herd immunity against the virus. And ringing through my head is, who bears the burden of getting vaccinated to realize this herd immunity at Penn State? From my perspective, I believe that providing incentives or encouragement instead of requiring a vaccine also means that the burden of realizing herd immunity would be unfairly or, like, inequitably distributed across the University.

This means that some Penn Staters, those who would choose for conscientious objections to the vaccine, nonmedical exemptions, could essentially free ride and reap the benefits of herd immunity without actually contributing to the collective action problem or solution of getting vaccinated. So, my question, because of how pertinent it is to the resolution is, what are your thoughts on this ethical dilemma?

Provost Jones: I think that sounds to me like it's a question about the resolution.

Noah Robertson: For clarification. I know you mentioned, like, this is something that happens outside of this space and administrative spaces, the decisions being made. And there hasn't really been, like, that communication. And you mentioned creating incentives, but they've kind of been loose. So, my question is, instead of creating incentives, there's this ethical dilemma about realizing herd immunity and who bears the burden of realizing that herd immunity that these groups who are creating the requirement, or who could potentially create a requirement, have to grapple with. So, my question is, what thoughts might you have on this question, this dilemma?

Provost Jones: That's probably a question that would take the rest of the afternoon for this group to wrestle with. I guess my very quick reaction would be that since the pandemic began, we have been tried to be very mindful of the fact that almost in everything that has happened in the last 15 months, that there has been the potential for an equitable sharing of the burdens from the pandemic across our community and population.

We are mindful of that. And I can tell you with sincerity that any interventions that we have considered, in any interventions we have considered, that we have done our very best to ensure that those inequities are addressed. Although, as you know-- obviously, it's a reason for your question-- this is not always easy. And in some instances, is just downright challenging. So, what I can really assure you is that in all of our decision-making processes, this is one of the things that is front of mind for us, that the burdens associated, that we're all dealing with associated with COVID, are shared as equitably as possible.

Noah Robertson: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: And Provost Jones, we have about 18 more questions. But I want to be respectful of your time. So, tell us when you need to leave, and we will respond accordingly.

Provost Jones: OK. I think I have a hard stop at 4:00.

Chair Szczygiel: Well, let's try to find some questions that are unique, that are related only to the Provost and not to the potential resolution that we will be addressing in a minute. And Maureen, does that help identify anyone for you?

Maureen Jones: Absolutely. Galen Grimes, who is Penn State Greater Allegheny, if vaccinations are not required, while faculty be permitted to change their course delivery mode to remote? I assume this means for fall.

Provost Jones: Hi, Galen. Thanks for that question. Our position for the fall and our planning for the fall is assuming that we will be not using COVID codes and we will be in regular, residential, instructional delivery mode. Cancellation because of vaccination status is not something that we are planning for.

Maureen Jones: Thank you. Sorry, many folks are not putting in their-- Adoo, Penn State Altoona. There will definitely be some proportion of students, staff, and faculty who will not get the vaccine, but measures are being put into place to protect those who have taken the vaccine to prevent spreading to their vulnerable families. I think I said that correctly. So, do you want me to read it again?

Provost Jones: No, I got it. I got it. So obviously, while vaccination is not perfect, it's pretty darn good. And so being vaccinated yourself is an important a critical step to take if you possibly can. And we, in saying that I do acknowledge that there are some people who, for very good reasons that do not need to be known to us, will not get the vaccine.

Beyond that, other measures that we are going to continue, at least at this stage to require, are masking in buildings. And even though physical distancing requirements may be relaxed, it currently is our expectation that masking will continue in our classroom environments. And we think that that will continue to be an important mitigating technique, along with hand washing and the other hygiene measures. Our hands are tied a little bit because we need to be consistent with the guidance that we are getting from the Department of Health and/or the CDC, but within those parameters, we will certainly be doing everything we can do to maximize the protection of individuals.

Maureen Jones: Thank you. Kim, Penn State Scranton. I have a question about timing. Provost Jones indicated that the University is operating under the assumption that by August the CDC will have relaxed its physical distancing requirements. On the flip side, any decision to pivot to remote will be announced in July. Will we pivot to remote if the CDC's guidelines for social distancing remains at six feet in July?

Provost Jones: Will we pivot to-- we won't pivot to remote if the six-foot requirement stays in place in July. We would have to pivot to the environment that we had in the fall and the spring of this past academic year, where we would be back in the mode of using the COVID codes and we would have a combination of face-to-face, hybrid, and remote learning. The only time that we were fully remote was back in the spring of 2020. And for us to be back in that mode where we are completely remote, what would precipitate that is really a pretty serious national and regional deterioration in the virus prevalence.

Maureen Jones: Thank you. Lear, College of Engineering. Universities are supposed to provide a safe environment for students to learn and a safe place for those that teach them to work. How can we honestly say we are not negligent in this role if we don't require vaccinations? We do so for other diseases. Why is this any different?

Provost Jones: We believe-- well, I would just say that I completely agree with the statement, that we agree that it is our responsibility to provide a safe environment. And we believe that in taking the actions that we are taking and managing the environments in the way that we are, under the prevailing circumstances of virus prevalence in the community and in vaccine status, that we are providing a safe environment.

Maureen Jones: Thank you.

Provost Jones: Actually, Maureen, I can I just add to that? One of the places that I will point to that I think demonstrates this resolve is we were very cautious and careful about offering learning environments that were hybrid in the fall and spring. There was a lot of nervousness about that, there was a lot of concern expressed that those environments were indeed not safe.

As far as we're aware, based on all the data that we have seen, there was zero transmission of the virus in a classroom environment from student-to-student, faculty-to-student, faculty-to-faculty that we're aware of. So, I think, while that doesn't prove it, it does demonstrate that the institution's commitment to providing safe environments is robust, I think, and the approach.

Chair Szczygiel: Maureen, I'd like to identify Terry Blakney in Q&A if we have not already given him an opportunity to speak.

Maureen Jones: I have a comment from him, not a question. I can read that.

Chair Szczygiel: Please.

Maureen Jones: Colleagues, we are writing to object to a University vaccine mandate. We believe that the choice to take COVID vaccine is a personal one, and that the University does not have the right to force anyone into it. Some of our numbers have committed to fight this in the courts and have already contacted lawyers with expertise in this realm.

Others are considering joining this legal action should it come to that. Still others are considering quitting, transferring, should such a measure be implemented. Yours truly, concerned faculty, staff, and students. And Bonj. I have a bunch of other for the records. They are not specific questions for the Provost.

Chair Szczygiel: Well, we will capture those statements for the record. We've got the Provost on for a little bit, a few more minutes, if you can identify any further questions. If not, then we could easily move on to the resolution.

Maureen Jones: Yeah, the rest are-- all right, here's one. Griffin, College of Engineering/Applied Research Laboratory. Is it even legal to require individuals to receive the vaccine with emergency use authorization? And is the University prepared for potential legal fallout from such a mandate? Of course, you have not said you are going to mandate, but I'm reading the question.

Provost Jones: Yes. So, I probably should just pass on that and just say that if the University moved in this direction, which we have no plans to do at this time, that these are all issues that would have to be fully resolved.

Chair Szczygiel: I see a question from Melissa Hardy from the College of the Liberal Arts.

Maureen Jones: If the decision is not to require vaccination, will faculty and students as well as staff be given the opportunity of continuing to be fully remote as the level of risk will be unknown? I think you partially answered that earlier.

Provost Jones: No, that is not the intent. Our intention and our planning is for a return to residential instruction in the fall. There is an exception process that is administered through Kathy Bieschke's office for people who have circumstances that require an exception. But the intention is to return to residential instruction as the default mode of instruction for the fall.

Maureen Jones: Yeah. Boley, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences. Whoops, my whole screen just moved. I apologize if I missed this earlier, but will the University be providing public numbers on vaccine rates, similar to what the state is on providing, I'm assuming on testing? Yeah.

Provost Jones: So that the state is able to provide testing numbers because every test that is conducted in the state is required to be reported to the Department of Health, so they collect those data. And the Department of Health is controlling the distribution of vaccine within the Commonwealth also, so they know exactly how many doses have been given. Because Penn State is not a provider, or actually, I should say, is a very limited provider, we simply do not know how many of our faculty, staff, or students have been vaccinated.

We do have provision for students to upload that information to the University, and we will be making that functionality available to faculty and staff as well very soon, but that depends on people voluntarily uploading that information. The only other way that we'll be able to get insight into this is to do surveys. And while we don't have a survey planned at this moment, we will certainly be considering, I think, moving forward whether we want to gather information through that vehicle.

Chair Szczygiel: Maureen, I think we've got one last question about vaccination from Galen Grimes, and then I'd like to entertain Christina Grozinger question.

Maureen Jones: For Grimes-- and I'll get the location-- can you explain the exception process for requesting remote teaching in the fall?

Chair Szczygiel: For the record-- for the record—

Provost Jones: Penn State Greater Allegheny.

Chair Szczygiel: Greater Allegheny. Thank you, Provost Jones. You're hired.

Provost Jones: Thanks, Galen. I don't want to get myself in trouble with Kathy Bieschke, but Kathy's office administers it. I don't recall the exact method for doing that, but I think if, Galen, if you look back in the communications that have come out from my office over the past several weeks, you'll find the instructions there, and also in the return to teaching website, I'm sure it's there as well, which you can get to from the virus info website.

Maureen Jones: All right. Then, the last one would be Noce, and she is-- sorry-- is from Penn State Erie. And if someone strictly online, for example, were off campus, would they be required to be vaccinated if the University requires it?

Provost Jones: Given that we haven't really discussed the requirement of vaccination and how that would work, that one probably is a little too detailed for me to answer at this point, because if we were to go in this direction, we would have to carefully consider what it means, because it is usually complicated to define. And the example that was just provided is a good example of the sort of things that we would need to consider, just as we did with testing.

Maureen Jones: Bonj, I think at this point the rest are for the record, or have already been answered, or cannot be answered at this point.

Chair Szczygiel: That's fine. And thank you, Provost Jones for spending so much time with us. We have one last question, actually, from Christina Grozinger from the Penn State College of Agricultural Sciences. And this is taking us away from vaccinations, but I know you will be leaving, so she is actually asking about some insight as to the new search process, presidential. So, Maureen, would you mind reading that?

Maureen Jones: Yeah, I can read that, mm-hmm. Grozinger, College of Agricultural Sciences. Provide insight into why the committees for the search for the new president are structured as they are currently proposed. Why are we not using the model from previous searches?

Provost Jones: I will answer this as best I can on behalf of the Board of Trustees, because the selection of the President of the University is the responsibility of the Board of Trustees. And the Board of Trustees sets the process for both the gathering of information and the selection of the individual.

So, this process was determined by the Board as being the approach that they wanted to use for this search. And that's how it came to be. I'm sorry, Christine, I don't have any-- I was a part of the conversation, so I don't have any more insight that I could share, but this is a Board responsibility and a Board decision. So, I defer to their judgment on it.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Provost Jones, for joining us. We invite you to come back after your 4:00 meeting if you would like to rejoin us. We will be segueing eventually into a further discussion about the presidential search.

Provost Jones: OK. Well, I will see if you're still here at 6:05, OK.

Chair Szczygiel: We may be. We may be.

Provost Jones: Right. Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your questions. And I look forward to continuing these interactions.

Can I just say in closing that I think we all thought that going into the pandemic was challenging? But in hindsight, coming out of the pandemic is, in many ways, more challenging than going into it was. And so, I think we've all got a lot of work to do, and a lot of learning and a lot of discussion needs to take place for us to do this well. And I appreciate the opportunity to engage with the Senate in that process.

For the Record Comments provided by Zoom Q & A

These are questions that were not read into the record but were typed and written into Zoom questions and answers and asked to be displayed and documented in the record:

Vaccine Comments

Terry Blakney, Penn State Behrend: My colleagues wanted this in the official record.

Colleagues,

We are writing to object to a university vaccine mandate. We believe that the choice to take a Covid vaccine is a personal one and that the University does not have the right to force anyone into it. Some of our numbers have committed to fight this in the courts and have already contacted lawyers with expertise in this realm. Others are considering joining this legal action, should it come to that. Still others are considering quitting/transferring should such a measure be implemented.

Yours truly,

Concerned Behrend Faculty, Staff, and Students

Ira Saltz, Penn State Shenango: The university wants faculty back in the classrooms and I think all faculty want very much to be back in the classroom. However, that is an unreasonable expectation with unvaccinated people present. The vaccines are not 100% effective and even fully vaccinated people will die of COVID because too many people are not considering the impact of not being vaccinated on other people. The longer this virus continues to spread, the more it mutates, and those mutations have been becoming more deadly and more contagious. Eventually, if we do not achieve herd immunity, a mutation of the vaccine may very well render the vaccines worthless. If we want Penn State to be a safe place to work, to study, and to interact, it MUST require all to be vaccinated. It is very unfair to ask faculty to return to face-to-face teaching otherwise. Further, requiring the vaccine makes the statement that Penn State endorses science over conspiracy theories.

Vikash Gayah, College of Engineering - For the record, I have received comments from seven faculty members and one student, all in full support.

Diane E Berish, College of Nursing: Not a question just for record Berish College of Nursing University Park. Similar to others, when this topic was sent out to faculty, I received feedback both for and against for similar reasons as others have cited

Rob Shannon, College of Agricultural Sciences: Not a question, but for the record, in a survey of faculty from my department, the sentiment was widely in favor supporting the vaccination resolution (11 for, 1 against). Most in favor were vocally so, stating that the public good in this case outweighs an individual's personal choice or objection, given the scientific evidence that overwhelmingly suggests any health risks from the vaccine are far outpaced by health risks associated with contracting COVID. Many have significant teaching appointments and see no way of getting back to safely teaching in large

classrooms unless everyone is vaccinated. Speaking from personal experience and having taught in-person classes for the past two semesters, I am in total agreement. I've also observed firsthand the havoc wreaked upon the lives of students that contracted COVID, including the devastating impacts of "long-haul" syndrome on a segment of our population typically less susceptible to the virus's impacts.

William Kenyon, College of Arts and Architecture: For the record only. I've only heard positive support for the requirement regarding vaccinations from the faculty in my College.

Michele Stine, College of Health and Human Development: For the record, when we reached out to our faculty for feedback, our results were very similar. More than 80% of the faculty who responded were in favor of requiring the vaccine with exemptions.

For the record - **Joyce Furfaro, Liberal Arts:** I want to commend Josh Wede for spearheading this resolution. I personally know of faculty and staff here at Penn State who are caretakers for medically vulnerable family members or similar individuals who have shared with me that they are extremely worried about bringing the covid 19 virus home to their loved ones. I am sure there are even more students in this predicament. Some of these individuals fear having to choose between their job and the health of their family's health. We have the ability to severely limit the risk of exposure for all of us – faculty, staff, and as importantly, Penn State students.

DISCUSSION

Chair Szczygiel: OK. Thank you very much again. And let us move on to item B, Discussion. This is regarding the resolution on requiring COVID-19 vaccination starting in fall 2021 semester. It's identified as Appendix A.

And to present this resolution, I'd like to recognize the Senator from the College of the Liberal Arts, Josh Wede for any introductory comments he might want to make. Josh?

Josh Wede, College of the Liberal Arts: Yeah. So, thank you, Chair Szczygiel. And I want to start off-- if we are able to share the resolution, Erin-- there was a minor change to the resolution that was the result of feedback from fellow Senators. The change was approved by Chair Szczygiel and Parliamentarian Shapiro.

The change brings the ask for a vaccine requirement in line with Pennsylvania vaccination law. And I can post in the chat the relevant section of the law. And so, Erin, I don't know if you can zoom in a little bit. Towards the bottom there is some text in red. And we added, or it's been added, strong moral or ethical convictions as an exemption. And this is written into the law for Pennsylvania. So, this is the resolution that we're going to discuss.

I want to start by thanking everyone for considering this urgent and important issue, and also say thank you to all of those in attendance, whether Senators or not, that have reached out in support. I hope that as we debate this resolution, we can keep the focus of the discussion on the public health aspects of the vaccine requirement and not get bogged down in the details associated with implementation. I also want to remind us that we, as Faculty Senators, are the representative body of faculty across the University with representation also of students and appointed colleagues.

The goal of the resolution is to get as many individuals as possible to be vaccinated before the start of the fall semester, fully realizing that we will not reach 100% of individuals vaccinated. A vaccine requirement with noted exceptions would be significantly more likely to get us there than relying solely on an incentive approach. I want to start by sharing the results of an informal survey that was circulated last week.

I put together a one-question survey that was intended only for faculty in my department. Within 30 minutes of sending the original email, the survey exploded across the University. Within six hours, there were over 1,000 responses and the survey closed with over 1,200. While I know the survey's informal-- it's not clear how far the survey reached, and I suspect that it was mostly sent to faculty at University Park-- the results are overwhelmingly clear.

Faculty support a vaccination requirement. By a factor of almost 10 to 1, faculty were strongly supportive of a vaccine requirement. 86% of respondents were strongly or moderately in support of a requirement, with only 11% moderately or strongly against. So, I think the results are clear.

And if you look at how COVID is transmitted, the CDC states that prolonged exposure greater than 15 minutes, in enclosed spaces, and with inadequate ventilation are the primary driving forces in virus transmission. Yet, this is exactly what we plan to do thousands of times every day across the University system as we fill our classrooms and turn them over multiple times throughout the day. At UP alone, we have seven rooms that hold 350 students or more.

This fall, we will hold more than 250 classes and exams in those classrooms every single week. So over 250 times every week, we'll bring more than 350 people together for almost an hour. And while considerable effort and funds have been devoted to improving ventilation, we cannot guarantee that there will be sufficient mitigation of the risk if the room is full.

It would be possible to decrease the density in classrooms by continuing with increased offerings of hybrid or remote instruction. But as Provost Jones noted, that doesn't seem to be in the plans. Not only are classroom spaces a concern, but over 14,000 students at University Park will be living in close quarters and the dormitories, where sharing living spaces and dining halls with unvaccinated students could greatly increase public health risks.

And I want to remind everyone that the resolution is a statement of principle that does not need to solve every potential issue of implementation. Rather, this resolution allows us, as a representative body of faculty, to express our desire for the University to require a vaccine to protect the health of the University community. 341 colleges and universities have already stated some kind of vaccination requirement, including 175 public institutions and 3 institutions in the Big Ten.

And as a University grounded in research and discovery, it is time that our name be added to that list. As we open up the resolution for debate, I want to encourage us to keep the focus on public health aspects of the vaccine requirement that would help keep the entire community safe. The call for a vaccine mandate recognizes that higher priority is being given to community and to public health than to individual preference, if those two concepts seem to clash for some of us. But we make that decision and give priority to community health and well-being in many other ways every day.

Penn State says that their absolute priority is the health and well-being of its students, employees, and local communities, but the only way to return to full in-person instruction and an in-person experience

while protecting public health and well-being is if, aside from allowed exemptions, students, faculty, and staff are vaccinated. Nothing else will offer the same protection to the entire community. I urge you to vote yes on this resolution.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Josh. And just, also, a clarification for the record, the edited version, the words that were added in red to read, "or strong moral and ethical convictions", that edition was not approved, or should have been approved by the Parliamentarian. And that was a Chair decision, alone. So, if you're going to be angry at anyone, be angry at me. All right, Maureen, do you have any questions in line about this resolution?

Maureen Jones: I do not have specific questions. We have three for the records, if you want me to read those.

Chair Szczygiel: I tell you what. Let's start with the raised hand. I believe we have Greg Shearer. Greg, if you could, again, identify yourself and your unit.

Greg Shearer: Hey, this is Greg Shearer, College of Health and Human Developments. And I want to just first express I have huge sympathy for the stress this has caused the faculty. And since I'm going to speak against the resolution, just the nature of speaking against this in this context, I want to make a few points clear, that vaccines are tremendously effective and safe for those in need.

I am a huge supporter of vaccine. I'm intensely proud of my colleagues who have achieved this remarkable therapy. And as far as I can tell-- I'm not an expert in this matter-- relevant authorities have the right to mandate vaccines.

Still, I hear a lot of incomplete thinking about the challenges mandate would require. For example, statements like, this is just like the measles or the smallpox mandate. And this comparison is incorrect because it appeals to a dichotomous risk analysis where you have exposed, and unexposed, and vaccinated.

And this is a more complex dynamic because it is trichotomous. We have three groups, the unexposed, and two groups with different degrees of immunity, the vaccinated and the naturally immune who are post-COVID. And this is important because the naturally immune are in a separate risk trajectory compared to the unexposed, and there are likely over 9,000 Penn State students with natural immunity.

And I will post two links. The first, for beginners, it simplistically explains how adaptive immunity works. And the second is a link to expert-level review on the topic. It's independent of me, it's gone through some peer scrutiny. The review is published in a premier journal and the authors recommend that the best evidence supports lasting and durable natural immunity to COVID.

And I know that there's estimates out there of the natural immunity ranging from marginally less effective than the vaccine, about 80%, to superior to the vaccine, about 90%. I want to emphasize no credible sources claim natural immunity universally disappears. And it's important because this drastically changes the vaccine's benefits and harms. And it's important because it demonstrates that it's likely that mandating vaccines for the naturally immune fails the World Health Organization's ethical guidance for vaccine mandates on at least two grounds, necessity and efficacy.

But possibly more importantly, the emerging evidence suggests the vaccine may fail also on the grounds of harm in this group. The vaccine elicits in an especially robust immune response in the naturally immune, which confers greater risk for harm. This data is just emerging, but there are some preprints that report higher odds for any harm, where there's a number needed to harm of two, which is freakishly large, or rather, freakishly small. And most concerningly, an estimated number needed to hospitalize of 17.

And that means that 1 of 17 naturally immune people who are vaccinated were vaccinated will require hospitalization following vaccination. I just, wow, if that's generalizable-- if their finding is generalizable, that's 540 Penn State students requiring vaccination, or requiring hospitalization and an unnecessary vaccination. That's a true harm and it violates the third ethical principle organization, not causing harm.

Together, the lack of necessity in this group, the lack of benefit, and the potential for harm failed to achieve a good ratio of benefits to harm. So, at the moment, I can only relay the data for where it is and the grounds for expecting that it's playing out the way one would expect it. It looks like a really bad idea. Let's reject this resolution and ask instead for the University to follow the emerging evidence and make the best evidence-based decisions they can make. Thanks.

Maureen Jones: Bonj, would you like me to read these into the record?

Chair Szczygiel: I think we can include them in the record. This is the-- we're looking at the Q&A from Charlene Gross, College of Arts and Architecture?

Maureen Jones: Correct. As well as—

Chair Szczygiel: Charlene, would like to-- how long is it, Maureen? Have you opened the—

Maureen Jones: She just wants a particular website to be included in the record. There's no question.

Chair Szczygiel: So, if it's part of the Q&A, it'll be part of our record. And it will be made available. Looks like we've got something from Shelley Stine.

Maureen Jones: Again, just for the record as well. And Lisa is pulling these down and making them a part of the record as they come in. Same thing with Saltz from Shenango.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. We have a raised hand from Ray Najjar. Ray, could you identify your unit, please?

Raymond Najjar, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Yeah. Ray Najjar from Earth and Mineral Sciences. And I just wanted to report on some response that we got from our faculty in the College. We sent out an email at your suggestion, Bonj, to get feedback. And we heard from 12 faculty members.

And then, I'll add two more that were in the Q&A but are not Senators, John Morrow and Joe Murgio. So that's 14. And of those 14, 12 are in support of the resolution and 2 are against it. And you can see some of their reasons in the Q&A.

And I just want to also add, I'm against this just recent addition of this exemption exception regarding strong moral or ethical convictions. I don't really know what that means. And I'm also against the

religious belief exemption. I'm not aware of any religious texts that ban vaccines, for example, and I'm not quite sure why that's in there.

And also, as a point of procedure here, I mean, we were supposed to be, I think, supposed to be debating the resolution that was placed in front of us. And so, I'm not quite sure how this got inserted, and I may have missed something. But the resolution as it stood before the meeting, I'm very much in support of and that's pretty much consistent with the faculty that responded. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Ray. And to clarify, the only editing that was done to this resolution is what you see on the screen in red. The moral and ethical convictions. Are you raising a motion to vote on whether to include that paraphrase?

Raymond Najjar: Well, I mean, yeah-- don't we have to vote to include something into a resolution that we were presented a week ago? It seems to me like we should be debating the resolution that was handed to us. And then if we want to add these additional texts-- I mean, I don't know the rules of the Senate here. Maybe it's your prerogative as the Head of the Senate to add text.

I'm just not sure. But I would feel more comfortable just debating what we have here. And if there's a motion to add text, then we could do that. Or yeah, the procedure just seems a little bit off to me, here.

Chair Szczygiel: All right, Ray, since you are raising a concern, this was added. It was considered to be a fairly minor edit at the time. But we recognize your concern. So, if you want to make a motion to vote on the addition of that text in red to the existing resolution, we would do that now. Is that your intention?

Raymond Najjar: Well, I guess I don't think it's minor at all. I mean, how do you decide if someone says, I just don't want to take the vaccine? I just don't want to take it. Is that a strong moral or ethical conviction? I mean, that would include everybody that is declining to take it, except those for medical conditions, as far as I'm concerned.

Of course, medical conditions, that's an excellent reason. People may react negatively to the vaccine or be very concerned about it based on prior experience. But the strong moral or ethical convictions, it's completely arbitrary, because what one person thinks is strongly moral or ethical another person will think is whimsical or-- there's another word that I can't seem to find. So, I would rather just be expunged and us be voting on the resolution that we were handed to us.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you, Ray. Josh, I'm going to ask you whether you are willing to revert back to the original resolution. If not, we would then have to take a vote on the inclusion of this new phrasing.

Josh Wede: I am OK going back with the original. This edition came out of some feedback that said for a vaccine requirement to comply with state law that that kind of exemption had to be in there. I'm not a lawyer, so I don't know for sure.

And when I reached out with Bonj and we talked about this, I guess, and when we used to meet in person there would be times this would happen where they would hand out copies of the resolution as you walk into the door with minor changes. And so, we looked at this as that. But I am OK going back to the original resolution without any of the red that is there, as was posted on the Senate website.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Then, if we could amend the document, Erin or Anna, and then post it as it was originally disseminated. And we'll go back and continue our discussion. I am not seeing anything in the way of questions and answers. But I do see some hands that are raised. So, could we go ahead and recognize Erin Boas?

Erin Boas, College of the Liberal Arts: Erin Boas, College of the Liberal Arts and President of the University Park Undergraduate Association. Good afternoon, fellow Senators. I first would like to thank the Senate leadership for creating the space for this very important discussion.

On April 21, the University Park Undergraduate Association passed resolution 416 supporting a COVID-19 vaccine requirement for the 2021-2022 academic year at Penn State University Park, with a vote 25 to 10 to 1. Following the announcement of the Faculty Senate resolution, the UPUA launched an informal survey on Monday, May 10.

The survey was distributed to students at the University Park campus, Commonwealth campuses, and the World Campus. After accounting for duplicate responses as well as those of nonstudents, there were a total of 2,319 student respondents as of 10:15 this morning. In response to the question, would you support a mandated COVID-19 vaccine requirement for the fall 2021 semester, 60.03% responded yes while 39.97% responded no.

Overall, the data shows support of a COVID-19 vaccine requirement. We also believe that the Senate would greatly benefit from comments and testimonials submitted to the last question on the survey. I want to preface these testimonials by saying that all comments and concerns have the right to be included in this discussion. And as the body tasked with communicating students' needs, it's essential to present all perspectives.

For respondents that indicated support for a vaccine requirement, comments strongly emphasized the collective need to protect our community, the University's responsibility, effects on the Centre County population, eased mental and physical health concerns, especially for those with immunocompromised conditions or immunocompromised family members, and citing a mandate as the only way that they would truly feel safe returning to in-person classes and engagement opportunities. For respondents that did not indicate support, many of the concerns surrounding the legality and constitutionality of a mandate, the infringement on personal choice, health and religious concerns, complications for international students, and the current FDA emergency use status of the vaccine. On April 29, the American College Health Association recommended COVID-19 vaccination requirements for all on-campus college students in the fall 2021 semester.

In their report they stated, "In addition to the obvious physical and mental health advantages offered by a highly vaccinated campus population, there are economic, academic, and social advantages. The resumption of continuity in the academic, extracurricular, and residential experience will once again enhance students personal, professional, and academic growth." As a highly acclaimed research University, we have a responsibility to treat this topic as an issue of public health and not weaponize it for political matters. As an educational institution, we must commit to the factual exigence of the topic at hand and assist in the communication of scientifically backed information.

I believe the University is taking many of the necessary precautionary measures to ensure the health and safety of the students, faculty, and staff in the classroom amid the COVID-19 pandemic. I also believe that the Senate has taken great strides in actualizing a community and culture of care in which the well-

being of not only our University community, but the State College community as a whole is prioritized. I ask that as we approach into a phase of the quote, unquote, "new normal", that we continue making strides in the areas of community responsibility. For this reason, I encourage the Senate to pass this resolution to ensure the health and safety of all members of our community. Thank you for your time and careful consideration on this topic.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Erin. And I see we have a hand raised from Noah. Please identify yourself and your unit.

Noah Robertson: Noah Robertson, College of the Liberal Arts and UPUA Vice Chair of Academic Affairs. Good afternoon, everyone-- Faculty Senators, members of the Penn State community. Thank you for your time and for having me here in my first plenary meeting as a Student Senator. I wrote a resolution similar to this one that President Boas mentioned as well, which was passed and adopted by the UPUA.

Here, I want to briefly highlight two of my primary reasons for supporting a COVID vaccine requirement and thus, this resolution, from my perspective as a student. So, I, and many of my constituent students, have expressed discomfort with how a nonrequirement could create a culture of uncertainty and distrust among the Penn State community on campuses and in classrooms across the Commonwealth. The decision whether to create a vaccine requirement should not solely focus on reducing COVID transmission events on campuses, but also on ensuring that the Penn State community has certainty and solace in knowing that their health is a priority in decision-making.

From my perspective as a student, I cannot imagine how uncomfortable it would be to sit in a crowded classroom, some of which like the Forum building have students sitting nearly shoulder-to-shoulder and wonder how many of my peers aren't vaccinated. Penn State has the authority to implement a vaccine requirement to alleviate these concerns, some of which are endured by the most vulnerable and susceptible among us based on constitutional and judicial precedents, and it absolutely ought to. I also want to comment on Penn State's influence on its surrounding communities across the Commonwealth, as this cannot be understated.

In State College, many students and student organizations-- notably Greek chapters here-- ignored the Penn State COVID safety guidelines. This resulted in COVID case spill over into the community and a temporary closure of the local school district, among other consequences. We have to acknowledge that a vaccine requirement would not only protect students, faculty, and staff, but that it would also curtail spillover infections into our surrounding communities, in which many of my constituents are just semesterly guests.

There's a famous analogy made by medical ethics philosopher Jessica Flanagan that forgoing vaccination is like randomly shooting a gun in the air, insofar as both cases threaten people's lives and health. They are similar from a moral perspective. I wholly support this resolution and I hope we see Penn State leadership join the legion of other universities that are already requiring a COVID-19 vaccination to deliver us to a normal and safe fall semester. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Noah. Maureen, I think we've got a question.

Maureen Jones: We do. Mahoney, Berks, can World Campus be exempted from this? I assume that's to Josh,

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, we're looking to Josh for a response.

Josh Wede: I guess if you're not working anywhere in the World Campus's offices on campus, like in the outreach building, I don't see any reason why the vaccine would be required if you're not on a physical location.

Chair Szczygiel: We have a raised hand from Rose. Rose, if you could identify yourself and your unit.

Rosemary Jolly: Rose Jolly, Liberal Arts. I wish to make three points in support of the vaccination resolution. The first is I would like to recognize that we are in a very privileged situation.

There are a number of people across the world, in India, spectacularly, at the moment, and South Africa as well, who have many multiple news strains and no access to the vaccine. This needs to be recognized as an element of the context in which we make this resolution. Second of all, I would like to point out that there is such a thing as social suffering that has been long recognized as opposed to individual suffering. I believe the previous speaker, Noah, spoke about this when he mentioned how many students may be sitting, generating anxiety for the valid reason that their bodies are at risk.

Thirdly, and importantly, I would like to point out that there is a false opposition that can be identified in the rhetoric around this issue. This false rhetoric suggests that it is individual choice against public health or public health against individual choice. I would like to point out that individuals make a choice to join a community before they can become identified as people who rally for public health.

No matter which side of this we are on, we all have individual rights. It's not that your individual rights disappear because you support the resolution or that you don't believe in them because you support the resolution. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Rose. Megan, we have another raised hand. Could you identify yourself? Megan needs to be given leave to talk. There we go.

Megan Neely, College of Arts and Architecture: Can you hear me now?

Chair Szczygiel: We can.

Megan Neely: OK. Hello. Megan Neely, College of Arts and Architecture. I would like to thank everyone for being here today and for your time. Speaking for arts and architecture students, many have expressed frustration over the inability to access performance spaces as well as art studio spaces.

While the COVID-19 guidelines have been effective in the classroom, learning in the arts has not. This is not the fault of the professors. This is a consequence of virtual and hybrid learning. The arts cannot be effectively experienced in a virtual setting or in a limited capacity setting.

All majors in the College of Art and Architecture or hands-on. Art is a communal experience. Around the country, the arts have been some of the most affected by COVID-19. There is no exception at Penn State. The Palmer Museum has been closed for half of the year. Theaters have been closed. Individuals in Blue Band have been separated by instrument, taking away the group experience.

Dance studios are limited to only one person at a time. Access to the visual arts building for studios are limited to certain individuals in arts classes, not all.

Art cannot be fully experienced and learned until we are fully in-person. The only way to do this is to mandate vaccinations with exception for religious and health limitations. Social distancing may still be in place next semester. These guidelines cannot be predicted.

To ensure more COVID-19 guidelines are relaxed. So, we can be in the classroom, vaccinations must be mandated. As previously mentioned, herd immunity must be reached to safely be in the classroom. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Megan. And I see we have a raised hand from Christopher. Christopher, could you join us and identify yourself?

Christopher Griffin, College of Engineering: Hi, my name is Christopher Griffin. I represent the College of Engineering, and in particular, I work for the Applied Research Laboratory. I don't have a prepared statement. And under normal circumstances I would not tell a personal story, but I'll tell a brief personal story.

First, the response to this resolution was extremely mixed within the Applied Research Laboratory, with 12 vehemently for and 14 vehemently against in an email request for response. I believe this is somewhat reflective of the conversation we've been having here, and I want to express the fact that I do fully understand the nuances of this conversation. The personal story is this.

On Monday, I received my Johnson and Johnson vaccine, and I had believed that I may have been exposed to and had COVID very early before it was a blip on anyone's radar in the United States. I had been sick for 45 days with a recurrent fever and a cough. I had no reason to believe it was COVID, but I had a deep suspicion, as did my doctors.

Despite that, I got a vaccine at the suggestion of the general population, and everything seemed to be fine until nine hours in when my temperature had been going up and suddenly spiked by almost 2 degrees Fahrenheit in five minutes. My heart rate jumped to 150 beats per minute, and I was deciding whether or not to call the EMS when I was lucky enough to remember I have a friend in the medical school and called him, who talked me through what was going on and described the response as a profound immune response, which sounds less scary than what was actually happening.

This is not to elicit sympathy. I went into this understanding that there were risks associated with the vaccine. But I want to impress upon everyone that this is not a hypothetical situation we're engaged in. There are many students who have already had COVID and it's unclear exactly what their immune response would be.

We were essentially suggesting running a very large experiment on a group of students. And believe me, as an ARL faculty member who teaches and spent the last semester attempting to get through Zoom lessons like the rest of the University, I have no love for Zoom school, and as the husband of an artist, my heart breaks for those artists who cannot be in their studios at this time. The questions I would raise, because there's mixed support for this, so I cannot support, I can't speak in vehement support or vehemently against the resolution is this.

First, given my own experience, it does suggest that the University may be open to certain legal challenges since there are precedents to requiring immunization for tested and well-understood vaccines, but not for experimental or emergency use authorized vaccines. And the second is this, and it's a somewhat more nuanced point. If this were to become mandated for the entire faculty, staff, and students, I would point out that the University faculty are a mixed group, with a small minority holding tenure.

These are not at-will employees and a large majority not holding tenure. These are at-will employees. What would be the effect on the tenured faculty or the untenured faculty if tenured faculty are told, yes, this is mandated, but you have tenure so you can really ignore it, while untenured faculty run the risk of losing their positions as a result of ignoring a mandate? This seems morally dubious in this situation, and it is something that ARL, considering that we are a different class of employee and a different class of faculty, pointed out. Thank you very much.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Christopher. Seeing no other questions and no other hands raised, I want to thank you, Josh Wede, for standing and presenting this and for your effort in bringing this forward. Do we have a motion from the floor to support this resolution? If so, please raise your hand or identify.

Keith Shapiro, College of Arts and Architecture: Do you have a second?

Chair Szczygiel: Yeah?

Keith Shapiro: You have to call for the second.

Chair Szczygiel: I'm sorry. Thank you, Keith. We are looking for a second for this motion that is presented to the floor, this resolution. We've got a second from-- several seconds. All right. Thank you. Erin, if we could please go to the clicker slide, it is time to go to TallySpace. Hopefully you all have your 9-digit Penn State ID handy. The link is now posted in chat.

So, you should access this URL and it'll be taking you to the voting page. You'll be prompted to enter your email and your ID number. And having done that successfully, you'd be able to log in to vote. We will give this a few minutes. Realize it takes a bit of time. Thank you, Erin. Erin now has the resolution title up.

Anna Butler, Senate Office Staff: And the votes are coming in,

Chair Szczygiel :Great. Thank you, Anna. The link is posted in chat. And there it is again. Thank you, Josh.

If you're getting a message saying that there are no open polls-- what is the advice that we were giving them last time? Refresh. Go home.

Chair Szczygiel: Refresh, please. Try that. Refresh or go home.

Chair Szczygiel: Refresh or go home. Try one of those two. Just another minute or two. Anna, how are we looking?

Anna Butler: They're still coming in.

Maureen Jones: Can I ask a clarifying question? They are wanting to know, we are voting on the original text, not the red that was added.

Chair Szczygiel: Correct. Correct. Joshua has rescinded the edits and we are looking at the original text only.

Anna Butler: OK, it looks like the votes have stopped now. And I have 113 Accept and 31 Reject.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Resolution is approved, Josh. We will go forward; we will share this information and communication with the President and the Provost. And thank you very much for all of your efforts. It's appreciated.

Letter for Board of Trustees

Chair Szczygiel: All right. We are now ready to go forward with our second item on the agenda. It is in the-- our next item, rather, is the letter from the University Senate to the Board of Trustees, which can be found or labeled as Appendix B. To present the letter to the Board of Trustees, I recognize Rose Jolly, Carey Eckhardt, and Steve Browne, representing the Senate caucus representation from Liberal Arts. If you want to make any introductory comments or clarifications, please take the floor. So, we just need to promote those three, Erin.

Rosemary Jolly: Can you hear me?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes. Yes, we can, Rose.

Rosemary Jolly: Thank you. Thank you, Chair Szczygiel. I stand before you all-- or at least I'm sitting in front of Zoom before you all to remind everybody, as if they needed reminding, that the University Senate advises the president.

In this regard, we have been reflecting upon the current process as it stands at the moment for the search for the new president. A few things before we get into this-- I want to remind people that the intervention that I and my colleagues are making here is one based not on the desirable qualities of the president-- although that is obviously a serious issue-- this one is based on the process for choosing the new president.

Currently, there is only one committee involved. That is the committee that is chaired by the Board of Trustees and convened by the Board of Trustees. In the past, this has not been the case. The letter makes two alternative recommendations to ensure appropriate faculty participation in the search.

In order to explain those two options, I will soon be passing on to my colleague, Senator Carey Eckhardt. I just want to emphasize that the goal of this letter is to advise the president, bearing in mind that the Senate has no direct relationship with the Board of Trustees except through its Chair and its newly elected representative, Senator Roland. In this instance, we wish to strongly advise the president of the importance of broad, consultative, and representative input from faculty, staff, undergraduate students, and students on all campuses of this University, in order to create the appropriate mandate for the new president. I now pass on my record of speech to Senator Carey Eckhardt.

Chair Szczygiel: May I ask whether it would be appropriate at this time for you to share your screen so that we can see the letter?

Carey Eckhardt, College of the Liberal Arts: And Bonj, is Erin posting the letter?

Chair Szczygiel: Well, I think she can. I believe we thought that was going--

Erin Eckley, Senate Office Staff: I am.

Chair Szczygiel: So, hold on a second. Go ahead, Carey. I don't mean to interrupt you.

Carey Eckhardt: Sure, sure, sure.

Chair Szczygiel: Go ahead.

Carey Eckhardt: Thank you. Eckhardt, College of the Liberal Arts. I'm speaking in support of the letter to the trustees. The letter's main point is to urge that the search process for Penn State's next president must include a broadly representative committee of deans and chancellors, faculty, staff, and students from around the University, including Commonwealth campus representation.

Such a committee would serve alongside the trustee selection counsel during the next phases of research, up until the point when the trustees make the decision. Including a committee of these key University stakeholders in upcoming phases of the search would be a win-win situation. We all want the same thing.

We all want a successful search and then a successful presidency. The trustees will, of course, make the final decision, but along the way, they would benefit from this partnership with a broadly representative and confidential academic committee that knows the University from the inside. The faculty would benefit from knowing that our voices-- multiple, diverse, and University wide-- are included in addition to the two outstanding faculty now on the trustees' selection council.

We just heard today that the new academic trustee, Nicholas Roland, will serve on that group. But we're talking about in addition to those two individuals, a broader more representative group. Candidates will benefit, and might, in fact, be more attracted to Penn State by seeing that ours is a University where we work together and shared governance is a reality, unlike at some other institutions that are in the news. And the new president, once hired, would benefit by being able to work with an academic constituency-- academic constituencies, sorry. We will have confidence in the search process underlying our new leader's appointment. So, nobody loses. All of us gain.

Our letter to the trustees, which we bring to you today, does not pinpoint exactly how such an academic committee would be structured, though it mentions two possible precedents. One, the committee that participated in the 2013 search, the other a revised version of Next Gen, in other words, a Next Gen, version two. Our letter doesn't focus on the specifics here, but we do want to make the point that the search process going forward can only benefit from and needs the greater inclusiveness and representation, academically, that we propose.

Those of you who are supporting this letter and bringing it to you today, ask other Senators to join us so the Senate can together send a clear message forward to the trustees on behalf of our more complete

academic inclusion in the search process. Thank you. I will pass things over to my colleague, Steve Browne.

Stephen Browne, College of the Liberal Arts: Thank you. Excuse me. Thank you, Rose and Caroline. It seems to me that the virtues of this case are self-evident, and that Senators Jolly and Eckhardt have identified precisely the most compelling rationale.

I would only add that while it is the case that this letter addresses immediate circumstances pending very closely on the horizon, the Senate has it within our collective capacity, not only given a positive vote on this, to send that message forcefully and directly, but really to help to establish a precedent for the long term. We can be a part of the history of this University in the most positive way.

Seems to me, this just hits it on every point. It's win, win, win, win all the way down. And I encourage your support for it. Thank you, again.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you all. I see we have three hands raised. Josh, do you want to identify yourself? Oh, Josh Kirby? And while-- Josh, are you muted?

Joshua Kirby, College of Education: Accident. Accident. Accident.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, an accident. Joshua is reporting it was an accident and he cannot lower the damn hand. All right, so Charlene, please-- the floor is yours. Identify yourself, Charlene.

Charlene Gross, College of Arts and Architecture: My hand's raised, I think from previously, for seconding. My hand won't lower, either. Sorry.

Chair Szczygiel: Going to have some rigor mortis here. And may I dare ask, Irmak, are you in a similar situation? Do you have a question regarding this letter to the BOT or is your hand also frozen?

Suat Irmak, College of Engineering: My hand is also frozen.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Very sorry for that. Sounds very uncomfortable. I see no-- I see no hands. Maureen, do we have anything in question in Q&A?

Maureen Jones: No questions.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Thank you, Rose.

Maureen Jones: has her hand up.

Chair Szczygiel: Excuse me?

Maureen Jones: Dawn seems to have her hand up.

Chair Szczygiel: Dawn, is your hand up intentionally?

Dawn Blasko, Executive Director, University Faculty Senate Office: No, it's not.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Listen, it's par for the course. Do we have any other-- we've got Ray Najjar. Ray, could you please identify yourself?

Ray Najjar, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Yeah.

Ray Najjar: I just wanted to report, also, what we heard from the faculty that we solicited in EMS about this second resolution. And six faculty responded, and they were all in favor of the resolution. And I would like to also add that I've heard from several faculty members that they would like more involvement in University decision-making. That kind of echoes the statement that we heard earlier asking the Provost for more interaction over the summer. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Ray. Seeing no other questions and no other hands raised, do we have a-- well, we do not need a second for this motion since we have a complement of faculty support and signatures. So let us go quickly now, and just move forward to a vote.

If you would, please, go back to TallySpace, if we could have that link posted again. We'll do that. You're all experts at this now. Thank you, Josh.

Anna Butler: We do have many votes coming in, Bonj.

Chair Szczygiel: Great. We'll just give it a minute or two.

Anna Butler: OK, looks like the votes have stopped. And I have 122 accept and 4 reject.

Chair Szczygiel: I heard 122 accept, 4 reject.

Anna Butler: Correct.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you very much. Thank you, Anna. Thank you, everyone. This letter has passed overwhelmingly.

It will be forwarded to the respective parties identified in the letter, in the Board of Trustees. And we will get that out very soon. As soon as we possibly can.

Thank you, everyone, for your forbearance of this process. And it's very much appreciated.

COMMENTS OR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Szczygiel: The last item on our agenda is simply one of recognizing if there are any comments or recommendations for the good of the University. Senators, I just want to remind you to wait to be unmute and identify yourself. Name your voting unit before speaking on the floor.

Members of the University community who are not Senators may not speak at a Senate meeting unless they request and are granted the privilege of the floor from the Chair at least five days in advance of the meeting. So, any comments or recommendations for the good of the University? I see Rose Jolly's hand is raised. Hopefully it's not a frozen hand. Rose?

Rosemary Jolly: I'm afraid it's not a raised hand in mistake, Bonj. It's me again, Rose Jolly, Liberal Arts. I just want to point out for the good of the University, that we have now acted on two important pieces. Having now set the precedent for that, it requires us for all to be actively involved in performing, now that we've got the precedent right.

We were looking for these wonderful moves to make a path forward. And now, it will require activism on all of our parts in the appropriate ways to ensure that what we have made a path for comes to be. So, I see this as the beginning of a process and not the end of one, and I thank you all for your robust discussions. Thanks.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Rose. Any other comments from the group?

Maureen Jones: Nothing in Q&A.

Chair Szczygiel: Seeing none-- sometimes it takes a while to type, but I see nothing coming forward.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Carey Eckhardt: So, moved.

Chair Szczygiel: Second?

Carey Eckhardt: Thank you, Bonj.

Chair Szczygiel: The Senate is now adjourned. Great meeting.

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday September 14, 2021, 1:30 p.m.

The following Senators were noted as having participated in the May 12, 2021, Senate Meeting via Zoom.

- Abendroth, Catherine
- Aurand, Harold
- Baka, Jennifer
- Bieschke, Kathleen
- Bird, Douglas
- Bishop-Pierce, Renee
- Blakney, Terry
- Blockett, Kimberly
- Borromeo, Renee
- Browne, Stephen
- Brunsdon, Victor
- Calore, Gary
- Chen, Wei-Fan
- Coduti, Wendy
- Costanzo, Denise
- Davis, Dwight
- Demirci, Ali
- Dube, Sibusiwe
- Eckhardt, Caroline
- Egolf, Roger
- Engel, Renata
- Evans, Edward
- Fairbank, James
- Farnan, Kaitlin
- Fausnight, Tracy
- Frederick, Samuel
- Fredricks, Susan
- Freiberg, Andrew
- Frisch, Paul
- Furfaro, Joyce
- Gallagher, Julie
- Gayah, Vikash
- Glantz, Edward

- Goffe, Lorraine
- Grimes, Galen
- Gross, Charlene
- Guadagnino, Frank
- Handley, Meredith
- Hanes, Madlyn
- Hardy, Melissa
- Harte, Federico
- Hauck, Randy
- Hayford, Harold
- Holden, Lisa
- Hu, Margaret
- Huang, Tai-Yin
- Iliev, Peter
- Jett, Dennis
- Jolly, Rosemary
- Jones, Maureen
- Jones, Nicholas
- Jordan, Matthew
- Karpa, Kelly
- Kennedy-Phillips, Lance
- Kenyon, William
- King, Elizabeth
- Kirby, Joshua
- Kubat, Robert
- Lang, Dena
- Larson, Allen
- Le, Binh
- Lear, Matthew
- Linch, Amy
- Mahoney, Joseph
- Marko, Frantisek
- Marshall, Megan
- Mathews, Jonathan
- Maximova, Siela
- McKinney Marvasti, Karyn

- Melton, Robert
- Mocioiu, Irina
- Moore, Jacob
- Mulder, Kathleen
- Najjar, Raymond
- Nesbitt, Jennifer
- Noce, Kathleen
- Novotny, Eric
- Nurkhaidarov, Ermek
- Ozment, Judith
- Page, B.Richard
- Palma, Julio
- Pauley, Laura
- Phillips, Kathleen
- Pierce, Mari Beth
- Posey, Lisa
- Precht, Jay
- Rhen, Linda
- Robicheaux, Timothy
- Robinson, Brandi
- Ruggiero, Francesca
- Rutherford Siegel, Susan
- Saltz, Ira
- Seymour, Elizabeth
- Shannon, Robert
- Shapiro, Keith
- Sharma, Amit
- Shea, Maura
- Shearer, Gregory
- Shen, Wen
- Sigurdsson, Steinn
- Simmons, Cynthia
- Sims, Damon
- Sinha, Alok
- Smith, David
- Snyder, Stephen

- Stine, Michele
- Strauss, James
- Suliman, Samia
- Tallman, Nathan
- Taylor, Ann
- Taylor, Jonté
- Tyworth, Michael
- Vasilatos-Younken, Regina
- Wagner Lawlor, Jennifer
- Warner, Alfred
- Wede, Joshua
- Weld, Jennifer
- Whitehurst, Marcus
- Williams, Mary Beth
- Williams, Nicole
- Wolfe, Douglas
- Yagnik, Arpan
- Zhang, Qiming
- Zilleruelo, Arturo
- Zorn, Christopher

Elected	113
Students	0
Ex Officio	3
Appointed	9
Total	125