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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, March 16, 2021, at 1:00 p.m. via Zoom Webinar and in person at the Foster Auditorium, with Elizabeth Seymour, Chair, presiding.

**Chair Seymour, Penn State Altoona:** Hello, everybody. It's Tuesday, March 16, 2021 at I think about 1:03 PM, and the Senate is now in session. We're meeting today in a modified in person but predominantly Zoom meeting. Let me go through the instructions for the meeting focusing on the Zoom portion.

Who can speak in 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're not a senator. You can email Executive Director Dawn Blasko or me if you would like to request to speak at a future meeting. Our Zoom capacity is 500. And if we reach capacity, you may not be able to attend. We create a complete record of the meeting that will be available about three weeks after the meeting. This meeting, like all senate plenary meetings, is being recorded. We've brought you in with your microphones muted and your video off. If you're presenting a report, when it is time for your report, we will unmute you and put your video on. Please wait to speak until you are introduced by the chair. When you're finished, we'll mute you and turn your camera off.

We're continuing to use Zoom features in the following ways. Chat will be turned on for you to communicate with each other, but chat will not be closely monitored. You may use it to post a comment and let us know you are having a technical problem, let us know you joined late, or to tell us that you are joining by phone and your phone number for attendance. But do not use it to take a question for a presenter to be recognized to speak and have the floor. If you have an emergency, please email Kadi Corter at kkw2@psu.edu. Today we also have Akash as our tech TAs. Thank you for joining us.

How do you ask a question? You have two ways to ask a question. You can raise your hand using the hand function. For those of you using the newest version of Zoom, you can see it at a yellow hand in your menu at the bottom of the screen. For those of you not using the newest version, you can find it by clicking on the Participant box. Wait until the chair recognizes you. Like our in-person meetings, you must begin by stating your last name and academic unit. For example, Seymour, Altoona.

Please speak clearly and slowly, as the audio is not always clear on Zoom calls. You can also enter your question in the Q&A with your name and unit, and Bonj will help me with that.

As always, we might not be able to answer everyone's question, but we will capture the Q&A and pass along questions that have not been answered. How do you vote? In order to get an accurate vote, we're using TallySpace. A final note, please be patient. Running a meeting like this has a lot of moving parts, so please give us time.

I want to welcome everyone and thank you for being here. Your commitment to the Senate is more important than ever. Thank you for staying focused and committed to shared governance. I value your time, commitment, and efforts. I'm also here to support you. So please don't hesitate to reach out to me. I want to thank our guests for attending and engaging in the work of the Senate, and I want to thank the Senate Office for their hard work. Without their support, the Senate could not get its work accomplished.
I have some of them in the room with me. So, thank you.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Seymour: So, let us move on to the agenda. Item A, Minutes of the Preceding Meeting. The January 26, 2021 Senate record providing a full transcription of the proceedings of the meeting was sent to the University archives and is posted on the faculty Senate website. If there are any corrections or additions to the minutes, please send them to Dawn Blasko at dgb6@psu.edu at your earliest convenience. May I have a motion to tentatively accept the minutes?

OK, Brunsden, Altoona moved. And Bonj Szczysiel, Arts and Architecture seconded. For the minutes, let's use a thumbs up vote. At the last meeting, we noticed the TallySpace timed out, so we want to cluster the votes closer together at this meeting. So please to accept the minutes, please raise your virtual thumb.

How are the thumbs looking? All right. If there are any nays, everybody with the yay thumbs, take them down, and anyone with a nay thumb, put them up. Minutes accepted? No, it's OK. No, I meant thumbs up either way. OK, thank you. The minutes are accepted.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report

Chair Seymour: Next, Item B Communications to the Senate. The curriculum report of February 16, 2021 is posted on the University Faculty Senate website and is in Appendix A.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Seymour: Item C, Report of Senate Council. Minutes from the February 16, 2021 Senate Council meeting can be found at the end of your agenda.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Seymour: Item D, Announcements by the Chair. A year ago, we moved all classes across the University to a remote delivery mode due to the pandemic. Faculty and instructors with only a few days warning made this transition happen. And for the most part, it happened incredibly smoothly. The pressures of the pandemic have continued to challenge faculty, staff, and students to adapt to new ways of learning, working, socializing, and living for over a year. We've continued throughout this time to do extraordinary things in very stressful and challenging circumstances. I want to thank everyone for their continued efforts.

I have a few announcements to make. The salary report is now available to all faculty at the University and can be found at both the Senate and the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research's websites. I'm also in the process of charging a joint curricular task force. This task force is co-charged by
the University Faculty Senate and the Presidential Select Commission on Racism, Bias and Community Safety. They are charged to make recommendations to the Senate to develop and strengthen an equity centered curriculum. The task force details, including the charge and membership, will be posted once they have been charged on April 1st. I look forward to their recommendations.

In the fall, I charge the self-study chaired by Keith Shapiro. They are charged to examine the Senate’s mission, determine how it fulfills that mission, identify the Senate's challenges, and identify potential possibilities for the Senate. They are conducting listening sessions to help inform the work. They’ll continue to work over the summer, and I look forward to their recommendation. At this time, I would like to welcome Tim Robicheaux here to discuss the John W. White graduate fellowship.

Tim Robicheaux, College of the Liberal Arts: I am here. Thank you. Beth, are you able to hear me all right?

Chair Seymour: Yes, we can.

Tim Robicheaux: OK, awesome. So last year we-- every year Student Life awards several students who are going to graduate school with the John W. White graduate fellowship. And last year we ran into a situation where this is a limited pot of money that started really in 1902 with a donation then and has continued as an endowment. Each year the amount we have varies based on economic conditions, et cetera.

And so last year we ended up in a situation where students were getting slightly less than $1,000 each. We wanted to award five students. So, the committee kicked in some money and made it where it was possible to give everyone this amount of money. We realized that there weren't many advertisements or much advertising for the fellowship.

So, working with Senate staff, who I second are awesome, and got this done among other staff with development, we now have a direct link if senators would like to donate to the John White fellowship. It is one of two, there's a scholarship and a fellowship, maybe three, that are under the exclusive control of Faculty Senate. We get some really bright students. And 20, 30 bucks goes a really long way with this with several people, because it's not a large fellowship, but it's one that can make a big difference in budding graduate students.

So, there is a direct link to donate, which you should see on the screen. If you're not able to see because you're on the phone, it's just raise.psu.edu/johnwwhitefellowship. It will go directly to the donation page, and your donations will go to that award. It has also been put on the Senate page. So, if you want to go there, there's actually a link on the Senate page as well. So, I am happy to answer your questions, though mostly we just appreciate any donations. And this ended up being much easier than my idea of using Venmo. So, this worked out well.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Tim, and thank you for your leadership. Does anyone have any questions for Tim? If you have a question, put it in Q&A or raise your hand.

Tim Robicheaux: Thanks, Bonj, for putting that up too. Great. Thanks, all.

Graduate Council Report
Chair Seymour: All right, thank you, Tim. Now I'd like to welcome Ken Davis, the Chair of Graduate Council, to present a report on the work of Graduate Council found in Appendix B. Thank you, Ken, for joining us today.

Ken Davis, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Greetings. Davis, University Park. Right, that's what I'm supposed to do? I'm trying to screen share. I think I have to take over. Let's see if I'm successful. Good. All right. Thanks for having me and for allowing me to go early to accommodate my teaching schedule. I have a short refresher on what is the Graduate Council, just in case you're not all up to speed on that, and then a few slides on the Graduate Council's current activities. And I welcome your input at the end. Hopefully we'll have time.

So quick refresher in Graduate Council, what it is, and its structure. As I have come to learn, I am not a faculty governance scholar. The authority of the Graduate Council comes by this delegation from the Board of Trustees to the President to the Faculty Senate and from you all to the Graduate Council. And the delegation of authority is as such. As delegated by the Faculty Senate, ultimate responsibility for all matters pertaining to graduate education great research rests with the graduate faculty, et cetera. The authority of graduate faculty shall be vested in a council, the Graduate Council. So that's where we're coming from.

And I've heard this referred to as a committee of the Faculty Senate. It's kind of a big committee. We have 11 standing committees and subcommittees plus about five ad hoc committees at present. So, it's a fairly large structure. And including one committee that is joint with Faculty Senate committee. And who is on the Graduate Council? This includes 44 elected faculty members, five representatives in the Graduate and Professional Student Association, and then a number of additional members from the graduate school and other administrative posts and a mixture of voting and non-voting roles. The faculty members, the Graduate Council members are elected every year, serve two-year terms. About half are up for election each spring.

And we have two-- well, we have two council wide officers, a chair and a vice chair which are elected in the spring. And this is new as of the spring of 2018, largely because of the action of the Faculty Senate to encourage the Graduate Council to change its standing rules so that we had a faculty elected chair. And so that changed in the spring of 2018. And I was the lucky fellow who started out as the first chair. Sven Schmitz from College of Engineering is the Vice Chair. We also then have graduate committee chairs as well, of course.

So that's the quick rundown of the structure. Now I've got just four slides of what's going on at the Graduate Council and what I see coming in the future. And first are some of the priorities I've been trying to push through the Graduate Council in my two years. This is the end of my second year as chair. One is simply to increase Graduate Council member participation in the governing process. I have been on Graduate Council before, and it has been a relatively quiet, largely consultative body, which is not necessarily bad, but there's not been a lot of active engagement all the time from the members.

So, in order to improve, increase, and extend the activity of the council members, we're trying to improve the orientation process, work to get their colleges and campuses to support the council members, include them in college level graduate program governance discussions, and I'm trying to support the process for transition to a new chair. I have some concerns about the sustainability of this position.
Second, we've been working hard, and the graduate school has been working hard as well before I came on as chair to open the Graduate Council process more to outside input and increase the opportunity for stakeholders to be heard before decisions are made. And we've heard a lot about this. I think we're making quite a bit of improvement in that regard.

Third, I'm personally trying to increase awareness among the council members of the ongoing tension between common standards and what I would call top-down regulation versus delegation out to the units. If there's a political issue within the Graduate Council, I would say this is the dominant one. And since we don't have a long history of orientation and very active membership, I'm trying to make people more aware of this so that when decisions come up, they can think somewhat in these terms, not to advocate one or the other.

OK, so that's me. Standing committees. We have a number. And now the committee agendas are posted online. They're not necessarily easy to find or very obvious, but you can find them. So, the standing committees have agenda items which we vote on. We did this for the first time, I believe, last spring to vote on the agenda items for the coming year, and they're posted. Some of the things we're working on at the moment. Professional degree programs have expanded a lot in graduate education.

And so, at request to the graduate school, we've been pushing through revised and new policies specifically for graduate degree programs. Professional doctoral program standards are being passed and master's degree programs are being presented and up for a vote at tomorrow's meeting of the Graduate Council. And I'm cheating a little. That's not a standing committee. My bad. The Academic Standards Committee has been doing what I call the clean the basement agenda, which is important. Not necessarily exciting, but important. They continue to go through the standing academic policies to update them. Some of them haven't been touched for a long time and have some dust, so to speak.

Graduate student and faculty issues has been working on both a leave of absence and on ombudsperson program policies. We have a Graduate Research Committee, which is joint with Faculty Senate, SCORSCA. I think I missed a C here. And you all may know this agenda better than I do, and it's unclear to me how well this joint committee is working. We could discuss that offline at some point. And then finally, our Committee on Committees and Procedures have made Graduate Council meetings now open to observers from the University community. I believe that's very similar to current Senate rules.

Ad hoc committees are important, and we've got some important work going on. And the first two are a little bit-- well, the first one is older. The second one is the earliest when we started this year. These are issues that the graduate school has promoted that we take on, and we've adopted those requests. First is academic integrity. And this actually predates my tenure as chair. An effort to adapt academic integrity rules to graduate education. And this committee should be nearing its work and submitting a report to the Graduate Council soon.

The ad hoc committee on professional master's degree policies followed the Committee on Professional Doctoral Degree Policies. They have just turned in their report to our February council meeting. And those new and revised policies are up for a vote tomorrow. They may not all get voted on tomorrow, but they're up tomorrow.

And then there are three newer ad hoc committees that I've promoted this fall as chair and the council has approved and these are moving forward. Two, I believe, deal with important broad issues influencing graduate students and faculty. We have a new ad hoc committee on diversity, equity, and inclusion. And
this may go on for some time. This is not an issue that's going to go away. And also, an ad hoc committee on the impact of COVID-19 on graduate education. Hopefully we'll be through that and not too long but understanding how that is influencing and has influenced our graduate education process is important.

And finally, I did a listening tour of as many campuses and colleges as would host me during the fall of 2019 and spring of 2020. And I got to all but three that have graduate programs. And the most common issue I heard about was concerns about graduate faculty status policies. And we have an ad hoc committee now that's looking at those problems trying to come up with improvements.

Finally, what's next? I believe the ad hoc committees have important tasks. I hope they'll continue their work, some of them at least into the next academic year, but that's going to be up to the council to decide. Council will be voting on next year's agenda items soon. So, if there are issues that you believe we should be dealing with, please let us know. Let your Graduate Council rep know. Let me know, et cetera. We'll consider it.

I'm a little concerned about the long-term viability of the role of chair and also concerned about keeping the Graduate Council members engaged and active. This takes a lot of work, and we all have limited time and resources, as I'm sure you all know. And I do greatly appreciate Senate support and oversight as the Council has learned to become more active and engaged. I have become sold on the importance of faculty governance, and I appreciate your push in this direction. Thank you very much.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Chair Davis. We really appreciate you being here today. I think we may have a couple of questions. Are there any hands raised?

Bonj Szczygiel, Arts and Architecture: We have a question from Leland.

Chair Seymour: All right, there's a question. I can't hear you well. You might want to get your—

Bonj Szczygiel: I'm sorry. Leland has his hand raised. We've got several hands raised now, and we do have two question and answers. However, you want to go first.

Chair Seymour: Which was first? The hands raised?

Bonj Szczygiel: How about Sue Rutherford, Health and Human Development has a question. So, if officers are elected, are these officers tenured, tenure line, or non-tenure officers?

Ken Davis: If you mean faculty, it does not matter if they are tenure line or non-tenure line faculty. It just matters that they are graduate faculty. I believe that's the only requirement for the officers of the Graduate Council.

Bonj Szczygiel: We have another question. This one is from Victor—

Chair Seymour: Let's do a hand raise. Could you give me a name for a hand raise?

Bonj Szczygiel: John Yen.

Chair Seymour: John Yen. Could you let John Yen speak?
John Yen, College of Information Sciences and Technology: Sorry, it was a mistake. Sorry.

Chair Seymour: Ray Najjar.

Raymond Najjar, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Hi, can you hear me?

Ken Davis: Yes. Hi, Ray.

Raymond Najjar: Hi, Ken, it's Ray Najjar, Earth and Mineral Sciences. Thanks for the overview of Graduate Council and how it relates to the Senate. That was very helpful. I chair the committee in our college that evaluates graduate faculty applications. So, I'm curious to know what some of the issues were that came up when you sort of did your listening tour regarding graduate faculty.

Ken Davis: Yeah. That's a complicated answer. I heard many different things. And since I've never been involved in that process, it took me a while. And I'm still working on the range of concerns that were brought up. There were a multitude. But I think I could group them broadly into two.

One is the approval process, which as I understand it, is largely not explicitly written down in Graduate Council policy and varies from place to place in a way that has confused some graduate faculty members.

So those are two. That's one of the issues, the approval process. The other is the consistency or inconsistency across different graduate faculty categories. There's a P, Q, and R graduate faculty status and some differences between tenure line and non-tenured and faculty in terms of their abilities within the graduate faculty. And that one I have not entirely wrapped my head around yet. In fact, this ad hoc committee is taking a look at it. But those are the two big categories of questions that were raised.

Raymond Najjar: Great, thanks very much.

Chair Seymour: Thank you both. I think we have a question in Q&A, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: This one is from Victor Brunsden from Altoona. Why do you think that the current chair position is not sustainable and what do you think should be changed to make it a more sustainable position?

Ken Davis: Well, I'm not sure that it's not sustainable. I'm just worried about it, primarily because I would estimate that the workload is if you do a limited job of it is about equivalent to teaching a course or more. And if I were actually to attend all the committee meetings that I am a ad hoc member of, I'd be overwhelmed, and there's really not any sort of extra support given to the chair. The graduate school administration does a great job with helping to organize things. Without them, we would be totally lost. We just wouldn't have the firepower to make things happen.

So, it just seems a little tenuous in terms of being able to talk someone into taking on this job. And as long as the graduate school is supportive, we do have administrative support, but that is also not controlled by Graduate Council. So, if push came to shove, that could get bad. Fortunately, relationships have been very good and there's no problem. But it makes me uneasy.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I think we have time for one more question in Q&A, Bonj.
Bonj Szczygiel: We have a question from Leland Glenna, College of Agricultural Sciences. I was just trying to find the-- oh. I'm going to send it down to Nathan Tallman, University Libraries. Graduate Council is clearly a body of University Faculty Senate. Why is Graduate Council represented as if it were part of the graduate school online? For example, why is Graduate Council not a part of the Senate website? Thanks.

Ken Davis: Good question. The Graduate Council works very closely with the graduate school I suppose is one reason. Historically was chaired by the Dean of the Graduate school, and all of our administrative support comes from the graduate school. There are some practical answers. Whether it's the right thing to do or not is another question.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Chair Davis. Thank you for joining us today. It's been a real pleasure.

Ken Davis: Thank you very much. Glad to be here.

________________________
_________________________
_________________________

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Seymour: Chair Seymour: Item E, Comments by the President of the University. It is my pleasure to recognize President Barron for his comments.

Eric Barron, President, Penn State University: Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity. So, I would like to perhaps explore but give you my sense of the future, which is one of cautious optimism. I would say the word cautious because in a COVID world, an awful lot depends on human behavior. And we're watching spring break photos and we're watching an increased number of individuals in the country that are traveling and having events partly because of COVID fatigue, partly because of weather, partly just because they wanted to do something for a long time.

But nonetheless, the travel is ticking up. So of course, we worry that this will result in some changes as states open and restaurants open, et cetera. But that's the cautious part of it. But human behavior will always rule here at least until we have a level of immunity where even that doesn't have the same level of impact.

But I am hopeful and optimistic about what is emerging. A good portion of that is the vaccinations, the rate at which they're occurring, the notion that by the end of May that all adults in the US will have access, that we're already substantially vaccinated those at greatest risk based on age. And we have a significant part of our population that has through contracting COVID developed some level of immunity. Those factors make a difference.

I don't think that we will be flipping any switches. I think that this will be a slow process to a more normal situation. We're watching carefully those engagement activities in the University that are so important for students to have some set of experiences through clubs and activities. We're doing that in a carrot mode rather than a stick mode and I think with some success. We're watching how the rules in the state change but not jumping in those circumstances and instead working carefully to work through it.

Clearly, we have a summer that is a transitional one where because of spacing and fewer courses and fewer students that we think we can do a great deal more face to face.
I'm really, really proud of the fact that in moving away from the COVID course designations for the fall that such an enormously high percentage of the faculty have selected face to face teaching. I think that's partly a sense of your optimism and the success of those who have done it in the last semester and the fact that we have not had any evidence of classroom transmission.

So, I see that as a significant part of the optimism that as we go and increase the level of vaccination that we will increasingly return to normal even though, as I said, it will be slow, not a switch that we're doing. I'm also encouraged by what's happening in the community with the State College Area School District, for example, for University Park having approaching where all staff and teachers are vaccinated and knowing that our own faculty and graduate students that are associated with classrooms are now high in the priority list for vaccination.

Another area for which I'm optimistic is how we're working through the budget. We took a hopefully you view it as a very thoughtful approach to the budget. We acted early in terms of controlling our costs. We had been working hard to save dollars during the last couple of years and including many things which were bearing fruit and allowing us to save money without impacting significantly our employees. That put us in a good stead to move forward. But we're now looking at the third tranche of stimulus funds, recovery funds from the federal government that are significant.

In this latest American Recovery Act recently signed into law, the projections by APLU are that the University will receive slightly more than $151 million. This is a significant amount. $77.5 million of those funds will go directly to students and defer those the cost of their education or those impacted by COVID. This is on top of the two previous tranches that each had $27.5 million that was being distributed to students.

So, this is a significant amount of money to help make sure that our students are successful in continuing their education. This is something that we worried a lot about, both from losing students in a remote environment but also their finances that the worst thing that can happen is for a student to stop or not be successful. So, this is a significant amount of money going directly to students in order to help them. And you couple that with the fundraising that has been done over the last couple of years, and we really have a great deal more money going directly towards students.

$73.9 million go directly to the institution. And we're working hard to look at all of those categories that fit within the law for which this University has been spending a significant amount of money. I think we crossed $25 million already in terms of testing costs and other costs directly related to COVID. So, these types of resources make a tremendous difference. No University set aside money because we might have a pandemic, and nobody knew how long it was going to take for us to recover. So those dollars are very significant.

Equally significant, I think, is the fact that the American Recovery Act has $7.2 billion that goes straight to the state of Pennsylvania. The state of Pennsylvania, I think, has a little more than a $3 billion deficit in their revenues compared to budget. So, this presents the opportunity for the state to recover and hopefully maintain the funding of higher education.

So, this previous summer, we were flat. We were very thankful for that. A lot of our projections had significant decreases in state support. That would have hurt. It goes directly to defray those tuition costs. And so, to have those resources go to the state makes a difference in terms of our planning and
expectation of the support for higher education and hopefully gives us multiple years for which we can recover economically without having it impact the state support that occurs there.

There's also funding for Center County, about $31 million, and for the borough, about $13 million. There's funding for some capital projects. But that stability of the state and surrounding communities is something that is very significant. And I gave you Center County as an example and the borough, because that's where the largest segment of students and faculty and staff are. But these are resources in the bill that support individual counties and will be an important part of the support for Penn State.

Our airport received funding. Many airports adversely affected by COVID and travel.

And this aids considerably in making sure that our budgets are manageable as we go through this mega hurricane that hit the nation and that we're going to come out of.

So, I just wanted to give you an update on those two areas, because I think all of that bodes well for how Penn State will emerge from this crisis. And as I say, I'm cautiously optimistic. Of course, human behavior can alter that considerably. And hopefully spring break or the lack of spring break but still a lot of travel and open states will be a blip and not a serious impact. But we will watch that very, very carefully as we move towards a more open University.

I also would like to comment on the success of the hiring of a new men's basketball coach. It was an incredibly deep pool of excellent people. I was quite impressed by the interest out there. We got a truly outstanding individual based on their experience and their fit with this University and on their reputation. I really have left that search process and the final approval last night feeling very good about it.

And I also think it's worth stepping back that in getting a truly excellent set of coaches that the University can also take pride that in athletics we have a noteworthy situation of having an African American football coach and an African American men's basketball coach. I'm not sure that I know of any other power five and maybe very few major universities which can say that. And it coincides with a high watermark in terms of the diversity of the administrative leadership of this University and a high watermark in terms of the growth in the last couple of years of underrepresented students that applied and are paid accepts in this University.

This University is changing, and I think changing in a very positive way. The only non-pride point we have there is the fact that the composition of the faculty is not changing. And in fact, in terms of African American faculty and Hispanic faculty, it's flat or slightly worse than flat. This is a problem that we have to solve. I'm very pleased that the Senate has been tackling a lot of these topics.

As Beth just said, focus on the curriculum as well. These are all important steps for this University to move forward successfully. But again, I think it's a moment, I think, of some optimism as well as we begin to implement all of the activities that our actions and proposals that are coming out of the select commission and the other groups that are working hard. And with that, I will stop, and I'm happy to take questions on any topic. Thank you.
Chair Seymour: Thank you, President Barron. If you have a question, please place it in Q&A or raise your hand. Bonj, do we have any questions?

Bonj Szczygiel: We have a question from Matthew Jordan from Communications. Given the optimism about an influx of Relief Act dollars to the University, will the previously announced give back by academic units still be required?

President Barron: Yeah, so it is too early to talk about any changes in the give back. We will continue to model and move through that in large part because, as is always the case, we don't know what the budget that will be approved tuition and the state until later in the year. And we need to find areas of investment as well and innovation. So, I believe we will continue that pace the way we have continued.

And hopefully as we emerge, we will see the opportunity for those investments to grow. It's, quite frankly, very important to me to be able to give raises to a faculty and staff that have worked even harder in this pandemic than usual, but budget conditions did not allow that. And so, I do want to continue down this path of being very careful with the resources and to make sure of what we're capable of before we decide that we can relax. As I said, it's a matter of cautious optimism.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. I believe Jim Strauss has his hand raised if we could recognize Jim.

Jim Strauss, Eberly College of Science: OK, can folks hear me.

President Barron: Yes.

Jim Strauss: Jim Strauss, Eberly College of Science, Chair of University Planning Committee. President Barron and Provost Jones, I'd actually like to take the time to thank both of you. Kelly Wolgast, her COVID organization committee, the Office of Physical Plant, our newly certified CLIA lab for the considerable positive efforts that you folks combined have made to combat COVID across our Penn State system.

As you know, this fall Senate passed a resolution. That resolution was important, I feel, to give faculty members a voice in this organization. Without going into details, your administration made really great efforts to engage our resolution, modify its spring semester schedules, start dates, improve testing regimes, employed rapid testing, and made considerable efforts to disseminate information as it was ongoing.

I know it's really too early to declare a complete victory over COVID, but we're very encouraged by the much-improved COVID rates this spring. And I thought it was very, very important that I at least acknowledged and appreciated your very proactive efforts to engage our resolution. So, thank you very much.

President Barron: Thank you. We're getting better and better. I'm just hoping that at some point we don't have to think about getting better and we put this behind us. But the team is-- and the rapid testing and the volume of it has been a significant improvement.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Bonj, do we have a question and Q&A.
Bonj Szczygiel: We do this is from Josh Kirby, education. President Barron, do you have a wish list, personal or professional, of things you'd like to do before you end your term as our University's president? And how can the faculty help you achieve any of those mission items?

President Barron: So, I actually gave to the Board of Trustees presentation on when I came in the door what I viewed as the critical imperatives for higher education and what I thought would be my effort to see how well we were doing. These were areas like diversity and equity and our role in economic development and the technology transformations for higher education.

And I preferred not to think about my giving the board time to do a search that was careful and thorough and gather the broad opinions from the universities over the next couple of months. I looked at it as my making sure that they would have the time to complete that process in a good way but that I wasn't going to stop what I wanted, and thought was best for the University. And best based on all the strategic thinking of the faculty and the leadership of the University. So, I spent considerable time on what it is that I wanted to do. So that's something that is posted.

And perhaps for a Faculty Senate meeting I can give a little bit of a presentation on the things that I think are important to get done. They probably cost more money than we have, but I don't mind dreaming a little bit about some of these areas. And I do think we can make a lot of progress. I will say that people sometimes say, well, will you get all these things done before you leave? And I think if a president gets everything done before they leave, somewhere along the line they stopped working and thinking about what's next.

So, I just hope I can keep my foot on the gas so that I run right into that date and it will never look like the University slowed down and we can pass the baton there successfully. So that's my plan. Personally, I'm working hard to turn myself into an oil painter. And I'm just hoping I get some of the chances to do that along the way and get my creative juices flowing. Thanks. Thanks for the question.

Chair Seymour: It sounds wonderful, President Barron. Do we have another question, Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel: This one is from Simmons in Communications. Is there any plan to provide vaccinations to students on campus? There's been some interest. 250 students from Schreyer Honors College have expressed interest in this.

President Barron: So, I love the idea that in November we said, come get tested. Don't take COVID home with you. Not to your parents, not to a brother or sister, not to a grandparent. And even though we were going remote and therefore we could say, look, this is not the University that's at risk here or the faculty and staff of the University that are at risk. We want you to be safe and go home safe. I thought personally that was just a wonderful message to do. I would love to be able to do the same thing for our students to say get vaccinated before you go home.

Now, of course, the timing there is, especially if it's a double dose, you've got about a six-week period to have full immunity. So, we backtrack that from commencement, and those vaccines have to come very, very soon here in order for us to be able to pull that off. And so that part is unlikely. But I will tell you, we have done a lot to indicate to FEMA that we're ready. We purchased freezer systems to make sure that whether it was Moderna or Pfizer or Johnson & Johnson, even better in that score, that we could be ready if the vaccines were ready.
And so, I think we have this attitude that we will do everything we can to be able to provide vaccines. The highest priority has been people that are at risk. And we specifically requested from the state to make sure that our faculty and anyone face to face with students was on that priority that was right after that level. And we're already seeing that start to take place, and I think it will open up even more. But it's likely to be a supply problem before we can do mass vaccinations at a student level. But we're going to push as fast as we get the opportunity to push.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, President Barron. I don't think we have any other questions. So, thank you.

**President Barron:** My pleasure. Thank you.

**Chair Seymour:** Hope you have a good day.

**Letter from Students to University Faculty Senate**

To the University Faculty Senate:

State students. There are about 46,000 undergraduate students at University Park alone, and not only do some of those students have serious medical conditions, but they also have around 46,000 homes and families that they will most likely return to once the semester ends.

As we return to the classrooms next fall, the vaccination of Penn State students and faculty would give Penn Staters peace of mind and a safer environment for the surrounding community. The vaccination of students would ensure a more effective return to normalcy. If students remain unvaccinated and there happens to be a future spike in cases, we will never be able to break this cycle of hybrid/remote courses due to safety concerns.

As I talked to a group of around 250 students, almost everyone seemed concerned about the lack of vaccinations for students. One student, Eliza Mull, said she desperately wants to get vaccinated but has no opportunity to receive a vaccination in State College. She stated, “I’m so nervous about seeing my family or accidentally spreading it to my housemates, so getting the vaccine would give me so much peace of mind.”

There is also growing concern that students may not have access to be vaccinated in time for the fall semester once they return home. Another student said she is also afraid of putting her family at risk when she goes home for the semester, and vaccinations at Penn State would be more accessible to students who may not have vaccination sites at home.

Student Emily Meinert said her family had to “jump through hoops” just to get her grandmother vaccinated, even though she met “every qualification in the book” for a vaccination. “I can’t imagine how hard it would be for students to go home and try to get vaccinated, especially since some come from areas where it isn’t readily available.”

There is a growing concern for the lack of ability to receive the COVID-19 vaccination amongst Penn State students. Penn State has been very helpful in offering free COVID-19 testing to every student. It felt like the university was really trying to make an effort to stop the spread in such a difficult time, and if Penn State can create a similar system for vaccines, students would be ready to take an advantage of it.

I was finally able to get vaccinated this past Thursday, but it was a struggle to find an appointment. I have many heart conditions—some that I was diagnosed with as a child and some from a result of when I tested positive for COVID-19 in September. If I tested positive for COVID-19 once more, which is possible, I am not sure how my heart would react a second time. It was very apparent that I needed the vaccine, but I had to travel almost three hours back to my hometown of Pittston, PA in order to get vaccinated due to the limited appointment availability at Penn State. I am just one of 46,000
students at University Park, and I am sure others have similar or worse medical conditions than me and the same inability to schedule a vaccination appointment in State College.

We can not only try to protect our students and faculty for next fall semester, but we can try to prevent University Park from becoming a “super spreader” as the spring semester comes to a close.

Sincerely,

Anjelica Singer

______________________________

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

Chair Seymour: Item F, Comments by the Executive Vice President Provost. It is now my pleasure to recognize Provost Jones for his comments. Provost Jones?

Nicholas Jones, Provost and Executive Vice President: OK. Hear me OK, Beth? Thanks. Thanks, Beth. Good to be with you all again. And actually, really good to follow on the President's comments expressing cautious optimism, because this time this time of year ago, I think we were feeling just a little bit different about the way things were and the way they were trending. So, it's good to feel even though we've got work ahead of us that we're on a positive gradient. So just very excited about that.

A couple of quick announcements first. And I just want to hit the high points on a number of topics and then leave some time for questions, of course. First, a couple of weeks ago we welcomed to University Park Faye Chadwell, our new Dean of University Libraries and Scholarly Communication. They joined us, I think, as most of you are aware, from Oregon State University. But she is now here and, in the saddle, and we're just thrilled that she is now present, and her transition went smoothly.

I'd also like to do a shout out to Diane Zabel who served really at relatively short notice very effectively in the interim role between Barbara Dewey's retirement and Faye's arrival. So, thank you very much, Diane, if you're listening.

Also, very pleased to announce the appointment of Yvonne Gaudelius as our new Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education. Yvonne, of course, needs no introduction. We did a comprehensive national search. Many of you participated in that process, and we appreciate very much your contributions to it. And Yvonne emerged as the leading candidate. So, we're just thrilled that we were able to transition her from her service as interim VP and Dean into the preeminent position. So, we're very excited to be working with her. So, congratulations to Yvonne. And she started yesterday officially in her role. And also welcome to Faye.

I'm not going to go into the gory details of admissions. Many of you, I think, have been exposed to some of these details in other meetings or other committees. But I would just characterize our status as follows. We had robust applications this year across the board. We did a very good job of getting out a good number of offers just focusing on the undergraduate at both the campuses and at University Park. In terms of indicators relative to paid accepts, graduate school, graduate applications a little early to be
definitive but trending in a good and a robust direction. The campuses are trending compared to last year, actually tracking fairly closely with last year in terms of paid accepts.

University Park is lagging by a bit this year, but we remain optimistic, and we think there are a lot of reasons for this, not the least of which is the fact that we only announced just a few short weeks ago that we would actually be open for in person instruction in the fall. And that is our plan A. So, I think a lot of students have put off making their decisions waiting to hear what we and other institutions are doing. So, we're actually pretty optimistic that this is all trending in a very good direction. We got a little bit of make-up and catch up to do, but again, optimistic that it is going where we need it to go.

We do have a couple of searches actively either underway or in planning. Our first is Dean for the Schreyer Honors College. That search is well underway. And as all of you are aware, the Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate School Gene Vasilatos-Younken is retiring at the end of this calendar year. And so, we will be firing up a search committee to search for Gene's successor in the not-too-distant future.

Pivoting to the strategic plan. The strategic plan is basically done. We have completed almost all of the unit level plans, which were the essential building blocks of the institutional plan. Institutional plan was done a year and a bit ago. We had a lot of work to do at the unit level informed by the institutional plan. Now all those blocks are pretty much in place and we will be pivoting in the very near future to full implementation mode.

And as I have said to many of you before, if you thought that I was annoying during the planning process as we go to implementation, it's going to be even worse. Because if we don't follow through on what we said that we were going to do, then all of the effort was for naught, and we do not intend that to be the case. So, we're very excited. I have appreciated very much the help of the team in the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research, particularly Lance Kennedy-Phillips and Daniel Newhart in really helping facilitate this process in extraordinary ways and engaging people across the University, connecting those unit level plans to one another really in tremendous ways that we simply didn't have before. So, we're really very excited as we move to implementation to see how this will all play out.

I know we've talked about COVID a little bit already in the President's remarks, but I'll just do a little bit of a recap again. We talked at the last meeting about the pre-arrival and on arrival testing. That is all now well behind us. I think it worked very well. We are now in our sort of regular semester mode. We're doing walk up testing. We're doing surveillance testing. We're doing systematic testing. A big part of our strategy has been to really strongly encourage students to participate in walk up testing. We encourage them not to wait until they have been contact traced, but if any of them have any concerns or any suspicion that they may have had exposure, we invite them in no guilt to come and be rapid tested.

If they test positive, we have them do a confirmatory PCR test. And we're actually getting pretty good turnout sort of in the range of 600 to 1,000 students a day in the combination of walk-up surveillance and, of course, symptomatic testing for students who are sick. So that process is going well.

It is also going better thanks to the effort of a group of people led by key leadership from Enterprise IT who brought the Salesforce platform to this effort, enabling much more efficient tracking of individuals and tests and an ability to more seamlessly contact people. So, for example, we have examples of people who test positive in a rapid test and maybe have walked over and are standing in line to do the PCR test and their phone rings as the contact tracing process begins.
So, it really, really is working very, very efficiently and enabling us to do a much better job of tracking positives and supporting the entire infrastructure that we need to be successful.

You're all aware that the summer and fall plans are out and we're busy now backfilling all of the things that need to be backfilled in order to effect first the transition into summer, which will take advantage of the COVID codes. But then fall back to what we hope looks very much like fall of 2019. We've said it before. I'll say it again.

While the plan is to have in person instruction, we do recognize that the virus remains to a large extent in the driver's seat. And should a pivot be necessary, we will affect that, which means that everybody should have it in the back of their mind, or actually in their drawer, a plan B in case we have to move in a different direction. Leveraging the president's optimism, hoping that that is not going to be necessary. But it's always good to be prepared.

And finally, there will be an announcement coming out tomorrow about commencement. So, stay tuned for that one. President talked about vaccination. We get questions about that a lot when I'm doing campus visits and other meetings. And I just echo what Eric said that we are ready. We've had a team put together. Everything that we need to have in place. And as soon as we get a thumbs up or a nod from the Department of Health and vaccine starts coming our way, we stand ready and able to help with vaccine distribution either ourselves or as a partner to local health providers. So, I think we're in good shape there.

I really do want to-- I know I've done it before, but I'm going to do it again, just do a big shout out. Jim, I really appreciated your comments before. Thank you very much. And just a big shout out to the COCC, Kelly Wolgast and the team that she's put together to navigate not just University Park but the whole institution through this. And then really there's a cast of thousands that have made this work.

From my perspective, the cast of thousands is organized into a dozen or so key groups that are leading the efforts of those thousands. But many, many offices and entities across the institution have just been doing amazing work for 12 months now.

And Beth was right. Calendar today 12 months ago was when we first threw the switch and started doing remote instruction. So, it is an appropriate time to really acknowledge once again just the extraordinary work done by so many people to help navigate the University through this pretty amazing challenge. And I hear stories every day of just people who have gone above and beyond the call to make sure that students are getting the support that they needed, faculty supporting other faculty members, staff supporting faculty, staff supporting staff, faculty supporting staff.

Just about every permutation and combination of support that one could possibly hear I've heard, and it's heartwarming and really gratifying to hear how that is happening at scale across the University. And geographically distributed as well. So, people at one campus helping colleagues at another campus. So, thank you to those who are listening for your efforts. But really, this is a big shout out more broadly across the University. And our success in getting to where we have as an institution is really a testament to the hard work of the many thousands of people who contributed. And Beth, with that, I think I'll stop, and I am happy to take any questions.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Provost Jones. Bonj, do we have any questions in Q&A?
Bonj Szczygiel: We do. This is from William Kenyon in Arts and Architecture. At the St. Patty's Day event, there were numerous documented cases on social media of students violating the COVID compact. Some of these reports resulted in the postponement or cancellation of events that also negatively affected students who have been toeing the line and being responsible. It doesn't appear that there were any consequences of those COVID compact violations. I know that it might be difficult to prosecute, but as we see spring break happening across the country, it seems that it might be a good time to demonstrate a firmer stance on these violations.

Provost Jones: Yeah. Thanks for that question. That has been a difficult question to answer for 365 days approximately. We obviously want to ensure that the compliance with our expectations and guidelines is as robust as it can possibly be. We do have student conduct processes in place when violations are reported. They go to the Office of Student Conduct. The students are contacted and the sanctions sort of vary from being told off and told not to do it again to actions that are more severe. As with any conduct process, the outcome of it is confidential and not broadly shared. But I can assure you that we are doing our best to ensure that students who don't comply and are caught doing so do face that process.

That said, and this applies not just to student conduct but to everything that we do, and before I say that I'll just say by and large, I've been and my colleagues have been very impressed at the degree to which the students have really respected and supported the guidelines. We know and we see cases where they are being violated. But overall, I think Penn State students have been pretty responsible and pretty compliant. And that has been key to our success.

What I was about to say is that our approach to managing COVID, as I've shared with, I think, this group and many others before, it is a layered approach. It's the Swiss cheese approach. We recognize that any slice of Swiss cheese has a bunch of holes in it. If we can get to 70% effectiveness, which you can think of as being the holes in the cheese in a particular layer, we're actually pretty pleased with that. If we could push a little bit farther, even better. But what is more important than driving up from 70% to 80% compliance in any particular layer is getting as many layers in series as we possibly can.

Because if we can get the compliance up in that 70% range and have a dozen layers from physical distancing to masking to hygiene, separation in classes, expectations about conduct and so on, then you end up with a pretty robust block of cheese and it is hard for things to get through it. And I think that has been an important key to our success. Rather than trying to drive that last 30%, which can be quite time consuming and quite all consuming, we really focus on that system level approach and try to strengthen all the layers to the most reasonable level possible.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Bonj, do we have another question in Q&A?

Bonj Szczygiel: This is from David Smith, Undergraduate Studies. Thank you for the updates, Provost Jones. I'm sorry if I missed this, but are there plans for departure testing for students at the end of the semester?

Provost Jones: We don't have plans specifically in mind, David, at this point. If we need them, we can just go to the shelf and pull the plans off that we used back in November, because those plans worked quite well. But we are monitoring very carefully the evolution of the virus through the fall. And I'm with President Barron on this one. I would much rather be doing pre-departure vaccinations than pre-departure
testing. So, I'm crossing my fingers that we're going to be in a position where that's what we're thinking about, rather than testing again.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Bonj, is there another question?

Bonj Szczygiel: We've got something from Roger Egolf, Lehigh. For fall will there be an exception process for both full time and part time faculty to allow them to teach fully by Zoom if they have health conditions that make them uneasy about teaching in person?

Provost Jones: Yes. We have two exception processes that are complementary. One is, of course, if the nature of the course itself suggests that the pedagogy is more effective with remote delivery. This may have been the case before, or it may have been an emergent course where that is appropriate. And the time to be making that request and getting that consideration really is now. For the latter case, yes, we will have a process in place for that. We think it's too early at this point to be going into too many details. But there will be an exception process. It's for all faculty. But there will be a review necessary. I think Kathy Bieschke is on. Kathy, I don't know if you want to-- Beth, if she could just maybe say a couple of words about this. She has her finger on the pulse of this a little more.

Bonj Szczygiel: Yeah, Beth, I think Kathy is here.

Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs: Yeah, I'm here. I can't do my video, but I can speak. So yes, we have a process. Right now, we are asking people to consider the assumptions we're making for fall, which is that we will be in person given that there's really optimistic news out there. If there's someone you know who has a condition that no matter what happens with the virus, they may need to get an exception to teach remotely, you can put that request in through your HRSP, who will then work with a small team to make sure we're consistent across all academic units. As the time goes on, as the path of the virus becomes clear, as we know more and more, we will add more exception reasons to that process. But for right now, we don't know what the path of the virus is and we don't want to approve things prior to having more information out there. So, for example, I really hope this doesn't happen, but let's say we're having elementary schools remotely in the fall and faculty are concerned about having kids at home again. Well, we will add that to the list of exceptions.

But right now, it looks like that's not going to happen. So that is not a current exception even though it may reflect current reality. We would not be registering now if we had control over the universe. But we have to. We have to have students register before they leave the end of the semester.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Kathy. Is there another question, Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel: We do. This is from Deirdre Folkers in York. Our campus has a classroom wing that was determined to have inadequate ventilation and thus was deemed unsafe for use during COVID. As we plan to return to face to face instruction in the fall with the pandemic still ongoing, we are unable to field a full schedule without the use of this wing. What are the plans to provide remediation for areas on campuses that we now know to have inadequate ventilation? And if no remediation is available, what are the alternatives?
Provost Jones: So, the Office of Physical Plant has a pretty good inventory of spaces, including instructional places, across all of our campus locations. And as conditions continue to change, i.e., improve, between now and the fall, they will be continuously evaluating those spaces. As part of our sort of optimistic view of this, we think that many of those spaces that were taken offline will on reanalysis be considered acceptable.

There may in some instances be changes that need to be made to ensure that that is the case. But the safety and wellbeing of faculty, staff, and students has been our driving priority really from 365 days ago. That's not changing. Now we have no intention of putting people into unsafe environments. And if there is a shortage of space, we will figure out a way to effectively provision it.

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

Bonj Szczygiel: Paul Frisch from Scranton. As of right now, fully acknowledging that everything can change, will current COVID precautions and restrictions within the classroom still be in place for the fall? If not, could individual faculty require it within the classroom?

Provost Jones: That's a great question, Paul, and thank you for asking it. I think many of you are aware of this, but I'll just be explicit. When we talk about returning to the classroom in the fall, the key constraint on us doing that is the six-foot physical distancing rule. If that rule or requirement has not gone by the fall, we are going to have to rethink things, because we just simply will not be able to get the students into the classes that we need in order to affect this. So, some of those requirements, I think, will be gone or taken away by CDC, Department of Health, and other entities.

On the other hand, masking. I do suspect masks will be with us for a while. But maybe the expectation about mask wearing will change a little bit. So maybe we'll feel more comfortable people not wearing masks when they are outdoors but when they're in a building, I wouldn't be at all surprised if we continue the mask wearing requirement through the fall semester even though we're in person.

Chair Seymour: Thank you.

Provost Jones: And beyond, potentially.

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

Bonj Szczygiel: We have one more question. This is from Peter Iliev in Smeal. Are there plans for resuming merit-based salary increases?

Provost Jones: There are plans. Yes, in the budget planning process, we have asked units to plan for a general salary increase. As President Barron said, there are a lot of both internal considerations as well as externalities that will really control whether or not a salary increase is able to be actually provided when the budget is approved. But we do acknowledge just how hard people have been working and the fact that people deserve a salary increase. We do not want to go two years without one if we can avoid it. So, we are planning as though we will be able to give one, and we just have to see as we get closer to budget approval time whether or not we're able to pull it off. But we're trying to make that happen.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Provost Jones. Bonj, are there any other questions? No, it looks like no other questions. Thank you, senators, and thank you, Provost, for joining us.
Provost Jones: Thank you very much.

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Seymour: Item G, Forensic Business. There is none.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Seymour: Item H, Unfinished Business. Now we're coming to the part of the meeting where senators will be voting on reports. So, it's time to go to TallySpace. Erin is putting the link up on the screen, and we will post the link in chat. So, going ahead. I'm going to wait a few minutes. Anna will record the votes and report out at the end of the agenda as she has been. But I want to give us a few minutes to get everybody logged in, because we'll be doing a slew of voting together hopefully.

All right, at least people in the room seem to have gotten in. So, I'm hoping everyone out there is getting in. So, let's go on ahead and move on. We have two reports from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules to be voted on today. We will make changes to the Faculty Senate Constitution or Bylaws. And when we do this, the report must be presented at one meeting and then voted on at the next meeting, just to remind senators. So, both of these reports, that's why they're Unfinished Business, were presented in January, and we will vote on them today.

Revision to the Constitution, Article III Amendments

Chair Seymour: The first report is the revision to the Constitution Article III Amendments, which can be found in Appendix C. Chair Brunsden, the floor is yours.

Victor Brunsden, Penn State Altoona: Thank you, Chair Seymour. So, at the last meeting in January, the committee presented this modification to the Constitution, which would remove the requirement that an amendment to the Constitution consistent with the directives of the Board of Trustees may be adopted in any meeting of the University Faculty Senate by a 2/3 vote. So, it currently reads of those senator’s present.

There is a question as what exactly does senators present mean right now, which I won't go into. But this is a requirement which has been somewhat of a bane to us over this past year. The purpose of this vote is to simply require a 2/3 vote of the faculty. So, of the faculty senators. So, it is 2/3 of the votes cast. Are there any questions?

Chair Seymour: Are there any questions? Any questions in Q&A or any hands raised? Give it a minute. Seeing none, I think it's now time to vote. Senators, you may cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept the motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B. Let's give it a minute. And I'll ask Anna if you're there to let me know how the votes are coming in.

Anna Butler, Senate Office Staff: Yes, there are many votes coming in.
Chair Seymour: Thank. You give it just a second to help people finish up. Just to remind everybody, we'll report out the results of the votes at the end of the meeting.

Revisions to the Bylaws Article V Meetings, Section 4 and Bylaws Article X, Amendments

Chair Seymour: All right, let’s move on to our second report. This is also from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules and its Revisions to the Bylaws, Article V, Meetings, Section 4 and Bylaws Article X, Amendments and can be found in Appendix D. Chair Brunsden, the floor is yours.

Victor Brunsden: Thank you, Chair Seymour. So, this modification to the Bylaws is the companion piece to the modification of the Senate. It removes the requirement that it be of the Senator’s present. This allows for a vote of conscience on the part of Senators, which the requirement that it be a 2/3 vote of the Senator’s present does not. That automatically converts an abstention into a no vote. So, this would continue this trend to modify the Bylaws so that the vote simply be a 2/3 vote.

Bonj Szczygiel: Victor, for clarification, is this a reference to 2/3 of votes cast or 2/3 of full Senate roster, present or not?

Victor Brunsden: In both places, there are two modifications. One is to make a majority vote removes the requirement that the members be present and removes the total voting membership requirement from a 2/3 vote. And then also in section one, amendments of the Bylaws may be adopted. Removes the requirement that it be of the Senator’s present.

Chair Seymour: I would just like to remind everyone we saw this in January. Also, these are all falling closer to Robert's rules of order. We've talked about this a few times in the Senate. But these two and the other in the standing rules today are all of a piece to try to help make us have less of a super, super majority and also that it's the votes in the room, if you will, the votes, the people present, not total number of members.

Bonj Szczygiel: Chair Seymour, there's a request that there be more discussion on the floor. There is an observation or question. Specifically, Steinn Sigurdsson, science. To avoid this changing the balance of votes, the votes ought to be recorded as accept, reject, abstain with abstentions an explicit option.

Chair Seymour: Can I ask Keith, the parliamentarian, to comment on the problem with abstentions?

Keith Shapiro, Parliamentarian: Generally, you either vote. Robert's rules doesn't allow for abstentions. Generally, a vote is for either you're voting for something or against something. I'd like to point out that-- and also Robert's rule says describes the description and Bylaws of saying members present as being generally undesirable, I believe, is the way they specifically say it in Robert's rules.

Because any time you abstain in a member's present vote, first of all, you have to take a vote or do a roll call to determine how many members are actually present before the vote takes place. And in the situation, we have now where we have members coming and going from these meetings all the time, that will substantially increase the length of time of our meetings. In fact, we've generally ignored that rule and simply voted and counted the percentage, whether it be majority or 2/3 of the votes that were cast.
So, if you're thinking about this legislation, it's really the difference between votes members present or votes cast. Does that help answer that question?

**Chair Seymour:** Steinn, if you want to speak, please raise your hand if you want to have an interaction.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** We've got a response from Eli Byrne saying it does clarify. Thank you.

**Chair Seymour:** I think-- does Chris Byrne still have his hand raised? Could we acknowledge Chris? You should be able to speak, Chris, if you're there.

**Keith Shapiro:** This change generally reflects the practice that we've been doing since I've been in the Senate.

**Chris Byrne, Eberly College of Science:** Do I have the floor or what?

**Chair Seymour:** Yes, yes you do, Chris. Could you state your last name and unit please?

**Chris Byrne:** Chris Byrne, College of Science. And my question has now been answered, but the first vote is already over. I was kind of frustrated that I was typing my question into the Q&A room when the vote was called. I mean, it was not time. There was not proper time for discussion there. That vote was called while I was still typing my question.

**Chair Seymour:** Would you like us to redo the first vote?

**Chris Byrne:** I don't know. If it's only me, then no, it doesn't matter. I don't know how many other people feel the way I do. Maybe you should take a poll on that. I don't know. It could take all day. I don't know. I don't know how to answer that.

**Chair Seymour:** Keith, could you just give me some input from the parliamentarian on this?

**Keith Shapiro:** I would say since there's a question being raised on the floor, it's basically a point of order. I would just rerun the vote. And that way there's no question about it. And the problem with this remote is that it's difficult. That the perception of time on the floor of the Senate is probably different than perception of time when we're in our offices or in other locations. So, I don't think there's a problem with rerunning the vote. And that way we're certain.

**Chair Seymour:** All right. Anna, can you rerun the first vote?

**Anna Butler:** Yes, I can.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, Anna. Hold on, everybody, while she gets the first vote set up. Do we have any other discussion on this before we run a vote? I want to make sure everyone's had an opportunity to fully discuss this.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** Chris, is your hand raised?

**Chris Byrne:** Yes, it is. Am I unmuted?
Chair Seymour: Yes, you are.

Chris Byrne: OK. So, I just want everyone to think about this when they vote. And this, I think, is the question Steinn was raising as well that this does allow for a very-- this allows for a minority of senators to pass something important because they're the ones that showed up. And if that's the way we want the Senate business to run, then so be it. But it does allow for the possibility.

Right now, we're on Zoom, so we have great attendance. But when we're back in person, what happens when there's a snowstorm and 25 of the people make it? Now maybe then they're all in Zoom. Maybe the Zoom continues. I don't know. My only concern about this is that it allows for a rather small minority to actually pass something if they're the only ones that show up and vote. So that's something everyone should just think about.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Thank you, Chris. I understand your concern. We are allowed to pass anything if we have a quorum of 50. So that is our quorum number. And that is the rules that our Constitution gives us as it is.

Chris Byrne: OK.

Chair Seymour: Keith, I see your hand is up.

Keith Shapiro: Yeah, and this doesn't change that. Because what ends up happening is this change the current rules from members present at not the total membership of the Senate. It says in the rules right now the members who are present in the room. And this really goes back to the days according to Dawn Blasko, who spoke on this before at one point, that when we used to stand up and be counted during our vote by the Senate staff. So, we didn't have clickers. We simply stood up. So being able to count the number of people in the room at any given time was rather easy.

So that language is put into our rules back at that time. After we moved to the clickers, we really stopped counting the members present when we were doing our percentages. We simply looked at the number of votes that were cast and decided whether they were majority or 2/3. And we've been doing that for a great long time. This legislation simply codifies that. It says we're going to do the thing we've been doing rather than saying we're going to do it in a way that we may have done it back in the days even before the clickers.

Victor Brunsden: Chris, I take your concern, and it is a reasonable concern, except that this does not change. This does not address that concern one way or the other. Such a thing could still happen with the current rules. And sadly, that is one of the problems with any sort of process like this. What this legislation does is it makes the-- it gives back senators the ability to not cast a ballot at all, which is something that the current state of affairs does not allow them to do.

Chair Seymour: Any other questions and Q&A, Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel: We have none.

Chair Seymour: Any other hands raised? Any other questions?

Bonj Szczygiel: No hands raised.
Chair Seymour: Are we ready to vote?

Anna Butler: I have Appendix C back up now and I have removed the initial votes. It's ready for voting again.

Chair Seymour: All right, so let's proceed to vote. You may cast your vote on TallySpace. This is the original--the first vote. So, it's the revision of Constitution Article III amendments Appendix C. So, to accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, please press B.

Anna Butler: There are many votes coming in. But I do have a question for the next vote that we take on the Bylaws, which is Appendix D. Since we moved on in the discussion, I had that pull up and I had some votes on that already. Do you want me to reset those as well?

Chair Seymour: Yes, Anna, please reset that one as well. We'll go back through the process.

Anna Butler: OK.

Chair Seymour: Have the votes started to slow?

Anna Butler: Yes.

Chair Seymour: All right. Well, let's move on to the second report.

Revisions to the Bylaws Article V Meetings, Section 4 and Bylaws Article X, Amendments

Chair Seymour: This is found in Appendix D. It’s the Revision to the Bylaws Article V, Meetings, Section 4, and Bylaws Article X, Amendments. Chair Brunsden, the floor is yours again.

Victor Brunsden: Thank you. So as earlier, this removes the requirement that the vote be all members present to at a regular meeting or the total voting membership of the Senate Council, it is just going to be who the voting membership the votes cast in a Senate Council meeting. And also, the third amendment, the third deletion, deletes the requirement for each of those senator’s present. These are all in the same spirit as the amendment to the constitution that we just voted on.

Chair Seymour: I’d like to ask if there are any senators who have any questions to please type your question in Q&A or raise your hand. I'll give us a few minutes, because it’s, as we've noted, a little slower. And nothing in. Are we ready to vote?

Bonj Szczygiel: We are ready to vote then.

Chair Seymour: All right. Let's go on ahead. And senators, you may cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept the motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B.

Anna Butler: There are many votes coming in.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Anna. I'll wait just a minute to let everybody focus on their voting. Chris, I see you have a hand up.
**Chris Byrne:** Yes, I'm not getting the new vote on my TallySpace. I've refreshed my screen a couple of times and I'm still getting the C vote, the Appendix C vote.

**Anna Butler:** Let me check that.

**Chair Seymour:** I'm hearing you might have to go out and come back in again. For some people it looks like refreshing is working. For others, it looks like they're having to log out and come back in.

**Chris Byrne:** OK, then just leave some time for that.

**Chair Seymour:** I'm not going anywhere. Try to click Home for anybody having this problem. That might also work. Click Home worked in this room, but hopefully it's working in your rooms. Having any luck, Chris?

**Chris Byrne:** Yes. I logged out and logged in again and that did it. Yeah.

**Chair Seymour:** OK. So, you've had a chance to vote?

**Chris Byrne:** Yes.

---

**LEGISLATIVE REPORTS**

**Chair Seymour:** OK, thank you. Let’s move on ahead to Item I, Legislative Reports. We have one Legislative report from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules, Revisions to Standing Rules Article I, Rules of Procedure. It’s going to take me a while to read this. Section 1(a); Article I, Rules of Procedure, Section 2; Article I, Rules of Procedure, Section 8(i), Article I, Rules of Procedure, Section 9; Article II, Senate Committee Structure, Section 3; Article IV, Amendments; Found in Appendix B. Chair Brunsden, the floor is yours.

**Victor Brunsden:** So, this is the third part of the package of legislation designed to remedy the requirement that the vote be of members present. It removes all of those, and it also settles on what a supermajority is. If you have read the legislation, you will see in various places that the vote required varies according to circumstances.

So, what we have done in this is to also take the opportunity to standardize on where a supermajority is required that that be a 2/3 rather than 3/4, as it is in Article I, Section 8(i) of the Standing Rules where the rules of this section may be suspended only by a 3/4 vote of the senator’s present. We now change that to a 2/3 vote.
So, there is another section where we require a unanimous vote of members present. This is somewhat onerous. If I might, very first Senate meeting required a vote, a unanimous vote of the senators present to suspend the order of business and change the order of business. And that was because that first day was September 11, 2001 and the Senate needed to pass a quick resolution, suspend its regular order of business, and then adjourned because far more important things were going on in the country than the University Faculty Senate. So, we have removed that with this legislation.

**Chair Seymour:** Are there any questions? Please put them in Q&A or raise your hand. I'm giving time for people to write long questions. So, if you wonder why I'm just standing here, that's what I'm doing.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** No questions and no hands raised.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you for your patience. I know we have to take a little longer when we're remote. Do you think we're ready to cast a vote? Remember, these are changes to the standing rules. We can vote on this today.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** I believe we're ready, Beth.

**Chair Seymour:** All right, it's now time to vote. Senators, you may cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept the motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B.

**Anna Butler:** The votes are coming in.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you. I'll give it just another minute to make sure everyone has a chance to refresh. Remember, click Home.

---

**ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS**

**Chair Seymour:** All right, Item J is Advisory and Consultative Reports. There are none.

---

**INFORMATIONAL REPORTS**

**Chair Seymour:** Item K, Informational Reports. We have 11 informational reports today. The first report is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules. The Committees and Rules Nominating Report for 2021-2022 and can be found in Appendix F.

**Committees and Rules Nominating Report for 2021-2022**

**Chair Seymour:** Committee and Rules Chair Victor Brunsden will present the names of those who have accepted nomination to one of three extra senatorial committees, faculty rights and responsibilities, standing joint committee on tenure, and the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. Senators may make additional nominations from the floor if you have first received permission from the person to whom you would like to nominate. To do this, please raise your hand and we will promote you to speak. Chair Brunsden, will you please present the slate of nominees for the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities?
Victor Brunsden: Thank you, Chair Seymour. The nominees for faculty rights and responsibilities are presented to you in Appendix F. Note that this year we are implementing our membership changes to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. The membership now includes three non-tenure line faculty. The membership of the committee will increase from six faculty and three deans to eight faculty and four deans.

At least one non-tenure line faculty member must be elected from a location other than University Park, and at least one must be from University Park. Two University Park faculty terms have expired, and we are adding two new faculty seats. So, we will be electing four new members and four alternates. Three of those must be non-tenure line. Let us begin with the faculty.

Chair Seymour: All right. If you have a nomination, please raise your hand, and we will promote you. Just reminding everybody, we're taking nominations from the floor in the ether. So, if you have a nomination, please raise your hand and we will promote you. Another reminder make sure you've gotten that person's permission first. Seeing no hands raised. Is that correct? All right, then let's move on.

Victor Brunsden: We also need to elect two deans or chancellors and two alternates.

Chair Seymour: As with the last vote, or not vote but query, if you have a nomination, please raise your hand and we'll promote you to speak. These are for deans and chancellors. Please raise your hand if you have a Dean or Chancellor you'd like to nominate, and you've asked their permission first. Any raised hands? Seeing none, let's move on to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Victor Brunsden: For the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, we need to elect five members, each serving a two-year term.

Chair Seymour: Are there any additional nominations besides those that are already listed? Please raise your hand if you have any, and we will promote you. Again, you need to have gotten this person's agreement. For those of you knew to this, this is how we create and finish the slate for these positions. Are there any hands raised?

Bonj Szczygiel: Nothing happening yet, Beth.

Chair Seymour: All right, seeing no hands raised, let's move on to the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure.

Victor Brunsden: If you have a nomination-- sorry, our last committee is the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure. We will elect two, one member and one alternate, and I promise this will be the last from me as committee chair today.

Chair Seymour: If you have a nomination, please raise your hand, and we will promote you to speak. As with the other positions, you need to have secured that person's agreement before you put them forward for the slate. Are there any hands raised?

Bonj Szczygiel: None.

Chair Seymour: All right. Seeing no hands raised-- oh, sorry, we've got a question. Is it in Q&A?
Bonj Szczygiel: So, there's a question in chat from Kathy Bieschke. Can we elect an administrator to P&T.?

Victor Brunsden: So, Kathy, I presume you are referring to the Associate Dean from Art and Architecture. She is considered to be a faculty member for the purposes of this election.

Chair Seymour: Are there any other questions? All right. Are we good? Is there a motion to close the nominations and approve the entire slate of nominees?

Victor Brunsden: So, moved.

Chair Seymour: Is there a second? All right. Brunsden, Altoona, moved. Egolf, Lehigh Valley, seconded. It has been moved and seconded that we approve the entire slate of nominees. We will vote to approve with TallySpace. Are we ready to vote? Wait, don't vote yet. So, someone has their hand raised.

Bonj Szczygiel: Randy Hauck.

Chair Seymour: Randy, you should be able to speak.

Randy Hauck, College of Medicine: Sorry, I was just putting my hand up to second.

Chair Seymour: Oh, thank you, thank you. Yes, it's the internet. So, thank you so much. All right. It's been moved and seconded that we approve the entire slate of nominees. We'll vote to approve a TallySpace. To accept the motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B. And for this particular vote, we're going to let Anna read the results. So, we're going to wait a minute.

Bonj Szczygiel: Beth, while people are voting on that, we have an observation from Tallman at Libraries that Brad Long location is not listed in the FR&R nominees. He is at Penn State Hershey. Just for the record.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Nathan.

Anna Butler: OK, for the vote I have 139 Accept and three Reject.

Chair Seymour: Thank you very much. The motion passes. The slate of nominees to these three committees has been approved and the slate it closed. Thank you, Chair Brunsden, and thanks to the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules.

Senate Council Nominating Report for 2021-2022

Chair Seymour: The next Information Report seen in Appendix G is from the Senate Council Nominating Committee who reports nominations for Chair Elect and Secretary of the Senate and the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President and the Academic Trustee. Senators may make additional nominations for the floor if they have secured prior approval from those whom they wish to nominate. Nicholas Rowland, Chair of the Senate Committee, sorry, the Senate Council Nominating Committee and the Immediate Past Chair of the Senate will present the nominations. Chair Rowland?
Nicholas Rowland, Penn State Altoona: Well, thank you, Chair Seymour. And greetings all the Faculty Senators. One of the honors of being the immediate past chair is that you get the opportunity to work with senate councilors to prepare a nominating slate. And of course, what a slate we have this year. That said, as Chair Seymour also noted, we can also hear today nominations from the floor of the Senate.

But before we get to that and as a reminder to everybody in attendance, the Senate uses the Hare voting system. This system ranks voter selection to ensure that each candidate receives a minimum number of votes to win an election. Therefore, when voting, elected senators will be asked to rank order their preferred candidates, selecting their first, second, or third choices and so on. Where five candidates are seeking a single office, if no individual secures an outright majority, the individual with the least number of votes will be eliminated. Anyone who voted for the excluded candidate as their first choice will have his, her, their second-choice vote added to that candidate's tally.

The process of eliminating the bottom candidate will be repeated until one candidate secures an outright majority of all votes. This is an important process and ensures that candidates are elected with broad based electoral support. Thus, when you vote, please be sure to indicate your rank preference for each nominee in the event that your favorite candidate is eliminated during the course of counting the votes. So, moving on today, we have two nominees for Chair Elect of the Senate listed in Appendix G. Both nominees have given their permission or permission to have their names placed on the ballot.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Chair Rowland. Are there any additional nominations for the floor? If you have a nomination, please raise your hand and you'll be promoted to speak. I'm going to wait a minute so people can raise their hand. Are there any additional nominations for the floor? Please raise your hand.

Bonj Szczygiel: None yet.

Chair Seymour: We'll give it just another few seconds.

Bonj Szczygiel: And still no hands.

Chair Seymour: Seeing no hands, let's move on to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. Chair Rowland.
Nicholas Rowland: For the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, we have two nominees. One will be elected for a three-year term expiring in 2024. The nominees listed in Appendix G have given permission to have their names placed on the ballot.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Are there any nominations from the floor? If you would like to make a nomination, please raise your hand, and we will promote you to speak.

Bonj Szczygiel: None coming from the floor.

Chair Seymour: All. Right no hands raised. We'll give it another few seconds. Seeing none, let's move on to the Academic Trustee. Chair Rowland.

Nicholas Rowland: Thank you, Chair Seymour. This will be our last slate to review today. For the Academic Trustee, we have four nominees. One will be elected for a three-year term expiring in 2024. The nominees listed in Appendix G have given permission to have their mostly correctly spelled names placed on the ballot.

Chair Seymour: Are we sure it's the right person? Never mind. I'm sorry. Are there any nominations from the floor? If you'd like to make a nomination, please raise your hand, and we will promote you to speak. Are there any hands raised?

Bonj Szczygiel: None raised.

Chair Seymour: Give it a couple of seconds. All right, seeing no hands raised, is there a motion to close nominations and approve the entire slate of nominees? Sorry, we have a question. Oh, call the vote? I was doing that. Brunsden has moved.

Bonj Szczygiel: Second, Szczygiel.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. All right. We'll need to vote to approve the report with TallySpace. To accept the motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B. We're going to wait and let Anna give us the results as they tally. Just a reminder to everyone if you're having trouble, please go home. The home in TallySpace, of course.

Anna Butler: Votes are still coming in.

Chair Seymour: Thank you.

Anna Butler: OK, for the vote, I have 129 Accept and two Reject.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Anna, and thank you, everyone. The motion passes. The slate of nominees has been approved and the slate is closed. Thank you, Nicholas and the Senate Committee Council Nominating Committee.

Senate Council 2019-2020 Ombudsperson Report

Chair Seymour: Just for everyone's knowledge, the Senate online elections will take place from April 9th through April 21st. after the results are certified by the tellers, the election results will be reported on
the website on April 23rd. We have another report sponsored by the Senate Council. 2019, 2020 ombudsperson report found in Appendix H. 10 minutes have been allocated for presentation and discussion. Dr. Ansari, the floor is yours. Dr. Ansari?

Mohamad Ansari, Berks: Yes, can you hear me? I'm sorry. I spoke, but you didn't see me or didn't hear me. Is that correct, Chair Seymour?

Chair Seymour: You are perfect now, so thank you.

Mohamad Ansari: Oh, should I start all over then?

Chair Seymour: Yes, this is the first time we've heard anything. But you're perfect now.

Mohamad Ansari: All right. I'm sorry about that. Good afternoon, everyone. I am pleased to present this report on behalf of my fellow ombudspersons from across the University. This report summarizes the activities and the services that they provided to the faculty during the 2019-2020 academic year. Every year the Senate office sends a 10-survey question to the ombudspersons and requested activities. This year we received about 83.6% response rate.

They summarize the activities, and they have 56 cases during the last year. The year before, they had 90 cases. So, we have put their responses in this report. Many of those are direct quotations from what I had received from the fellow ombudspersons. I'll be happy to answer any questions if anyone should have any questions. Thank you, Chair Seymour.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Dr. Ansari. It's lovely to see you. Very nice tie, by the way.

Mohamad Ansari: Thank you. You're so kind. It's very nice seeing you.

Chair Seymour: Are there any questions for Dr. Ansari? Please put your question in Q&A or raise your hand.

Bonj Szczygiel: There appear to be no questions.

Chair Seymour: It looks like we have a hand raised. Nathan Tallman. We will unmute you so that you can speak. Nathan, you should be able to speak now.

Nathan Tallman, Libraries: Hello?

Chair Seymour: Yep, we've got you Nathan.

Nathan Tallman: Apologies. It was a little different than last time. Thank you, Chair Seymour, and thank you Dr. Ansari for the report. This is less a direct question about the report and more a call to action for fellow senators. There's a lot of very concerning statements in this report from the ombudspersons feeling that the administration of the college does not take the Ombudsperson position seriously and felt nothing was done to resolve it.

They're referring to Ombudpersons as outsiders and pertaining to involve HR in the meeting. There's reports of calling the Ombudpersons a joke, trying to basically avoid involving ombudsperson, or just
straight out refusing to participate in an Ombudsperson process, potential bullying by administrators and staff. Something about for potential ombudspersons, prepare to be hated and ignored. These are pretty strong statements from our ombudspersons.

And clearly, I think there is a problem in our Ombudsperson program, either in the University's top-down endorsement and advocacy for following the Ombuds’ process and the role it plays in our University to inequities in how this is felt across University and administration. I think Senate perhaps needs to do a follow up investigation to get to the bottom of this. Hopefully that can be done in partner with administration. There's good things in this report, but there's really some unsettling things as well.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, Nathan. And it's Tallman, Libraries, right?

**Nathan Tallman:** Yes, sorry.

**Chair Seymour:** No worries. Do you wish to respond, Dr. Ansari?

**Mohamad Ansari:** Yes. I appreciate the question. These are also the concerns that I have generally, because I also read the report. But my experience personally with the past two and a half years is quite different, because every time that I have been involved with the faculty directly, which has been a lot of cases over the past year especially, they ask me to attend the meetings, and I have done this multiple, multiple times. My experience has been that the administrators were extremely receptive to the idea that I was present. They were very respectful and also, they were extremely cooperative with me when I said that I have received this request.

I have been in contact with many, many of my fellow ombudspersons, and I have never received this kind of report from any of them. I did not get a chance to, because I don't know who said what, to talk with them. But we have a meeting to model, a regional meeting at University Park for the colleges. And then I would like to bring this up and discuss it and perhaps we get more details. I have contact always with Vice Provost Kathy Bieschke, and the concerns that I have raised to her attention have been well received.

I met also with Provost Jones along with Kathy Bieschke and Senate Executive Director Dawn Blasko to discuss the presence of the HR strategic partners in the meetings. Because to me and to the fellow faculty members, this has been a source of anxiety. When a faculty member receives a phone call or an email and says you are being called to a meeting with HR present, this is generally an anxiety producing situation. We have brought this to the attention of the senior administration, and they are being addressed.

And I have received a good response, as a matter of fact. Sometimes the administrators, they call the HR because they do not know all the policies and they defer some of the parts of the meeting to the HR. So, it's not always a method of intimidation by the administrators. But these are concerns. We're working very hard with the administration to resolve this. I appreciate the fact that you brought this to the attention today. Thank you.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, Dr. Ansari. Are there any other questions? No questions in Q&A. Sorry. All right, Chris Byrne, if you could-- Chris, you should be unmuted.

**Chris Byrne:** Can you hear me?
Chair Seymour: Yes, we can.

Chris Byrne: OK. Quickly, I just want to relate this to either maybe it's a larger issue or maybe it's a parallel issue or a related issue. But going all the way back to when the more rivers to cross report came out last February and we discussed it with the President and the Provost, and the discussion came up regarding the issue of relying on personalities to make the system work versus relying on policy and relying on tangible incentives like raises and promotion criterion.

And if we really want the system to work in addressing whether it's racism or sexism or any other type of bias or inappropriate behavior or problems, we really need to have policies with teeth in them. When you're relying on the personality of the administrator to either be open to the ombudsman or not open to the ombudsman, cynical or embracing it, whatever, if you have a policy with no teeth, then you're just relying on personality and you're going to get a range of success according to the range of personality. And I think if the University really cares and the Senate if we care, perhaps we can really work with the administration to establish policies that are not so dependent on a benevolent dictator, so to speak.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Chris. And it's Byrne, Eberly College of Science, correct?

Chris Byrne: Yes, thank you.

Chair Seymour: You're welcome. Dr. Ansari, any response?

Mohamad Ansari: Yes. We do have the policy AC76, as a matter of fact, that describes how the fellow unit ombudspersons are elected. And the rules are completely outlined in policy AC76. I don't believe that it is a widespread problem across the University, but obviously there are some perhaps administrators that have made some derogatory remarks that my fellow ombudsperson has outlined in the report.

I intend to have, again, another meeting with the commonwealth campus ombudspersons and discuss that very issue and try to bring it to the administration at University Park and try to address it. But I can tell you for the past two and a half years, the system works. We have been able to provide significant assistance to the faculty across the University. Myself, I've been involved with it in many, many of the cases and saw the ombudsperson.

So, it's not that the system does not work. I'm sorry to see that there are some isolated cases. But we have to look at this as a big picture. And overall, this is a great support system for the faculty. They trust the ombudspersons because we keep their information strictly confidential and we listen to them, the details, and we provide the solutions as we see fit. Either the policies that we tell them that exist, or we outline some avenues that they could escalate it to the next level.

And many of these cases are really resolved at our level. In my case, probably the majority of those have been resolved when I have been involved with it. So again, thank you for your comments. But please rest assured that at least as far as I'm concerned, I am working very hard to bring everything to the attention and make sure that they're addressed and make sure that every ombudsperson receives the respect.

I drafted a letter that's sent all the ombudspersons and I told them when they are elected, it's a good idea to introduce themselves to the faculty as well as the administration. And I think they were receptive to that, and they are going to take that initiative as we move forward. Thank you, Chair Seymour.
Chair Seymour: Thank you, Dr. Ansari. Chris, do you have a quick follow up. We are running out of time allotted for this.

Chris Byrne: Yes, very quickly. I just wonder, I mean, I'm a big fan of Ombudspersons. I totally support the role. I think they're valuable for the reasons you said. But I just wonder if there's tangible data for the success of how effective they are in actually resolving issues. It's great that we believe in it. That's wonderful.

But is there any tangible measures to resolve the conflict between what you're saying, which is that everything works great except a few isolated cases, versus this report where these really drastic complaints are being made? And is there any tangible data that can resolve that? If there's not, I guess we should get some to really determine if the system is working or if the ombudsmen are not being properly respected as it moves up the chain.

Chair Seymour: Dr. Ansari, would you like to respond?

Mohamad Ansari: Yes, there is a tangible response to that. Because one of the questions is, how many of the cases were resolved. So, in this report, we have outlined how many of those cases are resolved. 56 cases get to the attention of the Ombudspersons, and we have outlined how many of those are resolved. And if you also read the past year reports, you can see that the vast majority of the cases were resolved at the Ombudsperson level and the University administration has acknowledged to me that this is a good service that we provide for the faculty. Again, those are, believe me, from my standpoint, are isolated cases.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Dr. Ansari, and thank you everybody. Thank you, Mohamad, it's good to see you.

Mohamad Ansari: It's a great pleasure to see you. Thank you so much for the opportunity. You have a good day. Bye bye.

2019-2020 University Faculty Rights and Responsibilities report

Chair Seymour: Thanks so much. Our final report sponsored by the Senate Council is the 2019-2020 University Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Report found in Appendix I. Ten minutes have been allocated for presentation and discussion. Chair Shapiro, the floor is yours.

Keith Shapiro: Thank you, Chair Seymour. I want to thank Dr. Ansari for his report. It's really important for this, for us, and Faculty Rights and Responsibility because the ombudspersons are the really first line of defense before a case is escalated into Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. And although we don't necessarily work directly with them, the petitions that we receive have significant benefit from the advice that Ombudpersons are giving those faculty.

University policy AC76, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, establishes the committee of the same name and defines the committee scope and operation. I'd like to note that there are some new changes in the composition of FR and R, which are reflected today in our nominating report, which is in Appendix F,
that will expand the committee to include fixed term faculty in the future, which is very exciting. And I'm certainly I'm looking forward to seeing those changes take place.

The committee may review petitions from faculty members who assert they have suffered substantial injustices resulting from violations of academic freedom, procedural fairness, or professional ethics. Those three things. Administrators can also seek committee judgments regarding actions toward faculty members that they may be considering taking. We have seen a case of that recently.

During the 2019-2020 cycle, Greg Zeigler was chair. And the committee received 10 petitions from July 1, 2019 until June 30, 2020. The committee's term is 12 months. One petition was carried over to the committee from the previous year. So, in reality, 11 cases were examined during the 2019-2020 period.

To put that in context, over six years, the last six years, previous six years, the committee examined between 7 and 15 petitions per year. Petitioner's may claim any or all of our three categories that we mentioned before of complaint in their petition. And we had during the 2019-2020 cycle three complaints of violations of academic freedom. Four included complaints of professional ethics, 10 claimed violations of procedural fairness, and they can claim more than one in a petition. So sometimes we have overlaps there.

Petitions can also list a complaint in the quote unquote "other" category. And in that, petitioners listed a wide range of complaints, including gender bias, failure to follow policy HR 68, which I think is postdoc appointment policy, retaliation, freedom of expression, discrimination, personal bias, conflict of interest, and changing expectations midway through tenure. The '19 '20 committee conducted investigations or in-depth reviews for five cases, with the resulting findings and recommendations being forwarded to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Kathy Bieschke. Kathy Bieschke’s office.

Policy AC76 states in the event that claims of bias or discrimination are a component of the case, the petitions are referred to the Office of Affirmative Action for a parallel review. During that cycle, that 2019-2020 cycle, we referred four petitions to OAA. In addition, we referred one case to the Office of Ethics and Compliance concerning possible retaliation.

Of the 11 petitions that were reviewed, seven of the petitions were completed and closed and four of the petitions were still in progress and referred into the 2021 committee, which is chaired by me, Keith Shapiro. In addition to that, we’ve received seven new petitions so far during the 2021 cycle. And in fact, one of the seven we received this morning.

I'd like to speak on behalf of Chair Zeigler, Greg Zeigler, and to thank the members of the 2019-2020 committee who devoted significant time. And this takes a lot of time to go through those petitions and a lot of thoughtful consideration. The committee consists of both faculty members and administrators, and they work together to try to understand those petitions the best they can.

The committee members express our appreciation to all the ombudspersons as well across the University for their contributions toward resolving conflicts and disputes at their colleges and campuses. If they weren't there doing that, we'd see a lot more petitions. And I would especially like to thank our University Ombudsman Mohamad Ansari, who's my friend but also my colleague, because he's worked very hard to improve the process and ensure compliance with policies and training and support the work of unit Ombud people throughout the University. And we may still have work to do. But from what I'm seeing coming forward in FR and R, clearly his work has been effective.
I'd like to additionally acknowledge, and the committee certainly as a whole would, the efforts of Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Kathy Bieschke, who we work with very closely. And she's worked really hard to ensure fair process for all the petitioners. And additionally, I’d like to thank the Senate office staff, because they've been really helpful, especially Kathy Craig, who was our staff assistant that's been appointed to work with FR&R.

And her work has made the organization of our processes. And she's really good at it. Much more fluid and organized and easier to manage. And I’d also like to thank Dawn Blasko for her support. I've called her many times to ask questions, and she helped today get these numbers organized into this report. So, thank you, Dawn. That's it.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Keith. Are there any questions for Keith? Please raise your hand or put a question in Q&A.

Bonj Szczygiel: We do have a question and Q&A. This is from Kathleen. I'm sorry, I don't know how to pronounce your last name. I'm going to try Noce. The question from Erie is, is there data? Although kept confidential, that provides a high-level view of the number of complaints reported by campus, the type of complaint and the resolution and the resolution of those complaints. If so, is there a report?

Keith Shapiro: We don't have that data organized into a report. To some extent because there are so few cases. When you have 11 cases or 15 cases a year, the real concern is that anything we do might be able to be identified. Any of those complaints might be identifiable, especially if they're coming from small campuses where you may have one or two promotion and tenures going on. So, we have not had those reports in the past. However, if that's an issue, what I can do is bring it to the Committee for Faculty Rights and Responsibilities for discussion and also touch base with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Kathy Bieschke, and talk about how we might do that in the future and still maintain confidentiality.

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

Keith Shapiro: It's a really good question.

Bonj Szczygiel: None received.

Chair Seymour: All right. Thank you, Keith.

Keith Shapiro: Thank you.

2020 Annual Report of the Reserved Spaces Program

Chair Seymour: We have two reports sponsored by the Senate Committee on Admissions Scheduling, Records Scheduling, and Student Aid. The first report is the 2020 annual report of the Reserved Spaces Program found in Appendix J. This report is online only.

Annual Report on Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded

Chair Seymour: The second report is the Annual Report on Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded, found in Appendix K. This report is online only as well.
Update on the Status of the New Curriculum Management System

Chair Seymour: We have one report sponsored by the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs titled "Update on the Status of the New Curriculum Management System," found in Appendix I. Chair Williams is here for questions, but she's joined by Alan Rieck, Associate Vice President and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education and Vicki Hewitt, Director of Graduate Council Administration, who will present the report. Hi, Alan, go ahead.

Alan Rieck, Associate Vice President and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education: Yes, thank you, Beth. Appreciate the opportunity to talk with everyone this afternoon about the new curriculum information management system. Vicki and I will also be joined by Jeff Adams, also Associate Vice President, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, as we go through the overview of this new system. Go ahead, Vicki. We'll go to the next slide.

Alan Rieck: The Course Leaf Implementation Project actually began several years ago. The first product of the project was the launch of the University bulletins. That happened in August of 2018 when we launched the undergraduate, graduate, both law school and med school bulletins, which I'm sure most of you have seen used extensively. The second piece of that is the curriculum management project.

This curriculum management system will replace CRCS. And one of the primary purposes for making the shift is the ability for the new curriculum management system to interface with both LionPATH and the bulletins. So essentially, we are eliminating a middle step of transferring information from one system to another, because they will be connected and linked technologically. Go ahead, Vicki.

Several goals of this project as we move through this. Number one is to incorporate all aspects of the curriculum into the curricular review process in a similar manner. The uniform look, uniform workflow, uniform forms, at least as far as the initial appearance, is one of the primary advantages. So, if you've seen one form, you've seen any others that will look familiar, although they do vary across form to form within the different units.

We're also streamlining the process to ensure the information is acquired according to policy and the committees that are needed to evaluate them. We want to improve on the current system. And that's one of the things we really emphasize that we've gone through, which we'll be discussing a little bit later. And we are also maintaining the curriculum archive and the access to historical data. I'm going to turn it over now to Jeff Adams to continue on with the aspects of the CIM features.

Jeff Adams, Associate Vice President and Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education: OK, thanks, Alan. Can you nod if you can hear me?

Alan Rieck: Yes.

Jeff Adams: OK, thanks. My camera will not connect, but that'll save everybody that feature. So, with CIM, probably the biggest single thing it does for us is in that first bulletin. I will not read these to you but is the connection between the University bulletin and the other direction. And a lot of the work that's been done in the last several years is about building that bridge and ensuring that the data move back and forth appropriately.
There's some things that will be manual. The building of new curricula. But for instance, in the case of courses, a lot of the information will flow straight out of the review system into the bulletin and connect into LionPATH in ways that avoid people having to duplicate that work and then the potential errors that can happen when information has to be repeated.

Another big piece is about the workflow capabilities. And I just want to say that I think something that Alan didn't perhaps emphasize enough in talking about the goals of the project is the importance of this actually being an improvement. It's been a while in the rollout on this, but I think that's because of the continued commitment that we're not going to roll this out and make it available until people see it and feel like, yes, this is an improvement on the current system. And we don't want the system to dictate the process. We want the system to support the process. And the ability to adjust workflow is key to that. If you go to the next slide, please, Vicki.

OK, so workflow basically is the order in which various groups would then review and vote on or approve the curriculum as it moves through the system. This is what it looks like in the system, just a screenshot. If you go to the next slide, you can see this rolled out. And anybody who looks at this and says, that's not the order we do it, that's fine, because we actually will be able to adjust this for the workflow for any particular college. And we've started several years ago gathering that information.

And it's something that we can update relatively easily. The nice thing about the software is it puts a lot of the control in our hands. And things like adjusting workflow is fairly straightforward. So, if a college decides this isn't the best approach for this or we'd like to insert a particular step in here, that's relatively easy for us to do. OK, go ahead, Vicki.

One of the nice features of CIM is that because it's connected to the bulletin, it allows it to go in and figure out where everywhere in the curriculum of a particular course shows up. So, it can find it as prerequisites. It can find it as a required course in other curriculum. And it'll make that information available to anybody who's, for instance, proposing a change. So, you open up a course to change, you'll know from the system all of the curricula that require it and where it sits in prerequisites and so on, which should make the experience better for the user.

I next want to show you-- we're not going to show you a live test system. But Vicki, if you show the next slide, this just gives you some idea of what the interface is going to look like. And so far, our testers I think have-- although there's lots of details to be worked out, uniformly quite happy to see the interface and how it operates. But this just gives you sort of one taste of how we've been doing this work. You see the red boxes are things that have to be filled in.

And if we go down to the next slide, you see where we have a whole set of attributes. And if you've clicked No or you aren't going to apply for that attribute, then the boxes stay closed. And when you select one of the attributes, I think in this case US cultures, you see the boxes open up. And what our faculty reviewers have told us, these are people who are used to reviewing these proposals, is that in the current system, for instance, you might select three elements of this US cultures that you are then asked to address in the box below.

And people often forget. They don't necessarily respond to all of them. And that leads to going back and forth with the reviewers. This system allows us at their direction to open up a separate box for each one
of those. So, the idea is to really customize the system to make sure that the information people are providing is exactly what the reviewers are looking for to just reduce the amount of back and forth. I suspect that in the future, things like instructions and the text and so on will continue to evolve.

I don't want to say it's simple, but it's relatively easy for us to control that, to add instructions, to add links as we discover that people have questions. And that's what our usability testing is doing right now. Furthest along in our process is the new course proposal. Go ahead, Vicki. Let's see. And we will-- oh, go ahead. Sorry. And we're now on to CIM features, and I'm going to kick this back to Alan.

**Alan Rieck:** Great, thank you Jeff. Due to our unique curricular processes and our unique structure, we have had to work with Course Leaf extensively to customize some of the aspects of the system for Penn State. So, I'm going to turn over actually to Vicki Hewitt to discuss a little bit of the features, consultation and to, but then to also briefly talk about some of the things that could be in the future that Course Leaf is working on for improvement of the forms as we go forward.

**Vicki Hewitt, Director of Graduate Council Administration:** Right. So, Course Leaf has to customize their products to some degree for each institution. And because they have to do that, they typically make the features that they develop for new clients available for implementation by current clients and also ask for feedback from current clients on features they'd like to see developed. So, things they're working on now, they host a yearly user conference in February to discuss what's under development. And I attended some of the sessions to learn about the new features they're working on. These are some of the things that are coming down the pike to be implemented by Course Leaf.

They're working on a way to bundle course and program proposals together so that they can move through the workflow as a group and for more integration with Nuventive concerning learning objectives. Currently you can import data into CIM from Nuventive, and they're working on the other way to export out of CIM and into Nuventive. And that's something that both of those things they're planning to implement later this year in the summer or the fall. For any sort of new features like these, it would be up to us if we want to incorporate these new functionalities. We don't have to if we don't want to.

So, it'd be something for us to continue discussing and deciding if this actually works for us and makes things better, makes things easier for us. Oh, I went too far.

So, where we are now in January. We started testing the course forms by having volunteers fill out proposals in small groups, and then we had members of our implementation team in the groups to observe the testing. And the testers gave us some great feedback. We are now currently as in this week and next week testing our program form in the same way with small groups observation testing with our team members.

We're planning to move into larger scale testing shortly and within the next few weeks with college administrators in the colleges. And we particularly need to meet with every college to make sure that the workflow-- as Jeff said earlier, the workflows are customizable by college, so we need to make sure that we have those right for every college how they want you know to start out with the workflows that will work best for them. So, I think I toss it back to Alan at this point.

**Alan Rieck:** Yeah. Just to give you some idea of the involvement of some people in this process, we want to thank Rob Pangborn and Gene Younken for being the initial sponsors. Of course, we'll be retiring
both of them before the project is completed. So, we you thank them, nonetheless. Bob Kubat and I served as the overall project leads for the entire Course Leaf project.

The next slide gives you an idea of this is the curriculum management implementation team members, people who are currently serving on the implementation team that are working on a regular basis to discuss the forms, review the forms, make improvements and suggestions to go forward. There are also some members who were previously involved that have left the committee and been replaced by others or who have moved from Penn State from their positions.

And I finally would like to share with you a list of people who have tested, who have been involved in the testing of the system. We're very excited about the participation that's come across the entire University in this process. And I believe that we really will have a very fine product to work with beginning this summer and then going into the fall in the future. With that, we'll open it up for questions if anybody has questions.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you Alan, Vicki, and Jeff. Are there any questions in Q&A? Any hands raised? Just to remind my colleagues, if you have any questions, put them in the Q&A.

**Bonj Szczygiel:** We do now have one from Kirby, Education. If Course Leaf might allow bundles of courses or program proposals to proceed through a review as a single package, what Penn State policies need to be revised to allow for faculty packages to be reviewed and considered as a unified whole?

**Alan Rieck:** I mean I think that's a very good question. One of the things that we've been committed to is as we've been going through is to, as Jeff mentioned, make sure that the system is not dictating policy but that the system supports the direction that the Senate has set forth. And the other governing parts of the colleges and graduate school, et cetera. So, I think if that were to come to pass, that would be a discussion that would need to be had with the Senate committees and the group that is working on this project. We want to make sure that we continue to follow the procedures and the policies, especially that Senate has already approved and dictated as appropriate for curricular management.

**Mary Beth Williams, Eberly College of Science:** Beth, if it's OK, I could say something on this.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, Mary Beth. Go ahead.

**Mary Beth Williams:** Thanks for the question. I saw a question from Victor too. These questions about current curricular procedures and the procedures that the committee follows as we get a proposal in have been ongoing discussions in Curricular Affairs. We're trying to closely align implementation of this new software system with procedural updates in the committee. And so, this question of streamlining and packaging individual course proposals together with program proposals was a topic of conversation and curricular affairs already.

And when this becomes available, if it becomes available, there would have to be an update to the guide to curricular procedures to enable our committee to be more streamlined in that way. So, I'd say these are going in parallel so that we can update and align our processes together with the software. Thank you for the question.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you, Chair William. Any other questions in Q&A? Any hands raised? Well, thank you all. Thank you for that good presentation and thank you for being here today.
New University Policy on Consensual Relationships

Chair Seymour: Our next report is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and is titled "New University Policy on Consensual Relationships," found in Appendix M. Chair Bishop-Pierce is joined by Annie Taylor, who's also Vice Chair of CC&R, and Suzanne Adair, Associate Vice President of Affirmative Action. And they both co-chaired the committee that worked on this. Chair Bishop-Pierce, the floor is yours.

Renee Bishop-Pierce, Penn State Scranton: I'm going to promptly turn the floor over to Suzanne and Annie Taylor.

Chair Seymour: A smart move.

Suzanne Adair, Associate Vice President for Affirmative Action: Thank you all. Can folks hear me? So, I cannot start my video because the host has stopped it. So, I'll just start talking, and if you all get my video going, that's great. As long as folks can hear me. Did I get a thumbs up?

Chair Seymour: We can hear you. Thank you.

Suzanne Adair: OK, wonderful. Thank you. And Annie, jump in whenever it makes sense. I see you have no video either.

Annie Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: But I'm here.

Suzanne Adair: OK, wonderful. Thanks for having us all. Hopefully folks had a chance to review the informational report. We just wanted to walk through pretty quickly some of the primary points that are, I think, really critical to understanding where we went with this policy, what our thinking was about this policy, what our charge was, and how we landed with AD102, which is our new consensual relationship policy.

So just given the current climate around the need to be more proactive about addressing and eliminating sexual misconduct across universities, we really understood that it was an opportune time to examine Penn State's consensual relationship policy to determine whether we had a policy that adequately addressed the management of these consensual relationships, which we know certainly that folks have.

And so, as you've seen in the report, there was a joint administrative slash Faculty Senate committee that was tasked with reviewing our policy and drafting revisions. And the goal really was to strengthen the University's position regarding these relationships and clarify how these relationships need to be managed. And note that the policy does not specifically monitor or address intimate relationships between individuals where there is no supervisory context except in instances where we've got faculty or staff members who are in a consensual relationship with a student within the same academic unit.

In those cases, the goal is simply to ensure that the unit administrator is aware of the relationship so that they can more easily manage any restructuring of responsibilities that may need to be done should a supervisory role develop in the course of that relationship. And if it does, that means this policy certainly has to be adhered to. And so, we just wanted to make sure that unit administrators could easily move into that space and have conversations with folks about managing any conflicts of interest or any supervisory responsibilities that need to be shifted.
A second point here is that we've addressed broad issues within the policy. And we've thoughtfully considered any number of aspects to this work and any number of constituents. And so, as you've seen in the report, and we'll talk a little bit more about it, we've benchmarked with other schools and then made revisions that we believe best fit Penn State and the Penn State community.

And so, for instance, we did not include in the policy an outright prohibition of relationships with particular populations that other schools have done. So, there are other schools that say faculty can have no relationships whatsoever with any undergraduate. We chose not to do that. We're a large, diverse, and complex University with lots of sites. We just didn't think that that made sense for Penn State, particularly given how many sites we actually have.

But the effort for us was about changing culture and promoting transparency when these consensual relationships occur so that we can really assist folks with addressing any potential conflicts and challenges. And so, we really believe there shouldn't be any shame in being involved in consensual relationships. We wanted to send that message. That's part of why we wanted to take it out of AD85, quite frankly.

And we definitely wanted to make sure that we address the kinds of issues that do have the potential to develop that create difficulties for all parties involved or folks who are impacted. And so that was really important for us.

These revisions are also very much about providing concrete guidance and clarification on exactly how to manage these situations should they arise. And we are making it clear that not reporting these relationships when you need to be is going to be taken seriously, and it is considered a violation of University policy. And we thought that point really needed to be made clear.

So, the committee, as we went about our work, we met a number of times to just review our previous policy, which was situated within AD85. It was a paragraph within the former AD85. And we, again, reviewed policies from other schools and reviewed any relevant literature that we thought made sense and that applied to the work that we were tasked with doing. And then after drafting a revised policy, we actually took it out of AD85, we broadened it, and we'll talk a little bit more about what's different.

But after taking it out of there and revising it and creating a new policy, essentially, we spent a considerable amount of time talking with ACGE and AQ and the Grand Council and USEC, at least three different committees here for Faculty Senate, ALC, so Academic Leadership Council, student organizations.

And we incorporated the feedback that we received from all of those groups. And so, Annie and I did what we called a road show and spent months actually meeting with all of these groups to get feedback, hear what they had to say, get some input from them, and then incorporate that.

Next, we presented the draft to President's Council and got some feedback, really important feedback, from that group as well and incorporated that feedback into the draft. And so lastly, we were able to finalize and publish what you all have seen, which is our new policy AD102.

The pieces that are different, so the primary pieces to pay attention to here, one, it's no longer situated within AD85. AD85 is now the new Title IX policy. And so, part of our rationale for removing it from
AD85, one, AD85 focuses on sexual harassment. We wanted to separate this. We're talking about consensual relationships. We're not talking about sexual harassment. And it feels as if you've penalized consensual relationships when you embed it in a policy about sexual harassment. So, for us, that was a primary reason to remove it.

Secondly, folks weren't reading it, it was a very small paragraph in a very large policy. And so, folks found it hard to even locate where the consensual relationship policy was, as it was buried. So, we thought it needed to come out of AD85. Second or third, we've added stronger language to clarify the University's position. And so, it no longer says we discourage relationships between folks who have supervisory responsibility over others. It now says these relationships are prohibited, which is what it needs to say. So, we wanted to have some stronger language there.

These next couple of things that are changed, they just didn't exist in the prior policy. And so, we thought these were really critical. One, we've specifically defined various aspects and terms that are talked about in the policy. And we didn't have any definitions in the prior policy. We've provided specific steps to follow to report the relationship and to manage it from that point forward.

The prior policy had none of that. It simply said managers need to meet with folks and try to figure out how you pull apart supervisory responsibilities and how you address it. It didn't give specific tips. It didn't give specific steps that one would need to take. And it didn't outline the specific areas that one needs to consider when you're trying to manage restructuring responsibilities from folks who have supervisory or authority responsibility over others.

We identified resources in this policy so that we wanted to make sure that our employees and our students know where to go to get assistance in working through some of these kinds of issues and working through who I might need to report the relationship to. What happens when I make that report? Is there support for me when I attend a meeting with the unit administrator? None of that existed in the previous policy. Then that was important for us, to make sure that that assistance was transparent, was included, first of all, and certainly transparent.

And then we identified possible sanctions in this policy for not adhering to reporting. What we say throughout this policy is the point of this is to help people manage these relationships when there's a supervisory or an authority relationship. And so, in order to do that, we certainly need to know when those relationships exist and the expectation is that people are reporting that. Either party can report it, but we are certainly holding accountable the folks who have the supervisory authority.

That is who we're holding accountable to report those relationships to the unit administrator so that folks can go in, sit with the parties, talk about what might be the best way to remove the evaluative or supervisory authority. So again, we're not trying to say you can't have the relationship. We're saying you should not be supervising folks that you're having a consensual relationship with, and we need to figure out how to address that.

So, we would argue that add AD102 as our new consensual relationship policy is now much more robust. It's a more comprehensive policy. And frankly, it's a more transparent policy. And those were the goals we really wanted to accomplish with the committee's work. So, I'll stop there, see if Annie wants to add anything before we take questions.
Annie Taylor: Just a quick, some may be wondering who on the Senate, especially if you're new this year, you may think, oh, faculty never saw this. They did. Suzanne mentioned that we met with different committees. We were specifically directed to meet with the Committee on Education, the Committee on Faculty Affairs, and the Educational Equity and Campus Climate Committee. And in addition, our committee who worked on this for a year had a very broad faculty membership as well and campus representation.

I'm just so happy where we ended up. You would not believe, or perhaps you would, the number of case studies we discussed in this process. Well, what if it's this and what if it's that? We talk a lot-- today we talked about supervisory relationships. We very much considered power relationships. Not always is the person a direct supervisor. But if you read through the policy, you'll see that as well, that we addressed many different kinds of power scenarios that need to be mitigated.

So that's all I would add. And I think at this point, we are just curious if there are any questions that anyone might have.

Suzanne Adair: Thank you, Annie. Appreciate that.

Chair Seymour: Thank you Annie and Suzanne. Are there any questions? Yes, it looks like we have a hand raised. Tallman. Nathan, can you speak? Nathan, are you there?

Suzanne Adair: We saw him. I think he disappeared.

Chair Seymour: The joys of Zoom. Thank you. I think we lost Nathan. Are there any questions in Q&A? Anyone else raise their hand?

Bonj Szczygiel: There are none in Q&A, Beth.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Have we found Nathan? Still no Nathan. Hopefully he's well. I think we might have found him. No? OK. Eric Novotny has his hand raised.

Eric Novotny, University Libraries: Hello. So, I'm not sure if this-- this is Eric Novotny from the University Libraries. I'm not sure if this represents Nathan's comment or not. He's back.

Nathan Tallman: Sorry, Zoom kicked me out for whatever reason.

Eric Novotny: Go ahead, Nathan.

Nathan Tallman, University Libraries: So, Tallman, University Libraries. I understand the basis for a need for the policy AD102. But I am concerned about various aspects about this policy. The first is the readability of the policy itself. I did not know for sure until Dr. Adair mentioned that this does not apply to employee-to-employee relationships in the same academic unit where there is no supervisory relationship. I read this several times and was not able to determine whether or not it applied, because that was a significant problem for me if it did.

And also, other people in our unit also had problems understanding the meaning and implications of this policy from reading it. And specifically, there's ambiguity around the definition of work unit. And it's
unclear exactly what constitutes a work unit and how that might be different across academic units. We're concerned that there's been no messaging about this policy across the University.

Our HR strategic partner was unaware of the existence of this policy until we raised it in a brown bag session with our constituents. He said that there had not been any discussions of this policy in HR circles. And there are many Penn State couples, sometimes in the same unit. So, what provisions or guidelines would be made for current working situations, and is there a timeline for dealing with those? That might be less applicable now that it's clear this does not apply to an employee-to-employee relationships without a supervisory aspect to it.

And although there is an annual review of the management plans built in, there is insufficient procedure to report the end of a consensual relationship. And the policy is ambiguous as to how to handle future reporting relationships. So, if a relationship ends and is not reported back and there are changes to the reporting structure, there's the possibility of introducing the power dynamics you're trying to avoid without sort of closing the loop when a relationship might end.

And I think the last concern is less applicable now knowing that this does not apply when there is no supervisory relationship. But the library constituents did have some concerns. And I think the readability might be stemming a lot of those concerns. Concerns might stem from the readability. Thank you.

**Suzanne Adair:** Thank you. Thank you, Nathan. That's helpful. So, we are having a significant conversation in session with our HR strategic partners and HR consultants to walk through the policy, their role, all of the kinds of things that we want to talk about with them. So that is happening. We made the decision not to socialize it yet to the larger community until we had this particular session. And so that is the plan. We will begin socializing, communicating, making sure that the University community knows about this policy and knows that we have revised it.

And part of the messaging is we've always had a consensual relationship policy. So, it's not new. We've always had one. It just expands on providing clarity and transparency and guidance. I think, Nathan, part of what you raise is there are a couple of things that we didn't include. Part of the difficulty with this and part of the task is trying not to be so prescriptive.

You do want some flexibility for folks. And so, we really thought long and hard about what do we have to say? What do we have to include? What makes sense to include? And what do we leave out? What do we say, look, we're going to allow a unit to or a unit administrator to manage some of these pieces? So, hearing your feedback is certainly helpful and gives us some additional pieces to think about and consider.

**Annie Taylor:** And I just want to add, Nathan, it's hard. It was a huge committee. And I know we always could have added more, but there was a Senior Director from Human Resources on our committee. So, they needed to be involved.

**Chair Seymour:** Thank you. Eric, was your question basically Nathan's?

**Eric Novotny:** Yes.

**Chair Seymour:** OK, thank you.
Eric Novotny: I'm good. Thanks.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Any other questions.

Suzanne Adair: I think there was one in the chat. Do we ever hire faculty that are married where one may be in a supervisory role and the other may be in a faculty role within that group?

Annie Taylor: Can I just quickly address? I can't address the President of the University. Suzanne can do that. But I can tell you I'm a use case. I am married to someone who worked in my same unit. And when I was-- and we were coworkers. When I was promoted to the director of the unit, his entire-- well, the moment we started dating we already had put our supervisor on alert.

But when I became the director, his entire reporting line had to be changed to another unit. He still works with our unit, but I am no longer have any power, any authority over him, which he likes to remind me of all the time. Suzanne, you could address the larger University question, though.

Suzanne Adair: Yeah. It's a tough question. But we clearly looked at, as Annie said, the varying stages of supervision for folks. And so, at best, we're talking very specifically direct supervisory responsibilities where you are making decisions about performance and evaluations and so on and so forth. When we move further away from those kinds of direct decisions, we certainly think that there is some responsibility depending on what's going on. But we may need to still manage those as well.

If we're talking about the President of the University, yes, we're going to have to manage what that means if we have a president who happens to have a partner or spouse who works here, and that the president would have some authority over in terms of specifically impacting their employment. And that does not happen for every single employee. The president doesn't necessarily make decisions about every employee. That's what we've got five layers of supervision for. But certainly, we'll have to think about that as well.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Any other questions for Annie and Suzanne?

Bonj Szczygiel: Not in Q&A.

Chair Seymour: Any hands raised? Excellent. Thank you both and thank you both for your hard work on this report.

Suzanne Adair: Thanks, all. Thanks for the feedback.

Faculty Resources Report

Chair Seymour: All right. We have two reports sponsored by the Senate Committee on Outreach. The first report is titled "Faculty Resources Report" and is found in Appendix N. This report is online only.

Strategic Planning Update: Outreach and Engagement Data

Chair Seymour: The second report from Outreach is titled "Strategic Planning Update: Outreach and Engagement Data," found in Appendix O. This report is also online only.
Human Research Protection Program Consolidation: Streamlining IRB Processes

Chair Seymour: And our final report is the Senate Committee on Research Scholarship and Creative Activity, “Human Research Protection Program Consolidation Streamlining IRB Processes,” found in Appendix P. Chair Egolf is I think granting the floor to Debra Thurley, Assistant Vice President for Research, Research Protections, and Rachel Lally, Director of the Human Subjects Protections Office. I'm not sure if Candy Yekel is here. She's the Associate Vice President of Research and Director of Research Protection. We have 15 minutes for this report, and the floor is yours.

Debra Thurley, Assistant Vice President for Research, Research Protections: Thank you, Beth. This is Debra Thurley. And as Beth introduced, the Assistant Vice President for Research. And Rachel and I are going to take you through some slides. And Rachel just brought this up. Thank you, Rachel. I can see them just fine. And like Beth introduced, Candy Yekel is here as well should there be any questions that we need her input for as well. So, if we could go to the first slide, Rachel. And I'm going to turn it over to Rachel. She's going to start us off.

Rachel Lally, Executive Director of the Human Research Protection Program: Hi, everyone. As Debra mentioned, I am the Executive Director of the Human Research Protection Program, which oversees the IRBs here at the University. So, I will start by giving you a quick overview of kind of what the IRB is. I imagine that many of you haven't had reason to interact with the IRB. So, IRB stands for the Institutional Review Board. And we are the group responsible for reviewing any research that involves human subjects across the University. So that can be anything from a community survey to new drugs at the College of Medicine and across Penn State Health.

So, the board itself consists of scientists, non-scientists, community members. There are guidelines set out in regulation that we have to follow for the membership on the specific boards. And research can't begin without our approval. There are lots of pieces across the institution that are required to conduct research, but our specific part is to make sure that any time we're involving humans that we have ethical and regulatory oversight by the IRB. So sometimes things go to that full committee of scientists, non-scientists, community members, and some of those things are reviewed by expedited procedures in our office.

So currently some of these slides have actually changed slightly since they were submitted. There were six IRBs at the University. We are slowly kind of stopping some of them as we move towards our new process, which we'll go into in a little more detail. But there were four at the College of Medicine, one at University Park that also covered the Commonwealth campuses, and one at St. Joseph's Medical Center. So, the St Joseph's board was disbanded in December of this past year.

University Park's board is kind of in flux right now. They don't have need to meet as a full committee very often. And so, some of those protocols are currently being seen by college of medicine boards. But again, we're revamping the whole process. So, we are slowly phasing those out into one combined IRB, which we'll talk a little bit more about as we move through the slides. How do I get that? There we go.

So, the history of kind of how we got to where we are now is that the Office for Research Protections oversaw the IRB program at University Park and the Commonwealth campuses and the Human Subjects Protection Office, or HSPO, oversaw the IRB offices at the College of medicine. And so, since 2006, those two offices shared a combined electronic system, one accreditation process as kind of a combined
program of human subject’s oversight. And then in 2014, we moved to the CATS IRB system, which is the system that we use now, to receive all of our electronic submissions and do our reviews.

So those two offices have kind of been working in parallel and moving towards a unified process for a number of years. And that process is really kind of solidified in April of 2019 when Candy Yekel, who is here, was appointed the institutional official for the University and the College of Medicine. And the College of Medicine had a separate reporting line until that time directly down to the College of Medicine. So, the College of Medicine HSPO program was moved up to the University level as kind of that combined program. And as a result of that, I was hired in April of last year to oversee that program at the College of Medicine.

That happened to coincide with the onset of the pandemic, and we learned lots of things, one of them being that if we stopped worrying about kind of who was sitting on which campus, we really had a lot of resources that we could combine, and skill sets that we could use to complement each other. And our offices kind of started working together to train me and to compare processes. And by October of this past year, we had put together a proposal that worked its way through University leadership on both campuses up through the Provost and really contributed to the one University program.

So, we feel like this program will really allow us to combine our expertise while still maintaining the local context. So, involvement of all the Commonwealth campuses and the various research that happens there. As Penn State Health continues to obtain hospitals and affiliate sites, we're able to encompass any research that happens at those sites. And it really does bring us in line with the other leading research institutions that are similar to us and that we consider our peer institutions. So, we began planning that operation. In January of this past year, we combined our staffs officially. All research that comes into the IRB office through that CATS IRB system is distributed amongst those analysts based on level of review, kind of review, PI last name. But we no longer split up our teams across campuses.

Here is the new combined HRPP structure. Again, as I mentioned, we have a few updates, which are happy updates to this org chart. There were seven open positions when we had the plan approved. Two of them were backfills and five of them were new positions that we really successfully argued that we needed additional resources to be able to move those reviews through the process quickly. Just this week we had, or last week I guess, we had a new analyst start on the full board team. So that fills one of those vacancies.

We are in the process of hiring the assistant director that you'll see on the third arm of our org chart, which is kind of the new arm that will manage all of the pieces that are not directly related to the review of protocol but are setting up processes related to us serving as the single IRB, overseeing our accreditation, our toolkit documents, those kinds of things. And we also, not shown on this org chart, have an IRB specific educator that also reports up through Candy but will work very closely with our team to be able to disseminate information about IRB reviews and submissions across the institution. And I think that's it for me. I will turn it over to Debra.

Debra Thurley: Thank you, Rachel. So, Rachel gave you a preview already that some of the changes for our actual boards that review the full board studies, the Institutional Review Boards, we've already started making them. But really the goal behind this was to increase the IRB efficiency, be more consistent, and produce more timely reviews. Again, like Rachel mentioned, we ensure that the IRB has the necessary expertise.
And so, what the plan is, is Rachel mentioned we're down to four IRBs at this point, having consolidated a couple of the IRBs into these four. And the plan is starting in the second quarter of 2021, so around May, that we will have one IRB for the entire institution. And what will happen is we will use the membership that sits across all of those IRBs, even the ones from St. Joe's and the one from the University Park IRB, will take all of that membership, add in any kind of expertise we're lacking for the research that we do across the University, and that will be one kind of big giant IRB with many alternate members.

And in that way, we can reduce the length of time that individual IRB members spend in meetings. Our plan is to have approximately 10 meetings per month. So that also opens up the number of meetings and the number of potential times a researcher could get their study to go to an IRB. Because right now each of those IRBs only meet once a month. But those meetings right now are extremely long, four or more hours long.

So, the intention is to add to the meeting the number of meetings per month, thereby reducing the number of meetings each member has to attend and also reduce those meetings to an hour. So, the agendas aren't four hours long but close to an hour in length. This will decrease the burden on the individual IRB members. It will increase the chances of getting a protocol reviewed on a monthly agenda.

And we think it will also help with that first bullet point, the consistency of the reviews. Because as you can imagine, spending four or five hours in one meeting, people start to drop out because they have other meetings they have to go to, and we lose quorum, or the conversation is just to the review of the first protocol and the review of that last protocol. What happens in that four-hour time period? So, if there's less they have to concentrate on, the ability to really be consistent and get things reviewed in an efficient way just increases.

And what we did is we benchmarked with other leading research institutions that have very similar portfolios to ours. And we benchmarked all along the way to find out how did they do this successfully? These two institutions have been doing this successfully for several years now, and so we wanted to find out from them, how exactly did you do this? And so, we've been benchmarking very tightly with them, very frequently with them just to find out how did you do this? What were the pain points so that we can try to avoid those same pain points? And how did you make it successful.

In addition to that one IRB that will review full board studies with the many alternate members, we will have one other board. And this board will be specifically set aside to hear issues of non-compliance. And that board will meet monthly. And that will be the only thing on their agenda will be issues of non-compliance. And if we could go to the next slide.

One of the things that we are doing to help make this reorganization successful is involving an advisory committee. And that's the second committee you see on there. The HRPP advisory committee is something brand new. We actually have our first meeting scheduled for the end of March. The focus of this group will be advisory and consultative. And what we did is we selected from amongst our most active human subjects’ researchers from across the University campuses, University Park and College of Medicine, and invited them to be members of our advisory committee. And all of them enthusiastically said yes. So, we're very excited about that.

I will co-chair this committee along with Dr. Zack Simmons from the College of Medicine. And we have 16 total members. And out of that membership, that includes myself, Candy, and Rachel, the three of us
that are here today. But this is part of our goal to make sure that we involve the research community in this reorganization to hear directly from them. Where are we still seeing pain points? Where is their confusion or issues that we can address? Or the opposite, hopefully. Where are things going really well? What was successful? How can we repeat that?

So, the focus of this group will also be meeting quarterly is the plan for this group. The first group you see on there, the Executive Committee, is purely informational, where we share information, and we get information share back. And this committee has been in effect for a while, but it's another way that we involve the research community. Next slide.

And our goal. So, I think we talked about this already, but we want to improve efficiency. We want to improve our review timelines. We want researchers to be able to get their protocols reviewed in a more efficient manner, whether it goes to a full IRB or whether it gets reviewed at an expedited or exempt level in our offices. We want to improve our turnaround times. Right now, we compare those to our creditor who collects national metrics. So, we want to improve those so that we're either meeting or exceeding those metrics.

We'll be monitoring this performance with a new reporting tool that we were able to put resources into purchasing. It's a very robust tool that gives us up to date daily information. Rachel and I will be preparing quarterly reports to Candy as the institutional official to keep her apprised of how that's going. Again, our goal is to always have more consistent reviews by our analysts and our boards. We plan to do some, in addition to the HRPP Advisory Committee, we plan to do some surveys and focus groups to hear from the researchers to, again, to hear about program satisfaction and how things are going.

And we also have, as Rachel mentioned, that third arm that was on the far right of the org chart, a whole new program that will be doing all those things that doesn't involve review of protocols that we still need to do as an IRB. And one of those things is what's called a single IRB reliance program where Penn State could be the IRB of record for research that involves multiple sites across the country. And that program will have an assistant director and four staff that supports it. And they'll do other things like help with education and reporting to federal sponsors, reporting to our creditors, things like that so that our reviewers are really just focusing on getting those protocols, reviewing them, and getting them turned around in a timely manner.

And I think that's our last slide. Hopefully we have some time for a question or anything that's from the group.

Chair Seymour: We do. Thank you, Debra and Rachel. Do we have any questions? Please put them in Q&A or raise your hand.

Bonj Szczygiel: There are no questions in Q&A and no hands raised.

Chair Seymour: I'll give it another second, because Q&A questions can take a little while. Thank you for your patience. It doesn't look like we have any questions. So, thank you, Debra. Thank you, Rachel and Candy as well. Thank you all.

Debra Thurley: Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Excellent report.
Debra Thurley: Thank you.

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Seymour: Item L is New Legislative Business. Is there any new business? I will pause. Please put it in Q&A or raise your hand. Seeing none, let's move on to the results of our votes. Anna, could you please share your screen and announce the results of the votes? Thank you, Anna.

Anna Butler: OK, can you see this?

Chair Seymour: I can, thank you.

Anna Butler: OK. So, the first vote, the Revision to the Constitution, there was 130 to accept, 12 reject, and it passed. The Revision to the Bylaws, there was 151 accept, 12 reject. It passed. The Revisions to the Standing Rules. There was 139 accept, 10 reject, and it passed. The Committees and Rules Nominating Report approval of the slate, 140 Accept and three Reject. It passed. And the Senate Council Nominating Report, Appendix G, voting on the entire slate of nominees. It was 129 Accept and three Reject. It passed.

Chair Seymour: Thank you very much, Anna. It looks like we might have some new business. Something may have come in. So, I ask Bonj to help me out.

Bonj Szczygiel: This is Simmons from communication. She said I would like to enter into the record the Honors College student’s letter. We should not feel the need to read it. I'm not sure what that's a reference to.

Chair Seymour: Yes. I think you mentioned this earlier, Cindy, during the meeting. How do we get that in the record, Keith?

Bonj Szczygiel: The letter about COVID from there 250 students were seeking vaccination.

Chair Seymour: Right, no, I understand. I'm just trying to figure out how to get it into the record. What's the easiest way to get it into the record? We don't want to read it. It's too long, I think. I don't know.

Bonj Szczygiel: She says it was emailed.

Chair Seymour: Right. Could you email it to Sarah Silverman or Erin Eckley so that they could add it into the record? All right. Sarah keeps our record for us. So, she will put it into the record when she creates the record. Any other items of new business? Seeing none.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Seymour: Item M is Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the University. Are there any comments for the good of the University? Any items? Raise your hand. Put something in Q&A. Other than snide comments in the room, anything else going on? Seeing none.
ADJOURNMENT

Chair Seymour: May I have a motion to adjourn? Brunsden moved.

Bonj Szczygiel: Seconded by Nesbitt.

Chair Seymour: Seconded by Nesbitt. All right. All in favor gives a thumbs up. Or raise hands, whichever you wish to do. All right. The Senate motion carries. The Senate is adjourned until April 27, 2021. Thank you, everybody.

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, April 27, 2021, 1:00 p.m., via ZOOM.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected Students</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>