101 Kern Graduate Building
University Park, PA 16802
Phone: 814-863-0221

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

T H E   S E N A T E   R E C O R D

Volume 55-----October 19, 2021-----Number 5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FINAL AGENDA OCTOBER 19, 2021

The next Regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, November 30, 2021, 1:30 p.m., via ZOOM.

The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, October 19, 2021, at 1:30 p.m. via Zoom Webinar with Chair Szczygiel, Chair, presiding.

Chair Bonj Szczygiel, College of Arts and Architecture: Welcome, everyone. It is 1:30 in the afternoon, Tuesday, October 19. The year is 2021 and the Senate is now in session. Let the record reflect that today we are meeting in a Zoom format. Let me begin by going through a few-- hopefully-- familiar instruction. Who can speak in a Senate meeting? Only those who are elected, or appointed student faculty administrative or retired senators or past Chairs have the privilege of the floor. The meetings are public, and others can join and listen. But please, do not try to ask a question if you're not a Senator.

You can email Executive Director Dawn Blasko or myself if you would like to request to speak at a future meeting. Our Zoom capacity is 500 people. If we reach that capacity, I don't think we will today. And you are not but-- for whatever reason, you're not able to join, a complete record of the meeting will be available within three weeks of this session. This meeting, like all Senate plenary meetings, is being recorded.

If you are presenting a report, when it is time for your report, we will call on you. Please wait to speak until you're introduced by the Chair. When you are finished, please mute. And then, for everyone else, please remain muted unless you are recognized to speak.

The chat function is in operation for you to communicate with each other, but not to be closely monitored. So don't put anything in there that you absolutely want some of us to see. You may use it to report, say, a technical problem or an observation for the general good of the meeting. But don't use it to ask a question, please, or to be recognized to speak. If you have an emergency, technology or otherwise, email Kadi Corter.

How to ask a question. Use the "Raise Hand" function at the bottom of your screen. Wait to speak until you are recognized by the Chair, me. Begin by stating your last name and academic unit. For example, Szczygiel, Arts and Architecture. And of course, please speak clearly and slowly as the audio is not always clear on Zoom calls.

How do you vote? In order to get an accurate vote, we're going to be using TallySpace. You're all familiar with this system. We've used it several times in the past. We're going to be using it again today. We'll be posting that link in chat, but you can also find the link on the Agenda. It is based on previous experiences. It is strongly suggested you retrieve your nine-digit Penn State ID and now have it handy.

But, by all means, hold off on logging into TallySpace until we're ready to vote. To avoid a timing out issue, the software has-- I think it has something like a two-hour session limit. So don't log in now. But get your Penn State ID handy. You'll need that ID to be able to log into the system. And if you don't have your ID, the staff won't have time during this meeting to look it up for you. But you can find it in Workday.

A final note. Please be patient with the limitations of a Zoom interface and hold on to your seats. Hard to believe, but right now, we are planning to be back in person for our March 20, 2022, meeting. As for new senators, if you've not been to a session in 112 Kern, well, it's an experience. But so is this today. And it's a special one because you joined us.

To that end, I want to welcome everyone and thank you all for being here. Your commitment to the Senate is more important than ever. I know that you're all very busy and you're staying focused and committed to shared governance is, frankly, harder than ever. Please know that I value your time and your commitment and your efforts.

And I'm also here to support you. So please don't hesitate to reach out to me and to the Senate leadership. And because I don't have a chance to call out their names as much as I would like to, they are, Lisa Mangel, Secretary, Kim Blockett, Chair-Elect, Beth Seymour, Immediate Past Chair, and Keith Shapiro, our Parliamentarian. Thank you all, friends, for all of your support.

I want to thank our resource people and guests for attending and engaging in the work of the Senate. And I want to thank Dawn Blasko, Executive Director of the Office, and especially the office-- the Senate Office for their hard work. Without their support, trust me, the Senate would not get its work done.

Finally, I want to wish a very special happy 100th birthday to this venerable institution. Senate Historian Roger Egolf tells us that in the month of October, 100 years ago, the Penn State Faculty Senate was born. It was in a very different form than what you see today. And we were planning on having a major celebration and then COVID hit.

But we will be back next October. We're just going to put the celebration off for a year. And we're looking forward to everyone gathering into celebrating this fantastic institution at Penn State University.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Szczygiel: Moving So let's move to the Agenda, if we can. Item A on our Agenda, our Meetings of the preceding minutes-- of the Preceding Meeting. The September 14, 2021, Senate record provides a full transcription of the proceedings of the meeting.

It has been delayed posting due to a transcription problem, but it will soon be posted on the Faculty Senate website, and it will be sent to the University archives as normal. A video recording, though, of that meeting is available now on the Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions to these minutes? Please raise your virtual hand.

Hearing none, may I hear a motion to accept?

Victor Brunsden, Penn State Altoona: So, moved.

Chair Szczygiel: Second?

Carey Eckhardt, College of the Liberal Arts: Eckhardt, Liberal Arts, second.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. All in favor of accepting the minutes please unmute and say aye.

Chair Szczygiel: Beautiful. Opposed, say nay.

Thank you. The ayes have it and the motion is carried. The minutes of the meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Szczygiel: Our next Agenda item, Communications to the Senate. The Senate Curriculum Report of October 5, 2021, is posted on the University Faculty Senate website and listed on the Agenda as Appendix A.

Editorial Changes – Appendix I

Chair Szczygiel: Additionally, we've got two editorial changes to the Senate Governing documents from the Committee on Committees and Rules approved at the October 5 Senate Council meeting. First is an update wording of-- within our documents from the phrase "fixed term" to the phrase "non-tenure line." This is an editorial change simply to be consistent with current University usage.

Second, it was recommended all instances of the phrase, quote, "non-voting unless Article IV section 2 of the Bylaws applies," end of quote. And its associated asterisk be removed, because we have clarified the voting rules elsewhere.

And in case I lost anyone with this, these changes will be posted to the Senate website for five days after at the end of today's meeting. If no objections are received, they'll be implemented. If objections are received, if they are received, it will go back to CC&R to be implemented as a regular report. Again, these were considered to be unsubstantial, not simple editing corrections.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Meeting of October 5, 2021

Chair Szczygiel: Moving along to Agenda item C, the Report of Senate Council. Minutes from the October 5 Senate Council meeting can now be found linked in the full Agenda. Included in the minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President at the October 5 meeting. You can access the full Agenda on the home page of the Faculty Senate.

ANNOUNCMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Szczygiel: Agenda item D, Announcements by the Chair. Over the years, when the University's state-wide campus structure has been mentioned, I've noticed in conversation, there has been a predictable enthusiastic appreciation for their purpose and for their critical role in Penn State's Land Grant Mission, certainly within particular groups, such as our alumni-- the Alumni Association, but also within the Board of Trustees. It's been an interesting phenomenon to observe over the past several years.

But I also know that, historically, and in our conversations with the campuses in our faculty leadership visits to them, the relationship of campus to University Park has or can be strained, no matter how often we use the one University refrain. This year I am wanting to find ways of recognizing and celebrating the campuses. They are unique and essential to this very complicated network that we all belong. And some have been unduly strained, financially or otherwise, in recent times.

Members of PSU Board of Trustees, Matt Schuyler (Chair), Dave Kleppinger (Vice Chair) and Nicholas Rowland (Academic Trustee) will address the floor

Chair Szczygiel: So, to that end, I've asked the Board of Trustees leadership to talk specifically to the state of our Campuses as they see it with a broad outline of the economics of our dispersed structure, for example, perhaps how the campuses contribute to Penn State's financial bottom line, and their relevance to the future of Penn State University.

To that end, I am happy to cede my time as Chair to welcome the following three guests. I want to introduce Matt Schuyler, who was elected to the Board of Trustees in July 2015 as an at-large trustee and is the current Chair of the Board.

David Kleppinger, who was appointed to the Board of Trustees by the Governor Tom Wolf, effective January of 2017. Dave is currently serving as Vice Chair of the Board and is Co-Chair of the Presidential Recruitment and Selection Committee. As well, I've asked our former Senate Chair and current Academic Trustee Nicholas Rowland who also serves on the Board's Presidential Selection Committee to bring us up to date on that process.

So, after these three gentlemen have time to present, I am hoping there will be time for general quote, "Q&A" at the end of their session. And with that, Matt, Dave, I believe the floor is yours to begin.

Matt Schuyler, Chair, Board of Trustee: OK, thank you Bonj, and thank you to everyone joining today's gathering. On behalf of the Board of Trustees, we're pleased to spend some time with you this afternoon directing our comments to Bonj's preview with respect to our Campuses.

So, I have had the pleasure of attending this meeting from time to time, including last year. And was Vice Chair of the Board then. And this year, I have the honor of addressing you as Chair. My colleagues trustees Kleppinger and Rowland here with me as well. David serving as Vice Chair of the Board as Bonj just indicated. And Nicholas representing faculty on the Board, please chime in as you see fit as we work our way through some thoughts with respect to the Commonwealth Campuses. And then, as we later in the Agenda provide you with an update on the presidential search process.

So, I recognize it's a full Agenda and we'll cover a lot of ground. And I want to thank everyone for the valuable time today. I'll keep my remarks brief so that we'll have time for any Q&A that might come from today's comments.

So, with that in mind, let me begin with the Commonwealth Campuses with a focus on three areas. One, the economics of a dispersed University structure. Two, looking ahead to the future of the Commonwealth Campus construct. And three and update briefly on our relationship with PASSHE.

So, as you know, the Commonwealth Campuses support Penn State's long-standing commitment to make higher education accessible and affordable irrespective of social and economic class within the Commonwealth and beyond. Forty-six percent of all first year Baccalaureate students started at Commonwealth Campuses. And these campuses serve Pennsylvania's working families with 82% of Commonwealth Campus students as Penn State-- Pennsylvania residents, I should say.

Often, students save money during their first two years by living at home and working part time jobs while they attend a local campus. Eighty percent receive financial aid. Sixty-two percent work an average of 22 hours a week in addition to their educational assignments. A Commonwealth Campus structure provides access to a world-class degree that otherwise would not be attainable for many Pennsylvania residents and students.

These campuses provide major economic impact in their surrounding communities. We should consider, for example, the campuses collectively provide substantial funding to the University. An important resource, they represent a solution to meeting the responsibilities of the University more broadly, including but not limited to extending the University's land grant mission of access across the Commonwealth and affordability to its residents, connecting the University to regional economies across the Commonwealth, and serving a large portion of the University students for the first two years of their academic career. Thus, enabling the University to maintain a much larger enrollment than otherwise would be possible with a singular campus construct.

Notably, tuition and fees paid by Commonwealth Campus students support 100% of direct campus operating expenses in the Office of the Senior Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses. Plus, Penn State's Commonwealth Campuses contribute $1.2 billion annually to the state's economy. They're an excellent steward of Penn State's resources and reputations broadly in their communities and in the regions surrounding those communities.

The second area I was hoping to cover today is the future outlook for the Commonwealth Campuses. As President Barron has said on numerous occasions, diversity of our population is incredibly important and essential for the success of the University. It's crucial for our business model, it's a moral imperative, and it's absolutely critical for environmental richness of our education.

The Commonwealth Campuses are a pipeline for diversity for the University. In fact, 16% of the students and Commonwealth Campuses are adults, including more than 1,000 veterans. Thirty-eight percent are first generation college students. Percentage of undergraduate students across all Commonwealth locations who are not White, international, or undeclared is 28% compared to 21% at University Park, for example.

In addition, campuses are often the higher education providers, cultural and research centers and major employers in their communities, thus extending the diversity Agenda beyond just the University construct.

Next, we should consider the political and policy impact of the Commonwealth Campuses. Seventy-five percent of Pennsylvania residents live within a 15-mile radius of a Commonwealth Campus. Ninety-six percent of Pennsylvania residents live within a 30-mile radius of a campus. That means that both in Harrisburg and Washington, the Commonwealth Campuses enabled Penn State to be relevant in nearly every Legislator's office and in every corner of the Commonwealth. Our reach is certainly comprehensive in this regard.

Fourteen members of Congress directly represent a Commonwealth Campus. And 2020 state senators and representatives have a Commonwealth Campus in their district. Finally, I'll comment on Penn State's relationship with PASSHE. The PASSHE schools are a less costly alternative for Pennsylvania residents. But cost is only one of many factors that help families in the Commonwealth determine where their children will attend college.

Providing a high-quality student experience and access to a large portfolio of academic programs while creating cost savings in the educational journey has made the Commonwealth Campuses a popular and sometimes more affordable choice for hardworking Pennsylvania families. As you've probably read, the enrollment picture at the PASSHE schools has been very challenging lately.

Demographic declines impacting the number of high school graduates in Pennsylvania. Especially in the rural areas of the state have impacted enrollments in colleges and universities throughout the state. This fall, the PASSHE enrollments fell to 88,000 students, down 5.4% from the year before-- more than 5,000 students.

Since 2010, when the system had nearly 120,000 students, enrollment has plunged nearly 26%. In contrast, this year's Penn State enrollment is up 2%, despite declines in residential students at our campuses, because this semester, many of those students opted to take classes through our World Campus. So, while residential attendance is slightly down, overall enrollment, slightly up across the Penn State network.

We fully expect those students who opt into World Campus types of assignments for the semester to return to resident assignments in upcoming semesters. The structure of Penn State and the integration of Commonwealth campuses across the state provides stability to us as a university. And we can see this in the fact that Penn State's market share and annual admissions targets for first year Baccalaureate students have remained consistent for the previous 10 years. That in relation to the decline in the PASSHE network is an interesting note.

Pennsylvania students find multiple pathways to complete their education, of course, as we know, including transferring. And students admitted to Penn State and to PASSHE transfer between institutions from time to time we throughout history. We believe that Penn State's relationship with the PASSHE system benefits students, families, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania more broadly.

So let me just conclude my prepared comments by saying that Penn State's Commonwealth Campuses have long advanced Penn State's Land Grant mission, having served hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvanians who would not have otherwise had the opportunity to pursue college. If not for that geographic breadth offered by our campuses, we may have missed out on a lot of educational opportunities for residents of the Commonwealth and beyond.

As we look to the future, it will be important that our Commonwealth Campus strategy avoids duplication, of course. We will look for it to maximize centers of excellence. We will look for it to continue to increase the percentage of Pennsylvania students that achieve a college degree. And we will look for it to continue to partner with employers across the state for work study and internship opportunities and apprenticeships.

So, in short, the Commonwealth Campus Network is incredibly important to the University as a whole and very strategic relative to our overall objectives as a University. So Bonj, I'll pause there and see if my colleagues have any comments they want to add. And then, we can turn back to you to see if you want to moderate some questions with respect to this topic or jump right directly to the next topic. David, Nicholas, anything you want to add?

David Kleppinger, Vice Chairman, Board of Trustees: Nothing that I think-- if there's any questions out there, we'd be happy to answer them.

Nicholas Rowland, Academic Trustees: I agree. We look forward to questions and I'm sure as everyone knows my perspective. I'm a firm believer in the Commonwealth.

Nicholas Rowland: Of course.

Chair Szczygiel: I think I'd like to just hold all of the questions to the end. So, if we could-- if you're ready to just go on and introduce us to the Presidential Selection Committee activities.

Matt Schuyler: Sure, we can do that. So, I think we have a presentation in this regard, and I'm not sure who's administering pulling that up. Hopefully not me. Not a capability set that I possess.

OK, so what we thought we'd do-- and again, we can tag team this. So, turn to my colleagues, trustees Kleppinger and Rowland to help run through this or pause me or add any commentary to any of the points that we'll make.

But we thought we would share with you a general overview of the presidential search process and status. So, with that, let me turn to the first slide and let you know what we'll cover. So, we'll give you an overview of the presidential recruitment and selection committee and also the Next Gen Penn State Advisory Group.

We'll describe the activities that both of those groups took on as part of this overall search process. We'll share an overall overview of the search process and the engagement that we've undertaken as part of that search process, talk about the strategy that we began with and continue to see through, the outreach we conducted relative to that strategy, and then talk a little bit about candidate engagement and the funnel that we're working our way through as part of the search process today.

So, with that, if we could move to the next slide. So, we began this process in earnest some 11 months ago by selecting a group of representatives to form a Presidential Recruitment and Selection Committee, and here are those members, which are diverse in terms of their background, their skills and experiences, their gender and ethnicity, and overall representation of various facets of the University construct.

We also took an opportunity to-- as part of the overall process, if we can move to the next slide, form a next-- what we call Next Gen Penn State Advisory Group with a broader array of representatives and constituents that we thought could come together and help us frame up an overall structure that we could use to work back from as we thought about what do we want the next president of Penn State to think about with respect to the future of the University?

How do we want to think about the tenure that they may experience as the next leader of the University? And generally, a future visioning session of what Penn State could be as we think about what this individual's tenure could look like in the next bit of time.

David, you want to spend any more time describing the Next Gen Group, since you led this effort? We'll pause and--

David Kleppinger: Just briefly, I think that along with our consultant in this process, Spencer Stuart, they concluded, and we agreed that this was one of the most robust information gathering processes they had ever seen in any of the searches they had done for University presidents in the past.

The undertaking was rather significant with the number of survey links that had been sent out, the number of responses we got in. I think 1,700 or 1,800 faculty surveys were completed by many of you that are on this call. We conducted 36 stakeholder sessions that included some 270-some people.

And coming out of that were an identification of what the University's challenges are or what the opportunities are, what that group felt the priorities should be, and then the qualifications and attributes of our next president. That work really led directly to the creation of the job specification that ultimately was posted. And as candidates began to apply and we began to speak with potential candidates, we continued to rely on the content of the Next Gen Penn State report to frame the types of questions those candidates were asked and their responses thereto.

So, it was a very complete, thorough process that brought in opinions from a very broad basis of constituents, whether it's faculty or deans or administration or community members or donors, students of all types all were included in the Next Gen Penn State process, as you can see from the 50 people that were participating on it.

Matt Schuyler: Thank you, David. So, if we can move to the next slide, it illustrates what David just described very precisely that we drove-- in the initial stages of the search process a very robust and disciplined approach towards framing up the position spec, framing up the ultimate job description, if you want to think of it that way. And that allowed us to think about how we would want to canvas for candidates.

And if we want to move to the next slide, this is just a visual depiction of all the sensory inputs that went into that position spec formation that the committee then used to begin the work of canvassing a broad array of potential candidates against that specification. And as you can see here, also included in that work were the groups shown at the bottom of this page. President's Council, Council of Chancellors, the Council of Academic Deans, Senate leadership, committee Chairs, staff advisory councils, and so forth. I won't read them all.

But you can see here, it was a wide canvas. And our commitment to being as wide as possible was fulfilled through this process. And as David indicated, we had thousands of responses vis-a-vis this process more broadly. We can to the next slide.

All of that input formed up, essentially, a framework-- a specification framework that we used to conduct the search. And so, here, you can see the input from the Penn State community more broadly where we highlighted strengths of the University-- areas where we may want to will continue to move forward. That translated into attributes and experience targets relative to the array of candidates that we may consider as a committee.

If we could move to the next slide. We then considered, what do we want to match up that target roster against? In other words, where would the candidates come from? And obviously, the Academy is the biggest potential source. So, academic leaders in the form of sitting presidents and provosts, high performing deans, academic and medical health system leaders, Penn State alums that are in considerable leadership roles in academia, business leaders with a penchant towards academia, possibly coming from academic business models and so forth.

And then, nominations from the broad Penn State community. And we received hundreds of those. And then, applied, of course, a lens towards making sure that this comprehensive list had a high degree of

diversity applied to it. That was, as you'll recall, part of the request when we laid out the targets. And when we solicited our community more broadly for names, we were very specific about the desire for diverse talent. And that paid dividends because the rosters that we considered relative to that attribute and experience target list was indeed very diverse.

So, we can move to the next slide, and I'll describe the funnel, as we like to refer to it as a committee. So, starting at the wide end of the funnel, initial prospecting and sourcing occurred relative to that target roster that I shared with you a few slides ago. And we looked at over 400 individuals identified as legitimate prospects from a variety of sources.

In partnership with Spencer Stuart, the search firm that we chose to partner with respect to the search, we began the narrowing process. Spencer Stuart reached out to literally hundreds of these prospects. And from that, identified 50 that we could consider to be legitimate targets. You might say, how do you go from hundreds to 50?

A lot of that is assessing their qualifications relative to the targets. But a lot of it is how long they've been in their current role, what their trajectory is, whether or not they're even interested, perhaps they're geographically locked in and can't leave. Perhaps their individual circumstances are such that they wouldn't consider the opportunity. This is the narrowing that occurred from hundreds down to the 50 or so suggested here in the middle of the funnel.

From those prospects, we narrowed further based on the committee's input flipping-- literally, flipping through CVs and resumes to determine where we thought the candidates matched up best with the needs of the institution. And where we stand now is in the zone of the suggested 11 candidates, moving from round one considerations and interviews to a further narrowing-- we'll call it round two. And we anticipate going from 11 candidates to three or four or five, based on that process that we're in the middle of right now.

From that, the next steps would be, I suppose, not surprising and logical, we will finalize a number of other steps in the process, including doing reference checking, due diligence, asking for input from committee members with respect to their reflections on the interactions with these candidates, spending more time with the finalists in small group settings, and ultimately, bringing those finalists candidates in front of the full Board for consideration as well as, I believe, the plan is to have further faculty interaction with a small group of faculty as well as part of that last stage processing to get to a final recommendation.

If we could go to the next slide, please. So just so you're aware of the time series with respect to that funnel, we conducted the pre-round one screening in June through September. We're in the midst of that round one narrowing to get to round two. So that's September, October, where we stand currently. And we anticipate further narrowing as we get deeper into the fall, of course, over the next several months.

Just wanted to share on the next slide the protocol we followed to conduct round one screening just so you have some context as to how you go about-- how we went about the narrowing, in this instance. We ask a series of questions. We let the candidates answer a consistent opening question. And then, the committee was assigned questions that you see here and given each candidate the opportunity to answer these questions asked to them consistently. So, we had some comparisons that were even.

Now, in any of these situations, as you might imagine, the conversation could take twists and turns and take you deeper or maybe into a different subject matter. But by and large, in the time period that we had

with each candidate, these were the questions that were asked uniformly and consistently. And that gave us the comparisons to allow us to narrow from round one to round two.

And then, last, in the interest of time, I'll just cut to what these next steps are as I mentioned when I was describing the funnel. So, if we can turn to the next slide and the last slide here. We will move from round one to round two. Round two, likely be further discussions with the candidates around specific topics. We will also have small informal settings with various members of the committee. Spencer Stuart is conducting deep reference checking and due diligence work.

And ultimately, all of that gets married up with the committee to form a finalist slate that we would then put in front of, again, that faculty group that I described as well as the full Board for consideration and discussion. So that is the overview I wanted to share with you today in the form of this PowerPoint presentation. Again, I'll turn to Nicholas and David to see if there are any additional comments you want to add or items that I may have missed that we'd like to cover.

David Kleppinger: I think you've covered it, Matt, ready for questions. Unless Nick has something.

Nicholas Rowland: No, nothing to add at this point other than in response to whichever questions emerge.

Matt Schuyler: So, Bonj turn back to you to moderate.

Chair Szczygiel: All right, thank you very much. We will have about 10 minutes for questions. So as is protocol with our group please, raise your hand and wait to be recognized. Noah.

Noah Robertson, College of the Liberal Arts: Hi, Noah Robertson, College of the Liberal Arts. Thank you for your presentation. I really appreciate your time. I was a little alarmed as you were going through because of one kind of noticeably missing criteria for selecting the next president, in my opinion, that's really important, which is climate action and commitments to sustainability.

So, I'm hoping you're aware, but there has been a lot of student advocacy recently on things like fossil fuel divestment and creating zero waste commitments for the University. So, my question to you is, how does the Selection Committee value sustainability in the selection process and how is the selection process ensuring that the next president is friendly and sympathetic to concrete climate action steps in guiding Penn State towards a more sustainable future?

Matt Schuyler: Yeah, thank you, Noah, that's a great question and a really great point. And frankly, the criteria was an even longer list than I was able to present today. And high on the mind of the committee, and frankly, high on the mind of every one of our candidates has been the notion of environmental sustainability-- building a more sustainable University for the long-term future.

And I'll also use this opportunity to suggest that equally important, interestingly, from every candidate that we talked to was diversity and inclusion. Without prompting, they showcased their thinking with respect to this topic. It was a criteria that you saw listed on that roster. But it was interesting that they cut straight to, "These are the things that I believe in with respect to diversity, inclusion, environmental sustainability, the ecosystem of the University and the footprint of the University as a whole, and also its contribution to these matters going forward."

So really, a very important criteria that we did use. And in fact, each candidate put on display.

David Kleppinger: And I would just add in the process of interviewing those 11 folks, already, many were aware of our emphasis as an energy University and being known as an energy University. And they specifically tied in sustainability. How could you not-- if you're going to be an energy University, you have to buy into sustainability. And we had candidates that just knocked that out of the park in terms of their answers to questions.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. And just a remind you to please state your name and academic unit before speaking. Cindy.

Cynthia Simmons, College of Communications: Cynthia Simmons, Communications, University Park. Gentlemen, I admire you and your commitment to this University, but how can you possibly go forward with this search if there are only two women to be interviewed?

Matt Schuyler: Well, Cynthia, thank you for that. And we, obviously, as I mentioned, had a goal of diversity with respect to the candidate slating and the consideration set. And of course, our partners at Spencer Stuart knew that this was an objective of ours as the slating began in the 400 that we started with. I think the fact of the matter is candidates for this position that come from the sources that I described, by and large, biased towards non-diverse from a gender perspective. In other words, it's a mostly male slate, if I'm being direct and honest.

There aren't a lot of sitting presidents to choose from that are women, if I'm being direct and honest. And as you saw, most of the sourcing came from academia. And sitting presidents, sitting provosts, sitting deans-- and as we went from the 400, the percentage stayed consistent. It's interesting in that regard.

Approximately 20% of the 400, women. As we narrowed the list and got down to our final slates, the 50, 20% women, to the final 11, 20% women. So, we stayed consistent with the original sourcing. And that's how we got to the numbers that we got to.

Cynthia Simmons: We are Penn State. We can do anything. We have the money; we have the prestige. It appears to me that Spencer Stuart has failed us. And instead of going forward with a flawed pool, you should get what is reasonable for the students of this University.

Matt Schuyler: Well, I appreciate that, Cynthia. Our objective as a committee was to find the very best leader for Penn State for the future with a goal of ensuring we had a diverse slate to consider. Our slate to consider was very diverse broadly in the broadest sense. Diverse backgrounds, diverse ethnicities, diverse genders, diverse upbringings. And I feel very comfortable that we saw a very diverse slate to get to the spot that we're at.

I don't think you would have wanted us as a stakeholder to bias the search towards any particular demographic. I would think you would want us to choose the best person knowing that the slate was very diverse to begin with. So, in that regard, we followed a principled approach of having a very diverse slate to start with and narrowing to be chosen by the criteria we applied to get to the very best leader for the future.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. We need to move on. We have other hands that are raised. Thank you, Cindy, you made an excellent point. Well stated. Ali.

Alison Watts, Graduate and Professional Student Association: Thank you. Ali Watts, with the Graduate and Professional Student Association. I also second the concerns about the gender bias there.

But one of the questions that keeps coming up in graduate and professional student's spaces is the lack of our representation in these conversations. There's nobody currently on the search process who represents that body. There's also only one student involved in Next Gen and he did not make it through the entirety of the process.

So, we're concerned, particularly as the future faculty in higher education, as alums of Penn State who will be coming out of this program, what does it mean for our voices not to be included in this process to be considered as valued stakeholders in the presidential search? And are there opportunities as you move forward in this process to make sure that those voices are being included? So that we're really not leaving out what I would consider to be a very important critical population in Penn State the way that it's been left out so far.

Matt Schuyler: Thank you. Yeah, thank you, Ali. And we agree that the voices of our graduate students are very important, as our all students. There are student representatives, as you know, on the broader committee and were involved with the Next Gen Advisory Group. And David and I, as part of our regular meeting cycle for the Board of Trustees, spend considerable amount of time with the graduate student government representatives and have been briefing them along this journey with respect to the process and the briefing you just received is the briefing they received.

So, I would suggest that student engagement has been high in this regard and has been high on our mind as we've gone about the search process.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Ali.

David Kleppinger: I think that the student representative on the committee has certainly been in touch with graduate and professional student leadership to continue to get input into the process. So, you should not hesitate to contact Erin if you think voices are not being heard or that she's not representing them. And I can only say that the Board members on the committee have been highly impressed with how Erin has conducted herself and she's been a very valuable contributor to the process.

Matt Schuyler: And I would add-- this may sound superfluous, but I will add it anyway. We were all former Penn State students. We spend a considerable amount of time with Penn State students as part of our deliberations as a board. Penn State students are part of every one of our meeting cycles.

If there were one criteria that we truly led with, it was the notion of the best interest of our students, present and future. And so, this has been incredibly high on our minds as we've gone about this process. As you can tell from the presentation that we shared, there were a number of criteria that we used to go about this process. This is one that I would say has been at the forefront from the very beginning and stays highest on our mind as we engage with the candidates as we narrow that funnel.

And frankly, again, what I said about diversity and inclusion and what I said about environmental sustainability, I will repeat about students. Every one of them has proactively described their engagement with students, graduate students, doctoral students, undergraduate students, in residence students, virtual students. This has been a major criterion that we've used as part of our screening process.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. I've got two of the hands raised. Christina.

Christina Grozinger, College of Agricultural Sciences: Hi, Christina Grozinger from College of Agricultural Sciences. And I was wondering if you could speak to the expertise of those 11 candidates

that you have. So, are they coming from academia? Have they been active faculty members? Anything that you could provide on that would be great.

Matt Schuyler: Yeah, thanks, Christina. And the answer is yes and yes, and I'll leave it at that. We don't want--

Christina Grozinger: For all of them or what is the percentage breakdown?

Matt Schuyler: They've all had academic experience, and all have taught. So yeah.

Chair Szczygiel: All right, thank you. Carey.

Carey Eckhardt: Eckhardt, Liberal Arts, University Park. Thank you all for the presentations and information. Would you be able to provide any more information about the small group of faculty who will participate and what the slide called the endgame game of the process?

Matt Schuyler: Yeah, we sure can, Caroline. You go by Carey. I see your name Carey, yeah. Nicholas, you want to take that one?

Nicholas Rowland: Yeah, that would be my pleasure. Carey, thanks for asking. I know this has been on the Senate's mind for some time based on the resolution earlier this summer, which of course, I believed in, and therefore, have done everything I can to push this discussion and negotiation to fruition.

The discussion has ultimately been a successful one. And I understand that some faculty might be somewhat frustrated they haven't heard more sooner. There are reasons for that. Some of them are-- I don't want to kick the can down the road on this, but some of which are just modestly technical. But I can assure you that we're working our very best on this one. So the plan communicated to me thus far is to include the option-- and I want to stress that-- the option for faculty on the presidential-- oh, sorry. Let me take that back.

The faculty members that are on the Presidential Recruitment and Selection Committee, that's Nina Jablonski, your colleague at University Park, and Evan Pugh Professor David Han, who many of us already know very closely from the Senate myself, along with an additional five at-large candidates. So that would be in addition to Nina, David, and I to meet with finalists before we conclude the process and then present, I guess what we call the end game finalist to the Board of Trustees.

Those five, quote, "other" faculty or at large faculty will be finalized very shortly. And I appreciate everyone in the Senate being so patient. It's taken a long time to iron this out behind the scenes. It is worth noting that meeting with a broader group of faculty members will be on a voluntary basis for the candidates, meaning that it will be by choice of the candidates for president. That's the arrangement that we were able to get to.

That said, we expect that Spencer Stuart, that's the consulting firm that we've been discussing, will encourage-- and I mean, very strongly and firmly encourage finalists to take advantage of this opportunity. I mean, my sense is that a president that would become the President of Penn State would very eagerly look forward to an opportunity like that.

Although I have been made aware of individual candidates-- some of them are quite private and don't want to upset their situations at their home institutions. It's very important that this is not-- we would not want to lose a candidate for this. And I guess this shouldn't come as any surprise, but the deeper into this

process I got, I came to realize very quickly, there's nobody that Penn State wants that other institutions don't also want very much, including their own home institutions.

And so, we tried to-- we try to strike a balance in this particular instance. And so, returning to the faculty members. After the meeting with the finalists, that would be the three faculty members that are on the Presidential Recruitment and Selection Committee. Spencer Stuart would then debrief with the full group of us. And then, this commentary would be then sent back to the Presidential Recruitment and Selection Committee, and thus, influence the final decision on who's Penn State's next president will be.

So as already noted, we anticipate fully and unambiguously that the candidate will want to meet with a group of faculty members beyond those closely related or already on the committee. Conversely, and now that memory-- now that I think about it, just last month, a group of us addressed the Commonwealth Caucus to talk about exactly these ideas. And a recommendation was made at that meeting that these finalists would want to have the opportunity to do a kind of town hall meeting that I think a lot of us are accustomed to and have seen very frequently over the last two years or so.

But there was a suggestion there that we might run the risk of, again, losing candidates, which the committee, of course, does not believe would be in the best interests of the faculty or the students to ultimately have a successful process. And so those details should come out very soon. But from what I can gather, the Board is fully committed to making good on the recommendation in the resolution from the Senate.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Nicholas.

Nicholas Rowland: Thank you, Carey.

Chair Szczygiel: And seeing no other hands raised and recognizing that we are just at our time up, I want to thank Matt, Dave, and Nicholas for taking the time to join us today. It is very much appreciated. We hope to have you back again for perhaps continuing this conversation or new conversations.

Matt Schuyler: Bonj, thank you for the opportunity on behalf of all of the trustees and on behalf of this Search Committee, which of course, involves groups beyond the trustees. We greatly appreciate the opportunity to engage with you in this regard and to give you an update. We'll look forward to future updates.

And I just want to add one more point, if you may-- if I may. And that's that this has been an incredibly exhaustive process. I think it's really important that everyone on the Faculty Senate and everyone on this call understand how vast this process has been. We've been at this for 11 months. It is by all accounts a wide canvas that has occurred. I do this for a living. I didn't have a chance to share my bio.

But I have run human resources functions for some of the largest companies on the planet. The company I currently work for, Hilton, has just been acknowledged as the number one company for diversity by DiversityInc. We are the number one best company to work for three years in a row by Fortune Magazine.

I share this not to brag, but to lend some credibility to what I'm sharing with you today. That this has been an incredibly exhaustive process. The most exhaustive executive search process I have ever seen in my career in 35 years in HR. We canvassed more candidates; we were more thorough in those

considerations. The funneling that's occurring is the most thorough I have seen. The due diligence that Spencer Stuart is conducting is the most thorough I have seen.

And I just want to share that because I think, as Penn Staters, we should all be very proud of this process. We're not done, and we'll look forward to these next stages being just as thorough. But I can tell you I'm proud of what the committee has done. And I have some expertise in this regard that allows me to compare it to other processes that I've been through. So, thank you for indulging me and letting me share that. I think that's important context relative to this.

I think we're going to be very pleased with the outcome of this process and very proud of the next leader of this University to carry forward the great work that previous presidents have instilled in this University. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: That's one thing we can all agree upon is that we certainly all want to be-- feel pride in the selection.

Matt Schuyler: And I think we will. I really think we will.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, again, all of you. Appreciate it so much.

Nicholas Rowland: It's good to be back. Thanks.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Szczygiel: And onto our next Agenda item. Here we go. Agenda item E, Comments by the President of the University. It's now my pleasure to recognize President Barron for any comments he would like to contribute.

Eric Barron, President, Pennsylvania State University: Well, thank you very much. I appreciate that. I don't sound very good. I have a non-covid upper respiratory infection, at least, that's what the COVID test suggests that it's not COVID, fortunately. But I'm not going to talk for a long time but can certainly answer questions.

No, I just thought I would-- since there was discussion about PASSHE when talking about the campuses, in particular, I would note-- and you probably know that all the individuals responsible for budgets and including Nick Jones for the state-related had a hearing on our budget. He may be about to talk about that as an experience.

What I thought was so interesting was that the questions quickly pivoted around the impact of a voucher program instead of doing the appropriation for the state related. And the idea there is that the students would then pick up the voucher and they could take it to the University of their choice. Of course, for us that, as you know, that has the potential to truly impact our mission because we use the state appropriation entirely and actually amplify it to create in-state tuition.

So, we would have to be competitive for those vouchers with a higher stated tuition, which would be problematic. But the messages that we were hearing is that we want to make sure we're giving the money

directly to students as opposed to giving it to universities that are doing things that we don't believe in. And so, this presents an interesting issue, especially since our appropriation requires a 2/3 vote.

In contrast, the PASSHE vote only requires a majority. So, this is a substantially different issue, in many ways. But I find it fascinating that PASSHE had a 5% drop in their students that came in the door, but they're asking for a significant increase in their appropriation. And of course, we've been just trying to stay even with inflation now for more than a decade.

So, this will be something very interesting to follow. As Bonj and others know, we have quite an advocacy program that's already being started to point out the immense value of Penn State and our campuses in particular. I'm hopeful that we will be successful. But this is one of those years that may prove to be a little bit trickier.

I'm also pleased, and hopefully you noticed, that the University has now completed another item that was on the Select Presidential Commission for Racism, Bias and Community Safety in creating a Center for Racial Justice. And the decision was made to put this into the Social Science Research Institute as a center. This gives us a standing capability that is a well-worn path of success and instant credibility with the idea that we're going to tackle this issue from a research perspective and that this research perspective is going to yield improvements in what we teach and how we teach it as well as help become a national leader in policy in so many different ways.

The position for director is going to be posted. This is something that is designed across the entire University. It is not a University Park effort. And we're busily collecting what a lot of people are doing in this space so it can help us attract a good director. And the other thing that's good about the institute positions that institute a structure is that we fund this with physicians that are then split with colleges and campuses.

And this has the benefit of the college or campus being interested in the candidate and it being supported by the institute as well. So, this is an opportunity to create growth in the research portfolio across the University in the area of racial justice. So, you should be seeing that announcement soon.

I was thinking here about talking a little bit about vaccine rates and things like that, but maybe Nick would do that so that I don't cough my way through the rest of it. I've been talking all day, unfortunately, and I still have my class to teach tonight. So, I will do my best to stand for questions without getting too carried away here.

Chair Szczygiel: Well, by all means, please take a sip of something to drink and catch your breath. And just to clarify the public hearing that you mentioned right at the very beginning that-- for everyone, that was the Joint State Appropriation and Education Subcommittees. Joint public hearing on higher education funding that was the link to which was sent out by us to everyone. So, if you are on the Senate mailing list, then you would have received that.

So, questions. I think he is still here. So that means you're going to stand or sit for more questions. Cindy, I see your hand raised.

Cynthia Simmons: So, this is--

Chair Szczygiel: Did you identify yourself?

Cynthia Simmons: I just know you so well. University Park College of Communications. In an August 12th letter you cited political realities as a key reason why the University was not imposing a vaccine mandate. At the time, Pennsylvania Senate President Jake Corman said he would not take action to punish the University for such a mandate.

Since then, President Biden has issued a strong call for mandates for schools. The political system requires that voters be informed about the policies supported by their elected officials. The Pennsylvania legislature is an elected body, and many members of the Board of Trustees are either directly elected by alumni or are appointed by elected officials. Will you please identify those political figures who blocked implementation of a vaccine mandate so that the voters of Pennsylvania can make an informed decision at the polls?

Or if you cannot cite any evidence of political pressure, will you explain why your administration disagrees with the federal government and believes a vaccine mandate is not an effective tool to stop the spread of COVID? This is from a professor who was at the town hall on COVID, but whose question he did not feel was properly answered.

President Barron: So, I'm definitely not going to go through a list of legislators. I don't think that would have a lot of benefit. You just have to realize it's a 2/3 vote. And you have to realize that there is considerable political division in this country. Our vote must be bipartisan.

And the other factor here, which I keep hearing over and over again about not approving a mandate. What we're doing is almost identical to what Michigan is doing and Indiana is doing. And it's interesting that Indiana just announced with some level of pride that their positivity rate was 0.6% for the testing they're doing for all people not vaccinated. While at the same time, they announced that ours was 0.3.

The simple fact of the matter is that all the mandates that are out there have exceptions. And they have exceptions for multiple things, including Michigan having an exception for-- that's based on personal ethical choices. And so, the fact that we're moving to vaccination rates, which are so high, basically, by having either your vaccinated and it's uploaded, or you're being tested, puts us actually really in line with the numbers at a lot of different institutions.

I'm really surprised that people don't take a serious look at what those institutions are doing and how they're doing it and how they're announcing it. Because this University is doing extremely well in this space. Now, I will admit that if I start to look at the data, those counties that have very low vaccination rates do have a higher positivity rate on campus. And there is a shift in terms of both faculty getting vaccinated and students getting vaccinated in those counties for which there are generally very low vaccination rates.

As a matter of fact, if we look at the six counties that have the lowest vaccination rates in those counties, four of those counties have the top five positivity rate in terms of the University population. So, there's clearly a correlation that is there. So, I have-- and this is not in opposition to the federal mandate. As a matter of fact, I'm sure you know that the federal mandate is associated with contracts and-- federal contracts. And we're in the process of going through this University and taking employees and making sure that we're following all those rules.

And hopefully, although there are health exceptions and religious exceptions, hopefully we'll see that our vaccination rates, particularly for employees, will trend higher. Right now, the student vaccination rates tend to be higher than the entire employee rate at some of our campuses that are more highly vaccinated.

So, I think we're doing a-- I'm not going to declare victory. We have to keep looking at every single area that we can move forward. But I think you're going to watch and maybe the Provost will comment on the degree to which the federal policy is going to have an impact on UP and other campuses within our system.

But I don't know why you would want to poke the legislature when I can accomplish the same objectives without using the word mandate.

Cynthia Simmons: It was about voters having the information necessary to perhaps vote those particular legislators out of office.

President Barron: OK, so you can go right now and look at who voted in both House and Senate. It passed to remove funding for any entity that had a vaccine mandate. That's part of the public record. But it is certainly not my job to sit there and say, here, let me take this-- my job is to protect this University and make sure that its employees, staff, and students are safe and that we have a financially stable institution. That's my job. What you're asking me to do is not my job.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. President Barron, do you want to stand for another question?

President Barron: Yeah.

Chair Szczygiel: Megan.

Megan Neely, College of Arts and Architecture: Hi, Megan Neely, College of Arts and Architecture. Last Faculty Senate, we discussed the campus climate survey. Since then, some of the data has been released and a large number of timely warnings have come out. We got another one today around 12:30. There's only one, though, that has standed out-- stood out to me in the last month.

On October 2nd, during the Indiana football game inside Beaver Stadium, an individual reported being inappropriately touched by three unknown males. During this game, there was over 105,000 people. Just to put that in perspective, that's basically Penn State enrollment at all campuses.

And in this stadium with over 105,000 people, three men felt comfortable touching and violating this individual. Since this incident, I do not feel safe on campus anymore and I'm sure individual doesn't, either. Frankly, Penn State has a sexual assault issue. Penn State has not created an environment where sexual assault is being prevented and discouraged.

We can do better. Students should not be the ones protecting each other. I understand this is a hard issue. It's not something that's fixed in a day, in a month, it takes years. But not enough is being done and I don't feel safe and neither do my friends.

So, in addition to what's already being done, what can the administration do to prevent sexual assault on campus and to protect its students better?

President Barron: Yeah, so that's a list, I think, that-- many things which we work to implement. But there's no doubt, especially during a red zone period of time, that there are issues on student campuses.

And it's a national issue among universities. Personally, the notion that that's happening in a stadium is disgusting.

We've had groups of people, including large number of students, working on this problem and coming up with suggestions on how it is-- and then we can fix it. Unfortunately, if you have 100,000 people, you've got creeps that are there. And if you have good suggestions about the next things that we should do, please tell us. It's been a persistent and challenging problem in universities, particularly at the beginning of the year.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Megan. Ray, I see your hand is raised?

Ray Najjar, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Yes, I want to ask about--

Chair Szczygiel: Could you identify yourself and your--

Ray Najjar: Yeah, Ray Najjar, Earth and Mineral Sciences. Hi, Eric, I want to ask you about football games and COVID policies at football games. There was an article that ran in ESPN about a month ago called your COVID game plan our stadium safe. And they interviewed seven epidemiologists or seven public health experts.

Ask them, is it safe to go to a packed stadium even if you were vaccinated? Six out of seven of the experts asked. Spoke to for big football states were adamant in their response, no way, not now. I'm a diehard sports fan, said Jason Salemi, an Associate Professor of Epidemiology at University of South Florida in Tampa, but I would not go to these events right now.

A packed football stadium now is not a good idea, said Dr. Olveen Carrasquillo, a Professor of Medicine and Public Health Sciences at the University of Miami's Medical School. When there's a lot of shouting and yelling without masks, it means they're spraying the virus.

I mean, as you can tell, I mean, I think it's absolutely ridiculous that we have this policy of having pretty much no restrictions at our football games. One hundred thousand people packed together. They're not always outside. As they're entering the stadium, they're in this throng packed together.

And I just don't understand when you and the rest of the administration constantly repeat that the health and safety of the faculty, students, staff, and community is your top priority. You would not even do something as small as require masks at a football game or require some evidence of vaccination or a negative COVID test. It just makes no sense to me and I'm trying to understand what's going on there.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Ray. And I will give President Barron a chance to respond just to everyone else. We are trying to keep this conversation in this meeting on time. So, this will be the last question for Dr. Barron. And then, you need to move on.

President Barron: Yeah, thanks.

We know that this is a challenge to implement or to enforce something like masking in a stadium of 100,000 people. I can't imagine who would be the ones that would wander around for anybody having a mask. But the simple fact of the matter is that we've had a lot of contingency plans in this space. And we've been watching very carefully.

First two weeks of football before we had our first home game was the opportunity to look. And for one reason or another, and maybe it's multiple reasons, we cannot see the impact of a football game on our testing or hospitalizations in State College. It is not--

Ray Najjar: It's not just State College. People are coming from all over the state.

President Barron: I agree.

Ray Najjar: Come on, it's not common sense.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you, Ray. We understand your concern.

President Barron: I'm just saying if-- they do come from all over the place. And it's a personal choice. So, I guess I would say if you don't want to do that, you shouldn't do it. And I'm sure, Ray, that you're not doing it. But the simple fact of the matter is a substantial number of those people are local and we're not seeing it.

Ray Najjar: Cases were high the county. They're very high in the county.

President Barron: Ray, let me just finish, OK? I go to the hospital systems and say, do you see our football game? Well, people ask me that all the time, we cannot see it. I look at the testing for the students. You cannot see it.

And probably this is occurring because, to some large extent, a herd immunity has emerged. I'm just talking about the facts. We simply do not see the impact. And maybe it's because it's outside and we have masking inside. We simply do not see the impact of the stadium on COVID numbers. We don't.

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you very much, Dr. Barron, for answering some questions. Thank you all for your participation. We do have to move on. Next, it's my pleasure to recognize Provost Jones. Provost Jones, the floor is yours for comments.

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: Thanks very much, Bonj. I'll try to keep my remarks fairly brief so that there's plenty of time for questions and fill some of the gaps that Eric left. So first on COVID, I-- I'm sure most of you are keeping an eye on the dashboard. I don't have time to talk about all of the campuses. I'll just focus on University Park. New data up to date. Positivity rate for students at 0.2%. Vaccination rate for students in aggregate both residential and non-residential at University Park is at 88.3%.

Faculty and administrators in the very high 90s. Our non-union staff at 85%. So that's where we are in terms of vaccination rate. We're seeing, as I said, very low cases. The hospitalizations at Mount Nittany remain stubbornly in the 30s and have been there for several weeks. We don't, obviously, have access to all of the details of the demographics. But our understanding is that the majority of the admissions to Mount Nittany are people who are coming from surrounding communities, not from the direct State College borough and the five surrounding townships. So that they are a service facility for the broader region.

Let me jump, though, quickly. Eric mentioned the mandate and I just want to follow up on that. President Biden did, indeed, issue an executive order several weeks ago that indicated that federal contractors would need to be required to impose a mandate with appropriate religious or medical exemptions. But you couldn't test out of the mandate. So basically, you got an exemption, or you need to be vaccinated or you don't work for said federal contractor.

And the language was broad, indicating that it wasn't just people who were working on federal contracts, but any people with whom they might interact. And we had a responsibility to be able to demonstrate that said federal contractors were not interacting with people if we were not going to impose a-- the mandate broadly.

We did an assessment of the contract starting at University Park, obviously. That's where the majority of our research is done. We have a large number of contracts that the practical logistics of being able to identify buildings or individuals who were directly or indirectly involved with the contracts or the people with whom they would interact became an impossibility.

So, we made the decision that we would impose the mandate at the University Park campus. Today, we are announcing that because of contract, or anticipated contract exposure, six other campuses will also be subjected to vaccine mandates. These are Brandywine, Altoona, DuBois, Harrisburg, Erie, and Fayette. So, we'll have an announcement. If it's not out already, it'll be coming out soon identifying those six campuses as additional locations where mandates will apply.

There's a lot of work to be done between now and December 8, which is the deadline, particularly, if you start counting back to two weeks post final vaccine shots. Factor that back from December 8 for both Moderna and Pfizer and you get to practically next week. So, we need to get people moving.

The good news is with the vaccine numbers that I reported a few moments ago, we've done a lot of the heavy lifting already. And so, now, we're focused on the last few thousand employees. This applies to employees - not to students, but to employees, including student employees.

So, our focus is on that last several thousand are people who need to be vaccinated and doing everything that we can do to get them through the process and over the finish line by December 8. So again, a lot of work out. We have a team led by Lindsey Droves that is identifying all of the things that need to be done to make sure that this happens and happens smoothly.

And we need to make sure that everybody has their vaccine information uploaded, that it's verified, that it is auditable, and so on and so forth. So much to be done in the next six weeks.

The work exceptions process was re-opened a couple of days ago by Kathy Bieschke's office. There are a couple of ways to get into that. Obviously, if you had an exception before, you can ask for that exception to be extended into the spring semester. But we've also opened it for people who, for whatever reason, find themselves wanting to request an exception for the spring when they didn't for this fall. So, we're taking requests from both groups.

Let me just-- had a couple of other things. Budget. We have a tough couple of budget years ahead driven by a number of factors. Obviously, COVID took a-- had a financial hit on the institution. We were approved this year, as I think you all know, for a modest 2.5% tuition increase. That enabled us to do a general salary increase retroactive to July 1, which you should have all received in your paychecks at the end of September. Don't think that it's going to be that big for the remaining months of the year.

We had warned all of our budget executives that we may need to impose a 1% rescission mid-year, depending on how our budget numbers looked. We have not removed that guidance at this point. That may still be something that we need to do. The tuition increase certainly helped bring in some additional revenue, but it is a pretty tough budget year. And as I said, the years ahead are going to be a bit of a challenge as well as the negative bubble of COVID works its way through the system.

One thing that is helping is, I think, as many of you may be aware, we did transition the budgeting system this year from really what was a year-to-year incremental budget approach to a five year more strategic budgeting model for all of our units. And so being able to take that long view and be more strategic about resource allocation planning has really been very helpful and will help us get through this tricky period.

You heard from the Board Chair about enrollment data. I think that has been broadly distributed. Census date was October 2nd. We are slightly down, again, most likely driven by COVID. Up a little bit at University Park, down at the campuses. But down overall by just a few hundred students compared to many of our peers or sister institutions. And by sister, I mean PASSHE. We've actually done quite well to hold on to the students that we've held onto to. And kudos to everyone for really working very hard to make that happen.

Two other things I've mentioned are related to COVID. We did receive funding from the federal government through the HEERF program, the Higher Education Emergency Relief Funds. When the dust settles, we will have received about $290 million from the federal government. It came in three tranches. In the first tranche of $55 million, half went to direct student support. The other half to institutional support.

And the second tranche, another $27.5 million went to direct student support and $57 million to institutional support. And in the last tranche, about $76 million went to direct student support and $73 million for institutional support. And in all cases, the institutional support was to offset lost revenue, in particular, on the E and G side of the budget that's lost tuition revenue as a result of COVID impacts.

This has been very helpful. It certainly doesn't fill the complete gap that COVID created budgetarily for the institution. And then, finally, I'll just mention SIMBA. We are one and one-third years into SIMBA implementation now. I think you all know, many of you on the call have been through multiple enterprise system implementations. You know that it takes more than a year for the dust to settle.

And with SIMBA, there was a lot of dust. We warned everybody going into December that it was going to touch every last corner of the institution. And we fulfilled that commitment. And it did touch every corner of the institution. And in some areas, particularly, I know in research accounting, there were a lot of challenges and we've been-- the team has been working very hard over the past months to address those issues.

We've hired additional people, brought in-- made short-term appointments to get through some of the backlog and we are beginning to emerge from some of the challenges we've had there. We're not done. We've got more work to do. Now that we're fully one year into December and into the second full year of management using this new system, there's a few other bugs that have emerged with the one-year anniversary. But we're working through those as well. And hopefully, those two will soon be behind us.

 So, we appreciate everybody's patience as we work through all of those.

So Bonj, let me stop there and I'm happy to take as many questions as you can spare.

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, and I see three hands are raised. And I would ideally like to keep it to that. So that, again, we can get back to some business. So, Ira, please identify yourself.

Ira Saltz, Penn State Shenango: Yes, Saltz. You mentioned that the workplace exemption process is open again. And was wondering if consideration would be given to faculty who have had an antibody test and found out that they had very low antibody levels.

Provost Jones: We're using the same criteria for workplace exceptions as we did last semester, Ira.

Ira Saltz: Right, and that was not on it. But would you consider that as a potential legitimate reason for wanting an exception?

Provost Jones: I do not think that we would consider that to be a reason for an exception. Kathy, can you confirm that?

Kathleen Bieschke, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs: We are consulting with a team of physicians at Hershey, Ira. So, if that were the case, someone should submit that. We can consult as needed. It doesn't fit neatly into our criteria. But we know that, in some cases, that is the case, particularly for people who have an autoimmune disorder. So, we'd have to take a look at it.

Provost Jones: So, it's not a general criterion, Ira, but in individual cases, certainly, with appropriate consultation it can be considered.

Kathleen Bieschke: Right, this year, this time around, we do have some medical professionals that we'll consult with for the cases that kind of fall outside the stated criteria.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Thank you, Ira. Victor. Name?

Victor Brunsden: Altoona. And so, my question is about the OSVPCC, which I hadn't heard anything about so far today. And specifically, it is about the reporting structure for the OSVPCC. Since the current surge it potentially could split what had been one position into a chancellor and a-- as one position and a Dean of the University College as a second.

Should that happen, what is the reporting line for the deans of the standalone colleges like Abington, Altoona, Berks, et cetera, and the University College? Should that position be bifurcated?

Provost Jones: Well, it actually could potentially split into three, Victor, because Madlyn also served as Dean of Great Valley.

Victor Brunsden: She did, yes.

Provost Jones: So just for everybody's edification, the reason we conducted the search not necessarily requiring candidates to have the qualifications to be the Dean of University College and/or Great Valley was so that we could cast a broader net. This was how the position had been structured previously when Madlyn Hanes took the position.

She also had the qualifications to serve in both of those roles. So, she had-- she ended up having all three. We are optimistic that we will get a mix of candidates for the search. Some will have qualifications to potentially serve in three, two, or just one of the roles. If it turns out that the person selected as Executive Chancellor and Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses does not have the qualifications to be dean of one or both of the entities, University College or Great Valley, we will do searches for both positions.

Those individuals would then report as the deans of the existing standalone colleges report, which means as-- in their capacities as dean, they basically report through the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses to me as the Provost.

Victor Brunsden: So even though such a person wouldn't be qualified to be part of the academic part, prior to Madlyn Hanes becoming the-- getting this position, the deans of these colleges had a split reporting line. When it concerned the sort of operations, yes, they reported to the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses. But on academic matters, they reported to the Provost.

Provost Jones: Right, that's what I said. They would report through the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses.

Victor Brunsden: They did not report through on matters—on—so, I'm sorry, Nick, but that was not what I was asking. They did not report on matters academic through the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses.

Provost Jones: I guess it depends how you use the word through, Victor. But basically, what you're saying is the same thing that I was trying to convey. So, there is a reporting line to the Provost. When Madlyn was in the role, because of her qualifications, she was able to manage a lot of the day-to-day academic functions as well.

But clearly, if the person in that position does not academically, the deans will revert to-- all the deans will revert to reporting to the Provost. And I say through because it's a partnership, right? It is a partnership. But for academic purposes, the reporting line will be to the Provost. It's not a question.

Victor Brunsden: So, for-- in matters academic, they would report directly to you?

Provost Jones: Well, they would report-- well, that's why I used the language report to me through the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses because it is a partnership. And many such partnerships exist now where there are dual or complex reporting lines.

Victor Brunsden: So, we would hire somebody not qualified to be in an academic reporting line and have deans report to this person and, subsequently, to you.

Provost Jones: No, it would be that, as I think you indicated, that for-- because the-- so the Dean of Altoona College, for example, is also the Budget Executive for Altoona College. So in currently her capacity as Budget Executive for Altoona College, Laurie-- let's assume that this person was in the role and did not have the academic qualifications. Laurie would report to that individual as the budget executive and report to me as the Dean.

Victor Brunsden: Thank you. That's what I was asking.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Victor. Moving on, Frank, you have your hand raised. I hope it's a-- is it the same question or is it something different? And this will be the last one.

Frantisek Marko, Penn State Hazleton: It is a different question. Frank Marco, Hazleton. I would like to share with the Provost some concern and a question about persistent data related to the inequity of the resources for COVID on campuses. We are all aware that the vaccination rates of students, faculty, and staff on campuses are much lower at outside the University Park.

There is a number of available resources that can be better distributed across the University campuses. University Park has more personnel. Rapid testing, vaccine clinic, and higher vaccination rates in the student population. And yet, at this moment, the number of tests performed is kind of declining. So, I would assume that there are some additional resources that can be better utilized on campuses with lower vaccination rates. And those that they lack rapid testing option.

Now, the question, what kind of assurances can you give us that these resources will be available, and we have equal access among all Penn State campuses. Thank you, Provost Jones.

Provost Jones: Yes, well, equal access is something that is difficult to guarantee or assure, Frank, I think, as you know. But our effort-- our focus always is on providing reasonable and equitable access. Now, I mean, I know that there will be many of you who disagree with that, but that has always been our goal.

Earlier in the semester, we, indeed, were concerned when the issue was raised about the effectiveness of some of our-- and rapidity of processing of test results at some campus locations. We made some adjustments and moved additional resources to the campus to try to address them.

And since we did that, we've seen some improvements. And we're going to continue to monitor-- focus the needs and make sure that the resources are available at all campus locations to support our faculty, staff, and students at those locations.

Frantisek Marko: Thank you. I would like to point out that when you reviewed the COVID dashboard data, you focused on University Park, which has the best outcomes. And there are campuses that are really significantly suffering with lower vaccination rates. There is no rapid testing available. So, we should really worry about the Commonwealth Campuses.

Early at the beginning of the meeting, we heard presentation about the importance of Commonwealth Campuses. So, let's just validate that talk with some actions.

Provost Jones: We are working-- we continue to work very hard at the Commonwealth Campuses. We consult with the chancellors and the people on the ground at those locations and are willing to provide additional resources as needed. At the end of the day, the test-- I mean, we know that the vaccination rates are lower at campus locations. In most cases, they are better, if not considerably better, than the vaccination rate in the surrounding communities.

And we do have a required testing program to back that up as well. So, compliance at the campuses, the number is actually quite good. I think compliance at University Park, which is either being vaccinated or participating in weekly testing, is around 90%, I believe. And at the campuses, compliance, the combination of vaccination rate or being vaccinated or participating in weekly testing, I think the number I heard this morning is at 82%.

So that is-- that's a very positive number and we've made great progress with that number over the course of the semester.

Chair Szczygiel: Now, can I just jump in here? Because this is just an ongoing problem. It's the reporting issues still are continuing. Problems with campus numbers. And are you suggesting that the initiative for a more robust campaign of education and encouragement needs to come out of the campuses themselves, from the chancellors? Or are those initiatives driven by people at University Park?

Provost Jones: They are supported by the Coronavirus Operations Control Center Team. But we defer to the boots on the ground knowledge and understanding of the local campus environments that comes from our chancellors. So, we need-- we realize that our campus locations-- I mean, that's not the same as University Park. They're completely different environments. And it is the chancellors and the faculty and staff at the campuses who best understand the needs and the uniqueness of the campus location.

So, we defer to their judgment and support the requests that we receive from them. So, all decisions and all actions that are taken on campus are made in full consultation with the campus communities.

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you for that information. And thank you, Provost Jones, for standing for questions. Let us now move on to item G, which is a treat for us because we haven't had one of these in a while, Forensic Business. We actually do have some Forensic Business. Let me explain what is about to happen.

A Forensic, as some of you may remember, is an opportunity. It's a forum for exchange of ideas. It's an opportunity for traditionally committees to bring questions, concerns to the Faculty Senate as a whole and engage in active dialogue. This is slightly different. This is a session that is in preparation of an upcoming Forensic session.

Who are we? **A study on the fundamental understanding of the purpose, values, and aspirations of the University Faculty Senate – Appendix H**

Chair Szczygiel: And once they get going, you'll understand. It is a session that was requested pre-Forensic. It's preparatory from the Senate Self-Study Committee entitled, "*Who are we? A study on the fundamental understanding of the purpose, values, and aspirations of the University Faculty Senate.*" It can be found in Appendix H of your Agenda.

And speaking, I am told, the two presenters for this session will be Michele Duffey and Julio Palma, who are both members of the Senate Self-Study. And they will present the pre-Forensic session.

Julio Palma, Penn State Fayette: Thank you. I'm going to share my screen. Well, yes, this is-- thank you, Bonj, and thank you everyone. And I hope I can get your attention. Yes, this is a little bit of a different directions right now in this plenary meeting. But I want to take this time-- we want to take this time as committee to present some of the work that we have been doing during the last year.

And also, again, this is a Forensic meeting, but it's also an invitation. And this is about us, the University Faculty Senate, who we represent, and basically, who we are and what are our aspirations. The members of the committee are here-- we try to represent different units. We represent the University Park. We have members of the University College. We have members of the bigger campuses in the Commonwealth Campuses.

And also, we have different experiences. We have members with a couple of decades in the Senate. We have members that have four to eight years in the Senate. And we have members that are really new to the Senate. So, we want to have that input from the committee members.

So, what is this? What is this Self-Study Committee? This is not new. This has happened once in a while. Roughly, once every 10 years where there has been a Self-Study Committee that focuses on a specific issue. In the past, for example, they have focused on the efficiency of the committee. And a couple of years ago-- actually, last year, sorry.

The Chair, Beth Seymour, then Chair of the Faculty Senate, charges with these two main questions. What are the main missions and functions of the University Faculty Senate? How well do our structures and procedures fulfill those mandates? And what she ambition was a more holistic study of basically who we are, our structures, our functions, and our aspirations.

This is the process we have done. We have held listening sessions with very specific groups representing leadership positions from past Chairs of the Faculty Senate to the Chairs of the committees to administrators. We have meetings with the President. We have meetings with the administration representing the Commonwealth Campuses like Madlyn Hanes and the intern Kelly Austin.

And we asked these three main questions, who are we? What are current strengths and challenges of the University Faculty Senate? What do we believe are our major functions to be? But in these conversations, there was one new question that we ask, which is, who could we be that we are not as a Faculty Senate?

During these listening sessions, there were three very specific challenges. I think these challenges have been highlighted. They have been, sometimes, very important. They have been highlighted during these times-- during the COVID times. And just as a parenthesis, this committee was not charged because of COVID. This was before. But actually, it's a little bit about perfect timing.

Because the pandemic highlighted some specific challenges. And those challenges are governance, what is faculty governance, and what efficiency in our procedures, in our methods, in our committees, and transparency. Transparency in the processes. But with these challenges also come opportunities. And we have these three emerging themes, what we call the three C's.

To work in those challenges we need better communication, collaboration, and clarity. And basically, what we attempt to study and to get at some point to the optimal balance. That sweet spot where we are efficient, and we can communicate with-- collaborate within communities and with clarity.

And then, I go back to that question of, who are we? What is the University Faculty Senate? And something that one of our members in the committee highlighted is, there is no other body in the University system that touches every single corner, that touches every single department, college, campus. That is the University Faculty Senate. We are the connecting tissue.

We are the connecting tissue and we, Self-Study Committee, we ask you to embrace that. To embrace that connective tissue concept. We represent faculty of all the units of all the campuses of all the colleges and departments. We have to own our faculty governance. We are in charge of the curriculum. We are in charge of the curriculum, and we have the right and we have the responsibility to protect that curriculum.

And we also have the power of educational integrity. And again, this comes with more questions. I'm saturating you with a bunch of questions but-- because I want you to-- we want you to think about who we represent. And we ask you, what is your governance? Shared governance can mean different things for different people.

Do we really have authentic consultation? And do we need new paths? And we ask you if we need new paths because we ask you and we want you to reimagine what we want of the Faculty Senate. We want you to rethink our structures. Why? Because same process, same results. So, we ask you to reimagine, rethink our purpose, our aspirations, and basically to question and challenge the status quo.

Because if we keep doing the same thing and we keep studying efficiency, maybe we don't get anywhere. Maybe we need to restructure and rethink what we are doing. OK, so I am not just here-- we are not just here presenting you-- we had listening sessions. That's great, right? We listen to people.

We are actually doing already some work. And this work is in progress. And working in that communication, collaboration, and clarity, we started the communications liaisons. And we also have a Non-Election Subcommittee. We're working in the General Election Subcommittee. So, believe it or not, the University Faculty Senate does not have a whole power and control of their election system.

And we are starting to change some procedures. Even this morning, we have a conversation of changing the rules, for example. And maybe, if you have been in committees where you have been part of these conversations, it's because we are in collaboration with the Self-Study Committee and this specific committee is taking the action on this thing.

And what you may hear from us in the future? Well, you're going to have a full report coming from us with very specific recommendations. It's not going to be just an academic exercise. We want to put the specific recommendations to work in that communication, collaboration, and clarity. And in addition to the full report, we're going to have a shared governance report.

Michele Duffey, College of Health and Human Development: This brings us to the Forensic portion and that invitation that Julio referred to just a little bit earlier. In reality, today is a pre-Forensic. We are not going to have a typical session because maybe doing things differently-- having a different process will have a different result. So instead, we're giving you homework. Because 10 or 15 minutes really isn't enough time to gain that genuine really thorough feedback that we're looking for.

So, we ask you over the next few weeks if each of you can think about Senate, think about that communication, collaboration, and clarity, and how connected we are to each other and to those specific pieces. For instance, how can we bring this discussion into our committees and then to the broader community? Or if we're thinking about relationships, what is the relationship between the University Faculty Senate and the administration, or what are the relationships?

If we're truly moving to become a very inclusive Senate, we're talking about inclusivity a lot more. How can we simplify what we're doing and how we do it to be more accessible and more inclusive to all? And when we think about all of that together, you might even ponder, how are we doing as that connective tissue? Do we have strengths and weaknesses in that tissue that maybe can be improved?

So, what we would like to do today is extend an invitation to you for a listening session that we're going to hold on Tuesday, November 2nd at 6:30 PM. We fully recognize that this is Election Day, and we hope you can plan both to carry out your civic duty but also to join us. And we'll send more information about this session, including the Zoom information, through the Senate Office in the next several days. So, who are we, and what should we do differently?

Question number one to think about. We've heard from many of you already, but we haven't heard from everyone. If you've been around Senate for a long time or if today is your very first day as a Senator, congratulations. We want to hear from you, and we are equally interested in what you have to say.

If you want to share with us what you think Senate does really well, we want your input. If you have suggestions and ideas to share to help us understand what we can improve, we want your input. We want to hear from every corner of the Senate. And to be very clear, you, every one of you, has an equal and important voice and that is regardless of rank or status or campus or unit or background. We want to listen to you.

So, who are we and where are we going? Perhaps we should be aspiring to answer a different question, and who could we be that we are not? The Self-Study Committee is grateful for your time today. Grateful for your willingness to listen. And on November 2nd, we will be the ones doing the listening. Thank you. And thank you, Bonj, for the floor.

Chair Szczygiel: Great, I appreciate both Michele and Julio for joining us and giving us this brief presentation. This little prequel to a Forensic, or forum, or whatever the heck we want to call it, on November 2nd. So, we appreciate that. Thank you very much. Moving on.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Szczygiel: We next go on our Agenda to Unfinished Business. This is the section of the Agenda where you can actually do something. And I would really encourage everyone to stand up and stretch at this point in time. But we're going to begin the voting process to approve legislation. In addition to standing and stretching, please take this time to log into TallySpace and we are going to put up the voting instructions very soon. If we could in-- there it is. Thank you, Josh.

And please take this time-- yes, to then just log into TallySpace. And first, we simply do a present vote, which will help-- simply help the Senate staff with attendance and to make sure that everyone has access to the software-- to the voting software. And it has up to the present vote image.

Anna Butler, Senate Office Staff: I do have the vote up. There are many people voting.

Chair Szczygiel: Great. Select A to record you're present at today's meeting, then click "Save My Vote." And we'll give you a few minutes to do that. A few seconds to do that before we move on to our Unfinished Business.

Anna Butler: That's a vote that I can keep up while you move on, Bonj, if you would like.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. And again, Anna, if they have-- if they encounter problems, would they contact you, Anna, or should they contact Kadi?

Anna Butler: They would contact me. But I would suggest if you have problems, refresh your page first or go to "Home."

Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article II – Senate Council, Section 1(c), Addition of the Category of Positional Reports - Appendix B
(Introduced at the September 14, 2021, Senate Meeting)

Chair Szczygiel: OK. All right, everyone. Thanks. Let's keep working on that. In the meantime, our Unfinished Business is in the form of a report from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules titled, "Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article II – Senate Council, Section 1(c), Addition of the Category of Positional Reports." This can also be found in Appendix B.

Changes to the Bylaws must be presented at one meeting and voted on at the following. This report was introduced as a change to the Bylaws at the September 14, 2021, Senate meeting. Chair of CC&R, Annie Taylor, will answer any questions before we vote. So, if anyone has any questions, please use the "Raise Hand" option.

Annie, did you want to do any sort of refresher?

Ann Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Sure. It's really quite simple, but I think this will be powerful and you'll remember this, I hope, from last time. That at this point, the only way we are able to make a formal position on the issue of importance is as a resolution. And those are raised by individual senators. But we don't have a formal report for-- that can pose a resolution on behalf of the entire Senate.

It might seem like not a big of a difference, but it is an important one we'd really like to formalize this way for the Senate to be able to assert its wishes-- a formal resolution. So, from one of our standing committees. So, this simply would add a new report type in addition to Legislative, Advisory and Consultative, Forensic - which we just experienced - and Informational Reports. We would now also have the opportunity to have Positional Reports.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Annie. And thank you, Judy, for putting in the TallySpace link again. Any questions for Annie Taylor on this report? I am seeing none. So, it looks like it is now time to vote. And could we please start the poll for this item.

Anna Butler: Poll is started.

Chair Szczygiel: Senators, you may cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B. Thank you, Annie.

In the interest of time, we will wait until the end of this meeting to see the results of our votes. And are we having indication that things are going all right?

Anna Butler: Yes.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article II – Senate Council, Section 1(e) and Standing Rules, Article IV – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(a) Committee on Committees and Rules – Appendix C

Chair Szczygiel: All right, so let's move on to item I, legislative reports. Our first Legislative Report is also from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules. It is titled, "Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article II – Senate Council, Section 1(e)," —got a lot of these titles— "and Standing Rules, Article IV –

Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(a) Committee on Committees and Rules," and is in the Appendix C.

It's a proposal to move the oversight of the Unit Constitution Subcommittee to the Committee on Committee and Roles. These legislative reports are brought to the floor by committee, and they need no second. Chair, Annie Taylor, again, will present this report.

Ann Taylor: Thank you, Bonj. I think we did-- I will let you correct me. I think we might have introduced-- this as a weird one. It's both the Bylaws change, which has to be introduced in one meeting, and then voted on in the next.

Chair Szczygiel: Correct.

Ann Taylor: And it's also a standing rule change, which would be vote-- is able to be voted on in the same meeting that it is presented.

Chair Szczygiel: Correct. It is listed under legislative because of its bifurcated nature. We just kept it there. But there will be no vote on it today. You're right. You're correct, Annie.

Ann Taylor: Thank you. So, I think we've talked about this before, though, I may just be having a little déjà vu. But the idea here is that the Unit Constitution Subcommittee is a body that's chaired by the Senate Secretary and reviews every academic unit's own governance organization. So, a college like mine, for example, Earth and Mineral Sciences, has its own Constitution Bylaws and Standing Rules.

If we want to make a change to those or something of that nature, we then-- we submit that to the Unit Constitution Subcommittee for their review. And then, ultimate voting by Senate Council for approval. That subcommittee has-- right now falls under the Senate Council.

Yet, the work of the subcommittee falls very closely with that of CC&R. CC&R, as you all know, because you have to hear from me all the time, we are responsible for any work that is done on the Constitution and Bylaws of the Senate or the Standing Rules. Those changes all come through CC&R.

So, we are-- we've become quite expert on this, more so than most people that don't have to deal with these kinds of legalese documents as we do. And the Secretary of the Faculty Senate and the union constitute-- excuse me, Unit Constitution Subcommittee is a member of CC&R.

So, we are proposing that the Unit Constitution Subcommittee be moved from the Senate Council to CC&R, but that Senate Council still retain that final check and balance. It just formalizes what is already happening de facto, which is that the Unit Constitution Subcommittee works very closely with CC&R.

We would continue to do that. It would become one of our formal subcommittees. But all unit Constitutions would-- and Bylaws and standards would still ultimately need to be presented and voted on by Senate Council for approval. To make this all happen, we need two changes, one to the Bylaws and one to the Standing Rules.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Annie. Any questions to the Chair of CC&R on this report? Please raise your virtual hand.

Ann Taylor: I'm going to raise my virtual hand, Bonj. Beth Seymour has reached out to me. And thank you, Beth, so much. I knew I was having déjà vu. We did present this at the last of the spring meeting-- the last two of the spring Senate meetings. And the Bylaws portion was-- it was approved.

The problem-- this is just going to make people's head spin-- the problem is that the second part that you see before you today, the Standing Rules, read Bylaws. But it wasn't a change. That second recommendation was a change to Standing Rules. Everything is the exact same, we just had to make that correction.

And we didn't feel comfortable-- now Beth's reminding me-- we didn't feel comfortable kind of sweeping that under the rug. We wanted to make sure that everyone on Senate understands that you are all-- that you have already and now are also approving that change to the Standing Rules. The two go hand in hand. The first recommendation, the change to the Bylaws, was already approved by Faculty Senate in the spring.

So really, what we are looking at today is making sure that Faculty Senate approves the Standing Rules portion of this legislation. And Bonj, I'm going to let you tell me if we need to have another formal vote or, as I said, we did vote on both recommendations last time. It's just the second recommendation read incorrectly that it was to Bylaws not to Standing Rules.

Chair Szczygiel: Actually, my greater concern, and if our Parliamentarian could weigh in on this, whether-- since this was presented at the last composition of the Faculty Senate, whether--

Ann Taylor: The last two. I believe it was presented in March and then voted on in April.

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, I was just referencing the membership of the previous Senate year. What is our responsibility now, or are we able to go-- move it forward?

Keith Shapiro, Parliamentarian: So, I understand that you're saying that we voted on this before verbatim?

Ann Taylor: Well, now--

Keith Shapiro: OK, so it looks to me like there's some confusion over this at this point. And because of the confusion, it is my recommendation that it's better to err on the side of caution and have another vote just to make sure everybody's on the same page and there's no confusion over what we're doing.

Ann Taylor: Keith, I love that. That is exactly what I was about to say. I think we are best to just go back to plan A, Bonj.

Ann Taylor: Today. We will vote at next-- the next meeting.

Chair Szczygiel: Absolutely. So, back to seeking any questions or a need for clarification by anyone.

Ann Taylor: And my apologies for all the confusion. This one made my head spin.

Chair Szczygiel: I know, that's fine. Seeing none, this, again, will be-- it was presented today. It will come back to us and be voted upon at our November Senate meeting. Thank you, Annie and Keith.

Revisions to Senate Standing Rules, Article I – Rules of Procedure, Section 2, Addition of the Category of Positional Reports – Appendix D

Chair Szczygiel: Appreciate it. Moving on. Next, we have a report from the Senate Committee on Committee and Rules and the Senate Self-Study Committee, titled, "Revisions to Senate Standing Rules,

Article I – Rules of Procedure, Section 2, Addition of the Category of Positional Reports," and can be seen in Appendix D.

Keith. Chair Keith Shapiro will present the report.

Keith Shapiro: These the idea of presenting this Positional Report really comes down to pretty much what Annie described as before. But I would like to also add that we are-- in the past, we did have something called resolutions that often started with language that said whereas and went on to say be it resolved.

That language is-- it may be suitable for a situation where individuals are giving honors to other individuals. However, I would say that it's probably not necessarily reasonable to do that when the Senate is attempting to give a position-- a serious position on a topic.

The idea of a Positional Report is that we present a position, but it's not binding upon our administration to respond to it. And it creates no changes in policies or procedures. But it does have some element of influence involved in it. It's different than our other kinds of reports that go along with it.

Also, I think it's important to understand that once we vote on a report, and it goes to the Senate Office, they have to know what to do with it. So, for our legislative reports, they're changing-- they know that's going to be a change in policy and they follow the procedures. For Advisory/Consultative Reports, we understand that they're going to have to go to the president for review. And for Positional Reports, we simply put it into our record.

And so, it clarifies for them exactly what the position-- what we're doing with the report and what its process should be after it leaves the Senate. Pretty much, that's it. We've been doing this for quite a while. And we've had several of them come through the floor-- to the floor already and pass. So, we do have some precedent on it.

I would suggest that it's pretty simple and that it clarifies what that process means when we attempt to add maybe nimbleness to our ability to give an opinion-- a consensus opinion from the Faculty Senate.

Ann Taylor: Keith, if I may.

Keith Shapiro: Please do, Annie.

Ann Taylor: So, we just voted to add Positional Reports to our arsenal. So, what this does-- just in a nutshell, what this does is simply add it to the order of business as you're seeing on the screen. So, we already-- you already said you wanted Positional Reports, everyone. So now, this just puts it in an order.

I do want to point out that if you are having deja vu, you did see this last month, but we withdrew it at the last minute. But at that time-- because we realized we wanted it presented on the same day that the Bylaws change was presented, which is what happened today.

But we did have a comment from Nathan Tallman from the University Libraries. We had had language in this about updating-- while we were at it, updating Robert's Rules Reference so that it would refer to a-- the current edition.

You'll notice-- and I wanted to point this out to anybody who was remembering that we did take-- it was at the end of this these three paragraphs you're looking at now and we removed it. So that's no longer muddying up this legislation. This is just legislation to add the Positional Reports to our Agenda.

Keith Shapiro: And Annie, if I could follow up on that, the Self-Study Committee and CC&R will most likely have a report on-- a more detailed and thorough report on what we should do with those rules regarding Robert's Rules. Because there are other systems that are maybe easier for us to use, have better educational resources, more understandable to people, especially new senators, and our Justice Theroux. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you both for that very thorough explanation. Do we have any questions, comments, concerns? Just raise your virtual hands. It looks like you've convinced everyone to their satisfaction. All right, so I think it is now time to vote. Anna, please start the poll.

Anna Butler: Poll is started.

Chair Szczygiel: Senators, you may cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

And Anna, when you see a good flow, just let me know and we can move on.

Anna Butler: Yes, Bonj, we have many votes coming in.

Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(j) Committee on Intra-University Relations – Appendix E

Chair Szczygiel: OK, we have flow. Thank you, Keith and Annie, very much again. Our last legislative report is from the Senate Committee on Committee and Rules and the Inter-University Relations Committee. The report is titled, "Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(j) Committee on Intra-University Relations." It can be seen in Appendix E.

Chair Annie Taylor will present this report.

Ann Taylor: Sorry. So, you are hopefully getting used to the idea that we are really trying to make sure as a Senate that diversity, equity, inclusion are officially forefront in our work. And this is being done by every committee by proposing changes to their Standing Rules. Some committees may be adding general statements of support and importance. Others may be actually officially adding resource persons to their committee while still others may be adding elements to mandated reports that will help us be sure that we are accountable for diversity, equity, and inclusion.

So this particular report is about University Intra-University Relations Standing Rules. It illustrates how they have chosen to have that kind of enforcement-- that effort in their own Standing Rules. And you'll see in their case, it's both added a statement to their duties, but it's also added a resource representative to-- or excuse, me representative to their body.

They also have added a element to their mandated reports to include data that is disaggregated by gender identity, race, ethnicity, and other categories of concern. So, they've hit it in all three areas. And they would like your approval.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Annie. Questions or concerns, anyone? Please raise your virtual hands.

Got a winning streak here, Annie, so far. Just giving it a bit of pause. All right, it's now time to vote. Anna, start the poll.

Senators, you may know cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

Anna Butler: The poll is now up.

Chair Szczygiel: And we have activity?

Anna Butler: We definitely do.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Thank you, Annie. You've gotten a workout today. There's no need to take that run this evening. Just stay in.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Revision of AC80 – "Outside Business Activities and Private Consulting" – Appendix F
REPORT REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE

Chair Szczygiel: We go on to item J, Advisory and Consultative Reports. We have one Advisory and Consultative Report from the Senate Committees on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity and faculty affairs titled, "Revision of AC80 – 'Outside Business Activities and Private Consulting.'" It can be found in Appendix F.

This report is brought to the floor by committee. Needs no second. Committee Chair Roger Egolf will present the report. Roger, the floor is yours.

Roger Egolf, Penn State Lehigh Valley: OK, can everyone hear me?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, we can.

Roger Egolf: OK, this report has come about because there are federal-- new federal guidelines requiring many new rules that are coming forward. And over the summer, a group-- a committee was commissioned to look at this Policy AC80 along with AD77, which was the previous conflict of commitment policy, and put them together in a way that one policy would cover faculty in all the aspects of conflict of commitment.

And the committee was well-represented by faculty. There were actually five faculty on the committee. And we spent a good part of the summer going line by line through the policies, adjusting things, and I think we came to a pretty good outcome. I would like to invite Clint Schmidt who is the Director of the Conflict of Interest Program to answer more detailed questions, if anyone has any. I believe he is on.

Clint Schmidt, Director of Conflict Interest Program: Yeah, I'm here. Thank you, Roger. I have a couple of slides I can share, or I can just answer questions if you prefer.

Chair Szczygiel: Oh, go ahead, Clint. And I think it would be a good thing to share some slides. It's a complicated piece of a report.

Clint Schmidt: OK, so can everyone see that?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes.

Clint Schmidt: OK, so we-- as Roger said, we have two conflict of commitment policies. One is AC80, the one we're talking about revising here, and the other is AD77. And in addition to that, anyone doing research has to submit a financial disclosure in coins under a Policy RP06.

So, there's some confusion about requirements and a few areas where there are gaps between requirements. And a little bit of redundancy in reporting because the AC80 are the reports, or the PDF consulting reports that faculty are asked to do each spring through their department head.

And so, the goal is to streamline this process and have just one conflict of commitment policy, which will go along with the conflict-of-interest policy. And then, AD77 is planned to be a staff conflict of commitment policy. So, faculty will just have to worry about one.

Roger also mentioned the federal developments, which have been driving some changes here. And there are three primary ones: The National Defense Authorization Act, National Security Presidential Memorandum 33, and the Joint Council on the Research Environment from the Office of Science and Technology Policy. All came out in January of this year and are all requiring federal agencies and universities to do more in terms of being aware of faculty and researcher outside activities and conflicts of commitment.

So, it's going to require more reporting and we're trying to do-- accomplish that in a way that will not increase burden and will actually streamline the process and make it simpler to follow. Roger also mentioned that we worked with a group of faculty this summer. And he was one of those there.

The faculty did have good representation across the University. Last spring, we presented an Informational Report to the Senate on this issue just to let everyone know. And then, that's when we formed the Faculty Committee for the summer.

So, the Faculty Affairs and the Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Committees reviewed this and voted on it last month. Just to-- some of the highlights. I already mentioned that we'll be changing AD77 and that AC80 will be the only faculty-focused conflict of commitment policy. There will be a few additional activities that require prior approval.

Right now, we only have five. But there are some that the federal guidelines and legislation that I mentioned will require us to do in addition to that. There were also a lot of activities that colleges had required approval for under AD77. And when we noticed that that was consistent across most colleges, we've incorporated that into the new AC80 revisions, made clear that department heads are not solely responsible for approval of outside activities, depending on what is at stake.

So, for example, intellectual property issues would need to be referred to another office. And then, we-- like I said, also we want to align the reporting and everything with the conflict-of-interest reporting so that faculty can just do one report in one place.

And then, we identified a certain number of activities that require reporting but do not contribute to monthly time limits. And those are ones that are expected of certain professionals, nurses, and architects who have to do a certain amount of time. Bonj, are you--

Chair Szczygiel: Yeah, I am. Are you attempting-- are you advancing your slides?

Clint Schmidt: I'm sorry, I was clicking on the wrong screen. I'm so sorry about that.

Chair Szczygiel: And thank you. To Deborah.

Clint Schmidt: Yeah. OK, the one I was just reading. Let me just tell you that one. This is what I was-- these are the highlights I was trying to go over. It had my slides up on both screens because of the presentation mode.

So, I went over all of these already verbally. And just got to the end of that except for the last bullet point where I added-- we're adding a training requirement. That's also something we're going to need to do based on federal expectations.

Just so I can make sure you had a chance to see these other slides. This is the one that shows the federal guidelines and recommendations that are driving some of these changes. And these are expected to be implemented by January of 2022. So that's why we've been trying to make a push to make these revisions this year.

Chair Szczygiel: Do we, by any chance, have access to the page of the report? Could we pull it up that just does a summary of the changes that are made?

Clint Schmidt: Yep.

Chair Szczygiel: And that's a question for Erin or for you, Clint. I don't know if--

Clint Schmidt: I had it pulled up here.

Chair Szczygiel: Erin's got it. Could it be bigger, Erin? Larger?

Clint Schmidt: I think that-- I'm still sharing my screen, so I'm not sure if that's me or--

Chair Szczygiel: It's pretty small text.

Clint Schmidt: Is that better?

Chair Szczygiel: For my eyes it is, yeah.

Clint Schmidt: OK, so the revisions-- yeah, so changing AD77 to a staff policy added some definitions for certain terms. AD77 requires colleges and units to develop guidelines for outside teaching and other activities. So, we are trying to incorporate what was already there into AC80. And AC80 will still require colleges to have their own guidelines.

And like I said, we require prior approval for five activities right now. But there needs to be some additions to that based on federal expectations and also based on some of the college-specific requirements that were consistent across units.

And I mentioned how we are making clear that some other offices may need to weigh in on approval of some outside activities depending on what is at stake or at issue. For example, intellectual property, I mentioned, is something the Office of Technology Management would need to review if that is being-- if there's a request for a conveyance of IP during a consulting relationship or something like that.

Chair Szczygiel: Any other highlights that are worth pointing out? And then I see we do have a hand raised.

Clint Schmidt: Yeah, I will just point out one last thing because-- just in case there's any confusion for people reading through the policy. We had a section in the current AC80 that's called activities not subject to this policy. And it carves out all the things that faculty typically do outside of a University, but that's expected of them. Like journal editorship or work with professional societies. And those are still there, we just renamed the section scholarly activities.

Chair Szczygiel: Galen, might you have a question?

Galen Grimes, Penn State Greater Allegheny: Yes, I do. Thank you very much. Grimes, Greater Allegheny. A few days ago, I received a rather lengthy email from a colleague of mine who is a Professor of Integrative Arts. And she was very concerned over how some of the changes in definitions in AD80 are going to-- AC80 are going to affect her scholarly activity.

In particular, and I won't read the entire email to you. It is rather long. But she's concerned with the definitions of the removal of musical and creative performances and exhibitions. And that's going to happen-- she's an exhibition performance artist. And she's saying this is going to very seriously impact her scholarly activity.

Now, question that comes up is, is this definition being moved to another policy somewhere that isn't noted in the change here? Or if not, I'd like to make a motion to put those definitions back into this policy change if possible.

Clint Schmidt: That was actually just moved in the policy. I was just looking for it here. So, if everyone can see this. It was--

Galen Grimes: OK, you've got musical in here, but you don't have-- let me say, she expressed--

Other creative performances and exhibitions.

Clint Schmidt: Yeah, so we have musical and other creative performances to the extent that there is an expectation in the faculty members discipline that the faculty will engage in these activities. So, it wasn't-- it was moved down to a section where it's supposed to be reported, but it doesn't count towards the time limits on outside activities.

And the faculty group that we worked with over the summer felt like it was appropriate to ask for those things to be reported. But we're not saying that a person is limited to one day per week or 40 hours per month, like most activities are.

But if you're a music professor and you're giving performances, then--

Galen Grimes: Well, she's an artist and she does a lot of exhibition work.

Clint Schmidt: Yeah, like I said, it was just moved to a different section of the policy, but it's still in there as a--

Galen Grimes: OK, like I said, she read over this, and she felt that the changes you were making in there are going to substantially affect her scholarly activity.

Chair Szczygiel: Could you clarify?

Galen Grimes: Apparently has changed enough so she feels that it's going to impact her work.

Clint Schmidt: Did she maybe not notice that it was moved to his other section of the policy? Maybe she just saw that it was crossed out in the scholarly activity section.

Galen Grimes: That may well be possible.

Chair Szczygiel: Clint, could you just clarify or confirm that the language in this section has not changed in its previous incarnation but simply moved. Is that correct? It does not indicate it being changed. As being crossed out.

Clint Schmidt: That's correct. Let me just double check here. Yes, it's the same language it's just been moved.

Galen Grimes: OK, where has it been moved to so I can reference that for her.

Clint Schmidt: Yeah, it's down in the section that's titled, "Required Disclosure." So, it's in a subsection of that that says, activities that must be disclosed but do not count toward the monthly or annual time limit.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, Galen, you think you got that? I mean, if you look at the document, you'll find it. It's being shown on the screen. So, can you find that on your own?

Galen Grimes: Hold on. I'm seeing-- OK, I'm still looking for that in-- God, this is long. Oh, OK, OK, activities must be disclosed but do not count toward the-- Guidelines. Musical and other creative performance to the extent there is an expectation of the faculty, this one-- that--

Chair Szczygiel: Galen, can I suggest that you peruse on you own time? And let's go on. We've got a couple of other hands raised, and if you have a problem come back. Put your hand up and come back if there's a problem. OK, Roger. You're muted, Roger.

Roger Egolf: There we go. I didn't realize I was re-muted. OK, I just wanted to stress that in moving that statement, it was not saying that this no longer counts as research or-- and scholarly activity under how a faculty member is evaluated. It was just talking about whether they have to report it or get permission.

And this particular one is something that they do not have to ask permission to do. Just to let the University know that they are doing it. And also, it explicitly shows that they are not limited on how many performances they can do, which is important.

I felt that the way we did this actually protected the faculty members in their ability to carry out their scholarly activities. It was not meant to limit them. Or say that those kinds of activities weren't going to be evaluated as scholarly activity. It really has more to do with the federal guidelines and what has to be reported to the government. And we made it clear that we weren't going to count the hours against the person here.

Chair Szczygiel: Roger, there's a complication that it appears the word exhibition, indeed, has been removed. I'm getting reports of that in the chat. So, we need to resolve this. It would be nice to resolve this. Can you double check the document?

Clint Schmidt: I see that. I don't remember there being a particular reason for taking it out.

Roger Egolf: We didn't talk about removing exhibitions. That must have just been an oversight in copying and pasting.

Chair Szczygiel: Are you in a comfortable position to allow us to-- if someone wanted to make a motion to include it back in?

Roger Egolf: Yes, certainly. Clint, you don't have any problem with that, do you, as far as policy goes?

Clint Schmidt: No, I don't.

Chair Szczygiel: I think we need a motion to amend.

Galen Grimes: I'll make that motion.

Chair Szczygiel: Keith, I'm recognizing you just guide us here.

Keith Shapiro: I'm just saying the motion is already on the floor. He already made the motion, you just need a second and a vote. And it's--

Galen Grimes: I second.

Keith Shapiro: No, someone else will have to second.

Galen Grimes: I thought you said somebody else made the motion.

Keith Shapiro: No, you did. You made the motion.

Chair Szczygiel: Do we have a second?

Charlene Gross, College of Arts and Architecture: Second.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. We have a second. Can we have a vote on the amendment to this report? And just to reiterate, the amendment would be to reinsert the word exhibition. Could someone highlight on the screen for me that second bullet point, musical and other creative performances. So it would be, I'm assuming, musical creative performances and exhibitions. Is that correct, Clint?

Clint Schmidt: Musical and other creative performances and exhibitions.

Chair Szczygiel: That's what I just said. So, I don't suppose we're able to type that in, are we?

Erin Eckley, Senate Office Staff: I can do that if Clint stops sharing.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, good. Right.

Erin Eckley: I need a little guidance as to where I'm supposed to be.

Clint Schmidt: Keep going down and a little bit further. OK, it's that middle bullet. Yeah.

Erin Eckley: And we want to add exhibitions here?

Clint Schmidt: After performances.

Roger Egolf: And exhibitions.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Erin. Could you just highlight that one section? What you've just typed in. Thank you. Do we need any discussion on the proposed amendment that is on the floor? Any questions? Mort, are you commenting on the addition or on the amendment?

Maura Shea, College of Communications: Only sort of. I'm just curious why are those of all the scholarly activities, why do those have to be disclosed at all? Sorry.

Chair Szczygiel: Sorry, yeah. We can get back to that, Maura. Hold on to that thought. Anyone else want to make a comment specific about this motion to add this text? And Galen, I see all these hands up. So, Galen, are you making--

Roger Egolf: Could I make a comment there?

Chair Szczygiel: Who is this.

Roger Egolf: This is Roger.

Chair Szczygiel: Roger Egolf?

Roger Egolf: Yes. This section here is just telling which ones need to-- that do not count towards the monthly and need to be disclosed. This is a list of things that don't have to get approval. They just need to be disclosed. There's other ones that need to be disclosed disclose the do count towards the monthly or annual time limits. For example, consulting.

This is actually a carve out section showing that these particular things do not count towards the hours that you're limited to.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you for that clarification, Roger. Any other comments about the actual proposed amendment? Speak. Just speak.

Mary Beth Williams, Eberly College of Science: Williams, College of Science. Thank you, Bonj. I just would like to suggest that editing on the fly at the end of a long meeting has-- presents opportunities for us not being as thorough and deliberative in these changes as possible. So, I would speak against the motion right now in favor of asking the committee to make these changes for us to consider in a thoughtful way at the next meeting.

Chair Szczygiel: Any other comments? Thank you, Mary Beth. Again, just speak. I can't tell if your hands are up for that purpose or not. So just speak out.

All right, I think we are ready for a vote.

Keith Shapiro: Can I step in for a second. I'd like to ask Mary Beth, are you suggesting that this be referred to committee?

Mary Beth Williams: Keith, my understanding is with the motion on the floor we have to vote on the motion on the floor before I can make a motion to refer to committee. Yes.

Keith Shapiro: Well, not necessarily because referring to committee is higher on the order of precedence.

If it's a motion to refer to committee, you can interrupt-- you can't interrupt. But you didn't. You were called on. It needs a second. We can debate it. We can amend it and it requires a majority vote.

Mary Beth Williams: My suggestion--

Keith Shapiro: If that's your motion, then you'll need a second.

Galen Grimes: I second it.

Keith Shapiro: OK, I'll step out here.

Mary Beth Williams: OK, thank you, Keith, for that clarification. That is my motion and I heard somebody else.

Chair Szczygiel: So, we are voting now on the higher order of motion created by Mary Beth and seconded to table this vote from further conversation until the amendments have been made and resubmitted to committee for correction. Is that correct?

Keith Shapiro: Yeah, and I would say, we're not using the word table. We're saying referring to committee.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Keith.

Keith Shapiro: That's a very different kind of thing.

Chair Szczygiel: We are referring to committee. Let's be clear. Thank you, Keith. And so now we need a vote, correct? And the vote is whether we refer this to committee or we continue on with the first motion?

Keith Shapiro: So that's a discussion first, just as we would in any other--

Chair Szczygiel: And a discussion of course first before we do anything. Of course. No, that's why you're next to me by my side. Don't go anywhere. So, any discussion about the motion to return to committee? I see, again, hands. We need to keep this specific to this motion that Mary Beth has presented.

Chair Szczygiel: Please take your hands down if you don't want to speak to this motion. Ira, go ahead.

Ira Saltz: OK, yeah, I would just like to say-- to vote against the current motion so that we can vote on the previous motion and just get this done. I mean, it was a very reasonable and I thought simple amendment that we should just process and move on.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Ira. Roger.

Roger Egolf: Yeah, while I normally do not like to legislate on the floor, in this case, I'm going to disagree with Mary Beth. This is only putting one word back in that was inadvertently dropped out. It's not really legislating from the floor, in my opinion. It's just replacing a word that somehow disappeared.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Roger. Stephen.

Stephen James Snyder, Penn State Berks: I would suggest that one word was misplaced. Others might be misplaced and the committee needs to take another close look at it.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Steven. Jim.

James Albert Strauss, Eberly College of Science: Well, I will second those comments.

Chair Szczygiel: Which comments, Jim? Could you be clear?

James Strauss: I will get that. I second comments just made and support this going back to committee so we can get it right. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: OK. Victor.

Victor Brunsden: I would also like to say this. I think we need to send this back to committee for a very-- it's important that we get this right.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Victor. And Galen.

Galen Grimes: Yeah, I'd like to agree with that. And furthermore, I'd also recommend, or I can have the professor who's concerned over this communicate to the committee exactly what her objections are and what her problems are so that they know exactly the point of where to reinsert the correct language back into this proposal.

Chair Szczygiel: I see no other comments. I believe we're ready to vote on the motion to send back to committee. And Anna, are we prepared to do that?

Anna Butler: Yes, we are.

Chair Szczygiel: TallySpace, then.

Anna Butler: Yes.

Chair Szczygiel: Great, thank you so much. And let us know whenever you're ready.

Anna Butler: OK, I have opened the pool and the pool says current motion refer report on AC80 back to committee select A to accept or B to reject.

Chair Szczygiel: A to accept, B to reject. And the accepting is sending it back to committee.

And this time, we do have to wait until the results are in before we can do anything else.

And Anna, can you tell me again, what do we need-- did you say 2/3 vote?

Lawrence Kass, College of Medicine: Can we just clarify what's accept, what's reject?

Chair Szczygiel: Accept is to move back to committee. Reject is to continue on and go back to the very first motion to edit the document here and now. And Keith, have we lost you? Have we driven you to other places?

Keith Shapiro: No, I was muted and didn't know I was muted, like always. No, that's correct. It's a majority vote. And if it doesn't pass, then we go back to the amendment that was on the floor.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. So there looks to be that we have 190 people on board.

Anna Butler: The votes have stopped now, and I have 104 Accept and 27 Reject. That 79.39% Accept.

Chair Szczygiel: So, the motion has been approved to return the report to committee for further consideration. Any other discussion? Keith, does that kill the first motion then I'm assuming?

Keith Shapiro: Yes.

Chair Szczygiel: Does it kill any further discussion on this?

Keith Shapiro: Yes, it's now back in committee.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you, all. Thank you everyone for your involvement and input. The report will be sent back to committee and hopefully we'll see it again soon.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Program Learning Outcomes Assessment – Appendix G

Chair Szczygiel: We have now an Informational Report coming from the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs. It is the "Program Learning Outcomes Assessment." And you can find it as Appendix G. The report will be presented by Geoff Mamerow, if Geoff is still with us. Assistant Vice Provost for Assessment in the Office of Planning Assessment and Institutional Research, affectionately known as OPAIR. Geoff, are you here?

Mary Beth Williams: If I might, can I say a few words first please to introduce the report?

Chair Szczygiel: Oh, absolutely.

Mary Beth Williams: I'm so sorry, Geoff. Geoff, I just want to lay the foundation for this. So, thank you all for being very patient and sticking with us today. Our program's curriculum requirements and courses are developed to enable students to learn and develop skills with which they grow become an accomplish both as individuals and as parts of our global society.

Today, we have an Informational Report that Geoff will present for us. It will begin a conversation about how faculty engage in and use learning outcomes assessment to reflect on our course and program curricula. I know it's late in the afternoon. It's been a long day. But I especially encourage senators to engage in this conversation because of our primary role as a Senate in curriculum and education.

So Bonj has already introduced Geoff. Geoff, thank you so much for being here and being patient with us today. I'll hand it over to you. Thank you.

Geoff Mamerow, Assistant Vice Provost for Assessment: You can hear me all right?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, we can.

Geoff Mamerow: Excellent. Well, thanks for the introduction. Thank you to the Senate. Thank you all for being here and have this opportunity. I think it's particularly important as you all represent the faculty and my office and my teamwork with quite a few faculty on program learning outcomes assessment. And the Venn diagram of senators and people who work as assessment leaders on program assessment is not highly overlapping. So, it's important for you all to know what your colleagues are doing as we work with them.

So today, I'm just going to give you a really high-level overview of what the assessment process is. Talk about what-- the definition of it. A little history of how we got where we are today. Penn State's philosophy about it. We'll get into the process requirements and expectations. And then, we'll talk a little bit about who are these faculty are participating.

I will talk also about how we have moved to an assessment management system. It's an online platform that houses all assessment activities now. How we've implemented that. The advantage that we've seen so far and some future advantages.

And then, along the way, I'm going to talk a bit about evidence that I can point to that speaks to a culture of assessment that is evolving at Penn State as well as how this feeds into and supports our accreditation with Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

So definitional, what is learning outcomes assessment? Linda Suskie is kind of a thinker and practitioner in the space. And the key part is the second sentence. It's really a systematic process of gathering, analyzing, interpreting evidence of student learning to determine how well that student's learning matches our expectations. Our being your expectations as faculty in your degree programs.

And then, when we've collected that evidence, we analyze it and think about, what can we use from that information to understand and improve student learning and the educational experiences we provide our students? So why do we do this?

There are a lot of reasons. Here are four of them and they're not in any particular order of importance. But the first, accountability. We want to be accountable to our students and perhaps to their parents who are paying good money for the educations that we provide as well as accountable to state legislators. To disciplinary organizations outside that sort of talk and interact with your disciplines.

The second is important to me, in particular, as an educator, self-reflection. You all are experts in your fields. You keep up on the top of the latest things-- developments in your field. But you also pass that information along to students. And so being reflective not only about your expertise, but about how you deliver that education to your students is important.

We do it to focus on strengthening the student learning and the learning environments. And then, of course, it is actually required for our accreditation. We do have to engage in an assessment process. Not only of Middle States, but other disciplinary accreditors as well.

So, a little bit of history. In 2014/2015 academic year was the last time Middle States visited our campus to reaffirm our accreditation. And as they always do, they have recommendations. And a number of their recommendations were around assessment at that time. And basically, it boils down to they wanted us to systematize the learning outcomes assessment process also in general education assessment.

Because to be sure, there was assessment going on here, but it was mixed. There were some pockets of really fantastic assessment practice and some areas that were a little bit more uneven. And also, folks who were participating in it were almost on a voluntary basis. So, they were recommending that we really codify this and instantiate it.

So, in 2016-17 that's actually where, not the OPAIR office, but an earlier predecessor to the OPAIR office established a team of people to actually focus on this and to work with the Penn State community to develop a standardized process for undergraduate, graduate, and certificate program assessment.

2018 through 2020. We were implementing that process that we developed, but it was all on paper and it was on Word document templates, and it was in box folders, online, and so on. And we recognized that we really needed to kind of join the new century and go to a platform that really managed these things in a much more, I guess, professional way.

And so we identified an assessment management system. I'll talk about that. And we piloted it with a number of colleges and campuses and individual programs. And then, this last year 2020-2021, we actually pushed it out and implemented it across the whole University.

And then, looking forward in 2023-24 is when Middle States comes back. And so, we were going to have a good powerful story to tell them about how we took their recommendations, and we ran with them and how we've instantiated assessment practice in a much more standardized way across the University.

So basic philosophy. As I mentioned, we-- back in 2016-17 we worked with the University Committee, and we decided this is how we're going to approach assessment at Penn State. Other institutions are very centralized and prescriptive. Not so much here.

We think that learning outcomes assessment is an activity-- a set of activities that are conducted by faculty. And they're for faculty and students. They're not for OPAIR, not for my office, and they're not for Middle States. And the goal is to maintain or strengthen program quality and student learning. That's the focus. It's not a checkbox thing. It's about knowing what's meaningful for you.

Engaging in that process. Again, Middle States doesn't say, do this particular process. They say, establish a process and then hold yourself accountable to it. So, we established a process and we're doing so. So, engaging in it meets our accreditors requirements.

So, what does OPAIR have to do with this? Well, as I said, we want it to be meaningful. And while you all are experts in your fields, you may not all be experts in learning outcomes assessment. So, we provide support by giving education to assessment leaders, some expertise, support, and resources.

And we help make it flexible for you. Because what's important in an undergraduate Biology program is very different from what's important in a Master's program in Nutritional Sciences or Mechanical Engineering or whatever program, right? So that's how we fit in there.

A little bit around requirements and expectations. So, all programs that are for credit-- for credit degree or certificate programs, must engage in learning outcomes assessment. Now, the distinction here is that some programs have an external accreditor. So, think about engineering programs with ABET or business programs with AACSB or some educational programs. A lot of programs have an external group that they report to.

And if you have one of those in your program, your reporting-- you're doing this, you're just doing it under the prescription of those-- under the rubrics of those particular organizations. If your program is not accredited by one of those, you're accredited under the larger Penn State Middle State's umbrella and so you follow the process that I'll describe in a minute.

Our expectation in that Penn State process is actually-- compared to some other external accreditors is-- I won't say it's easy, but it's not quite as strict. We expect that you assess one of your program learning objectives each year and that you file or submit an annual assessment report. And the report basically includes two critical components.

The first part looks backward. It says, here's the kind of assessment activity we did last year. Here's the objective we assessed. Here's what we learned. Here's what we plan to do about what we learned. And then, it looks forward and says, here's the objective we're going to assess in the upcoming year and here's

how we're going to go about doing that. So, it's always backward looking and forward looking at the same time.

Drilling in, let's look at that annual cycle. So, choose an objective-- a program learning objective. Then, you decide where in your program you want to collect evidence. So, this will differ by program. But we typically recommend ladder courses in the curriculum. Milestones. Things like culminating papers, capstone courses, milestones, like a thesis defense, a dissertation defense, things like that where you would expect students to show that they've mastered the objectives of your program.

Once you've identified both the formula of the curriculum and some sort of measure, again, could be a paper, it could be a presentation, it could be a dance, it could be a whole range of things. You go in and you collect evidence. Afterward, you analyze that evidence. This is just a typical research cycle.

And then, you interpret it. And you codify that all in a report and you write it up. And again, that annual cycle, it begins June 30, and it ends June 30. And so that's basically thing-- again, we like flexibility. So that's our date, but there is flexibility within there as well.

We do this all now online because it's 2021. And so, we-- the University purchased or licensed a platform called Nuventive Improve is the brand name. It's the same one that we actually use for strategic planning at the University. So, some of you who may be involved in that are familiar.

Why did we choose this particular one? Well, it really standardizes the process across programs. It maintains the flexibility but keeps the components of the process that are just described similar across programs. It really minimizes data entry. We used to have a system where you'd fill in these Word document templates, and you'd have to do that every year. Put your name in, put the objectives in, describe everything.

Once you've entered that stuff into the system, it's there and you can reuse it all the time. So, it actually reduces workload quite a bit. It creates a stable, consistent place where all that information is. So, if you're an assessment leader or a PIK or a DGS or a DUS in your program and you move or you go on or you're rotated off, somebody else takes over, everything is right there. It isn't on your desktop. It isn't on somebody's desktop who went to another University and is lost forever.

Also, everything that you enter into the assessment management system can be easily exported in a nicely formatted report. Those reports are very useful for communicating your assessment results with your faculty colleagues or with an alumni group or with a disciplinary consulting group or someone that you work with to keep your program fresh.

It also allows us-- and this is an area that we're really trying to make more robust. But it allows collaboration between different programs as well as programs that are in multiple locations. And so they're online spaces so that people can share resources. They can collaborate on an assessment study. Instead of everybody doing it on their own, they can do it together, right?

And of course, it becomes a historical archive so you can see trends over time. This last point I want to point out is something that we're working on. We're on maybe the first or second rung of the ladder. But an inventive system does integrate in different ways with some of the other systems that we use. So, for example, Canvas.

And we've been piloting this over the last year with some programs in Engineering and IST and in Education. And so, you can imagine if a course of yours is part of an assessment study and you're looking at papers and you're using a rubric and the Speed Grader function. Those rubric scores can then get sucked right into the new event of platform. You don't have to enter the information, that kind of thing. And so that kind of integration is something that we're sort of on the bottom floor of, but we're working toward making that more robust.

So, I'll just-- this is a quick overview. In summary, the assessment process, again, is really about maintaining and strengthening the quality of students' educational experience. Because that's why we're here. That's what we're doing. And while it is required, the focus is on making it meaningful and flexible so that it's not a chore, but it's something-- it's an opportunity to learn about your program and how your students are learning.

All academic programs participate in some form, as I said. If you're externally accredited, you're still doing this. But if you're internally accredited, I guess, you're doing it at the undergraduate level, the graduate level, and certificates. Just to put some numbers to it, the non-accredited programs roughly 750 programs. And I talked about assessment leaders. That's an individual faculty member from individual program.

There are roughly 650 of them. Some of them do double duty on some related programs and so on. So, it's a chunk-- it's a good chunk of your faculty that are involved in this process. Again, expectation. Assess one objective a year. And then, submit that backward- and forward-looking report on June 30 or thereabouts.

And as I said, all of those activities now-- I mean, you're collecting evidence in your classroom, but all the reporting and all those kinds of functions are done in the online system now. So, it's kind of neat and tight. And that's what I wanted to talk about. So, if we have additional time, I'm happy to address any questions you might have. Or if we don't, here's my contact information and I would love to have a conversation further with any of you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Geoff. We do have-- Jim, you've got your hand up. Jim Strauss.

James Strauss, Eberly College of Science: Sorry, I think my hand was up for previous discussion. Thank you, though, it was a great presentation.

Geoff Mamerow: My favorite kind of question.

Chair Szczygiel: Are there any other questions for Geoff and his very thorough and interesting-- Yeah, David Smith.

David Smith, Administrative: Hi, Geoff. It's David Smith. And I just was wondering-- a lot of this focused on the classroom curriculum. There are several Senate policies that do speak to learning assessment that extend beyond the classroom. Maybe more in the vein of the program assessment. For instance, academic advising. I was just wondering if you could talk about how, you would see that fitting into some of this that you talked about this afternoon?

Geoff Mamerow: Sure, absolutely. At a fundamental level, the techniques or the focus of how we think about assessment is really similar if you're thinking about academic advising as a programmatic thing or as a curriculum to academic advising. So, knowing what your objectives are.

Then, you can develop an assessment process for that. Again, deciding what kind of evidence would tell you if students were meeting those objectives or not. What ways you would collect those-- that evidence. What kind of period or the frequency of that kind of thing.

And then, also you really want to build in some kind of process to take that information and feed it back in so that you're using that information to make decisions. I know that we've worked-- our offices have worked with you folks before about having discussions around that. There are certainly within-- from accreditation perspective, there are some places where we could use assessment of things like academic advising or other programs. Student affairs kinds of programs.

And you could talk about the success of those programs. And other institutions I've been in showing that your program is really impactful to students is how you get money from the provost or others. And so I always encourage folks to really think about developing assessment of the plan. And I would further say that, although our bread and butter is in the academic program side of things, we have a lot of expertise in programmatic assessment.

And so, if you-- any of you faculty are involved in a program like advising or other financial literacy or anything that it might be, we're happy to talk with you to help think through models of assessment to provide our expertise and resources for you to get you going.

David Smith: Thank you, Geoff.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Martha.

Martha Strickland, Penn State Harrisburg: I'm Martha Strickland, Penn State Harrisburg, Educational Psychology, so this is right up my alley, Geoff. I have a question about the one objective choice. So when you're looking at-- what I understand is every year we'll just choose one objective from the program. Is that correct?

Geoff Mamerow: Yes, well, that's the expectation is to do at least that. Some programs decide to do quite a few more. But the minimal expectation is to look at a single objective. Yes.

Martha Strickland: Are you looking at a protocol for how to make that decision? Because that is a little-- can be a little problematic, right? It depends on how big your program is, but it can be problematic.

Geoff Mamerow: Well, we often will have discussions with faculty and the assessment leaders and the programs around this. Which objective should I select? What sorts of guidelines can you give us? Back to the idea of making it most meaningful. So, I used to teach high school and you would always have the water cooler conversation in the teacher's lounge. And students, they can't write, or students are coming in having this issue.

And so those kinds of conversations with your colleagues might point to a particular objective as this is the one, we should really focus on. Or there could be some kind of overarching or larger initiative on a campus or a particular college that's going on. And so, you might want to choose something that has some synergy with that.

Other programs will just sort of choose, let's go through them in order. We also have some general guidelines on-- it's perfectly appropriate to assess the same objective multiple years in a row, especially if you're making changes based on some of your assessment results.

So, these are, again, our focus is on making it meaningful. So, we won't tell you a prescriptively you have to do this, that, or the other thing. But let's figure out what is the best to get you the best information for the kinds of decisions you need to make in your program.

Martha Strickland: Yes, thank you. Just one real quick access point. So, is there a place to access besides just emailing you to get some guidance or some resources available that you were talking about?

Geoff Mamerow: Yes, I will-- I'm going to pull up my-- our website and I will put that link in the chat. Let me just really quickly grab that. And it's in the chat now. In there, you'll find there's we call it a LOA handbook. It's kind of a basic generic guide on assessment 101 for the novice.

We have information in there on guide trainings on the assessment management system. So, you can dig in there if you're looking for a rubric of some sort, we have a rubric library that you can adopt or adapt different pieces of rubrics in there. There's information on general education assessment and so on.

So, this is a great resource that has a lot of information.

Martha Strickland: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. I see, Michele, you've got your hand raised.

Michele Duffey: Thank you, Bonj. Duffey, HHD. Geoff, if you could tell us if there is a good interface between the assessment management system and the upcoming curricular implementation system or the curriculum information management system? Because that might be a nice synergy there.

Geoff Mamerow: Yeah, this is another place where we're sort of on the bottom rung of the ladder. I've been in conversations with leadership and Undergraduate Education as well as in The Graduate School about, for example, making sure that the program learning objectives that we have in the assessment management system match those that are going to be in CIM—the new curricular—system, as well as in the bulletin.

This is a work in progress. There are probably some additional cultural elements that we need to work through before we tackle the technological parts. But there are definitely some solutions that make those systems at least have a one direction talking that won't probably ever be fully integrated. But yeah, that is in the works.

Michele Duffey: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Geoff, and I see one more hand raised. Do you have a minute for that? Do you have enough time?

Geoff Mamerow: I have plenty of time.

Chair Szczygiel: All right, great. Tim, go ahead.

Tim Robicheaux, College of the Liberal Arts: Hey, Tim Robicheaux at Liberal Arts. I forgot. I actually don't have a question. I'm just asking for faculty buy in and I'm just added on to it. So, I'm writing one of the General Education rubrics right now for the global learning. And these are-- a lot of work is going into all of this. They're not easy-- for general education, particularly, they're not easy to write because some of the courses are-- the courses are in all sorts of disciplines.

And our goal right now is to try to make rubrics that are three-- I think we're three rows for most of the rubrics that we're working on. Three rows, three columns, so it should simplify it for all of you. And I know that sometimes it seems like a hassle because it's an extra thing to do. But we're working very hard to make it as efficient as possible.

And we're running into some issues because of disciplinary stuff. But this is important, and our goal is to make it easier. And I just want to add on that assessment in general is important. And I really hope we get faculty buy in because it's not super time consuming, even though it's an extra thing to do. And if you have any comments, because right now, the Effective Communication Rubric is available, and we will be adding the other one soon.

If you have any comments on how it should-- one of these should look, you can look at the effective communications one, which I'll link in the chat. And then, you can send all of your comments to Keith Shapiro who will handle them and not me. No, Keith is also working-- don't actually email Keith. Sorry, Keith. Don't actually email Keith.

But these are things that are not--

Keith Shapiro: They can.

Tim Robicheaux: All right, good.

Keith Shapiro: Invite me to dinner is what's going to have to happen.

Tim Robicheaux: It is unlikely I will respond to all of them. But really, a lot's going into this. And the goal particularly for Gen Ed is to make it as easy as possible for faculty and also make you think about it. I was looking at a couple of my classes and the different objectives. And it made me rethink, OK, how am I assessing this in my course?

So just something to think about. But really, if you talk to your constituents, to your colleagues, just promote buy in, please. Because it looks good for us. It helps us as a University. And also, it's really not that time consuming. Yes, that's all I had to say. And also, Geoff and others are doing a really good job with this. I'm working on one rubric. They're doing all the other stuff.

Mary Beth Williams: Bonj, can I just respond to that and say, thank you so much, Tim, for saying that faculty engagement in this takes time, it takes effort, and it's essential for our programs. We're going to come back and talk about the general education assessment later. We have some data that's separate. That's course level assessment of our Gen Ed program. This is focusing on learning outcomes assessment of our majors, minors, and certificates. But they're clearly related. They're clearly related. And faculty buy in is really important.

We're getting late in the day, but I want you all to know we're going to come back and talk about this more and get more faculty input and probably even have a Forensic session to talk about the kinds of things that faculty need to be supported to do this important work.

Tim Robicheaux: The faculty buy in. That's absolutely--

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you, Tim. And in the meantime, I see two other hands in-- quickly please, folks. Susan.

Susan Marie Fredricks, Penn State Brandywine: Thank you. As somebody that's been doing assessment on my campus for a number of years now, too many years to count, I just want to reiterate and I think I just heard it about not only faculty buy in, but this is timing for faculty where you have an under-supported program on some of these campuses where you might be the only faculty member teaching in the program to do assessment. And to maintain that becomes a major issue when there is no recognition for it.

And so, moving forward, I would recommend that there be some kind of recognition for doing assessment and being the assessment liaison for these programs. Because you say it's quick drop down put everything in. It's not. It's not as intuitive nor as easy as that. So please keep that in mind going forward. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Susan. Good point. And Ira, I know you're going to wrap this up, right?

Ira Saltz: Yes, and I know that they're not going to appreciate though. But prior to coming to Penn State, I was the assessment guy. I helped many programs with their assessment and all of that. But I no longer have buy in. And that's because we don't have control over the curriculum.

I mean, I'm part of a-- we are a business program with 14 campuses. And I spent several years as the assessment leader for the BSB at Shenango. We've identified curricular changes we need to make, but we can't make them. So that's why you're losing faculty. We do the assessing, but we have no power to make the curricular changes that need to be made. And we're moving in the wrong direction with one Penn State 2025. I'll finish on that note.

Chair Szczygiel: All right, seeing no other questions, thank you, Geoff, thank you, Mary Beth, for your assistance in the presentation. And I think we are ready now to look at some of the results of our earlier votes. Anna, how are we looking? Would you be able to share your screen and read out each reports name and the results of the report for the record? It's like magic.

Anna, were you going to be able to read out those or--

Anna Butler: Yes, now can you see this?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes.

Anna Butler: OK, so for the attendance vote, there were 165 senators present when we took that vote. The revisions to the Bylaws Article II, which was adding the Positional Reports passed 141 to 7. The report on Standing Rules article I, that was also addition of the category of Positional Reports passed 128 to 7. The Standing Rules, article II, on Intra-University relations revisions passed 121 to 6. And the revision to AC80, we did not vote on that actual report because there was a motion to refer the report back to the committee and that motion passed 105 to 27.

NEW LEGSISLATIVE BUSINESS - NONE

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Anna. And thank you for all of your help today. It's much appreciated. New Legislative Business. I see none in front of me.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Szczygiel: Moving to the next Agenda item, Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the University. Are there any additional comments for the good of the University? And I see Dawn.

Dawn Pfeifer Reitz, Penn State Berks: Hi, thank you. Pfeifer Reitz, Berks Campus. I just jotted down my comments because I didn't know if I'd still be present. But with all due respect to my colleagues' personal opinions about all University Senate-related matters, I cannot in good conscience continue to be a silent party to the ongoing non-collegial behavior that I witnessed in the comments in the chat during these plenary meetings.

As a new Senator this year, I am shocked by the discourteous manner in which our guests and each other are treated in the comments and the chats. I believe it's in poor taste and it is a bad reflection upon us as a body and it is in bad form for us to behave in this way. And I would encourage all of us to be more respectful to each other moving forward in all of our communications. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Dawn. I want to echo at least some of that. I think civility goes a long way, especially in large forums. Thank you for making that observation. Nathan, do you have something to share?

Nathan Tallman, University Libraries and Scholarly Communications: Tallman, University Libraries. Thank you, Bonj. I just wanted to state for the record that this thoughtful, deliberative body did something rather ludicrous when we started this meeting. We passed minutes that do not exist. We approved minutes that we have not seen or read. As a legal record of what we have said, and I think it's derelict in our duties to approve minutes that we haven't read. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Nathan. In part, I should have called them potential minutes, but be that as it may. Ray, comments?

Ray Najjar: Yeah, I just wanted to know where we stand with regard to our second resolution from our August meeting. I don't know if I missed something at the September meeting, but I thought it would have come up since that was kind of a deadline for that second resolution. I'm guessing by the lack of response or some combination of exhaustion with a long meeting and exhaustion with the pandemic that we're kind of OK with the administration's-- that we're satisfied that the demands that we put in the resolution were met adequately.

And obviously, I don't feel that way. It comes across maybe rudely. And maybe that's what Dawn is referring to. I don't know and I apologize for that if that's the case. I'm kind of at my wit's end, which comes out in a non-professional way, I admit. So, I just-- at the risk of extending the meeting long, so I know everybody wants to go, I just want to get some sense of where we're at with that resolution. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Do we have anyone from Senate Council who would like to respond? Jim or Carey, you were involved in these discussions.

Carey, you're muted if you're speaking. Jim, do you have anything you'd like to--

Carey Eckhardt: Sorry, I couldn't get the raise hand thing to work for a minute there. My own sense of this-- and this may not be fully accurate, so I hope that others will chime in. My own sense of this is that after considerable delay that President Barron did, in fact, respond. And that he responded-- I remember-- I don't remember whether it was an email message, or something displayed on the screen. But I remember something several page—several paragraphs long in which he responded to at least some of what was in the resolution.

And having a response is, of course, different from maybe liking or not liking everything in the response. And I think that there was also some follow-up discussion within the Senate Council with the Provost, and to some extent, perhaps some of the things that we were looking at in August are no longer as pertinent as they were then.

So, it's not that there's been no response at all, but I think that it's perhaps not everything that was in that document was, in fact, implemented, which was not necessarily a surprise.

Chair Szczygiel: And to Ray, and to everyone, sometimes it does take a while. But when we do receive recommendation-- a signed agreements or an indication that the-- a special request was made for the President to respond to that resolution, they do not have to, according to our own rules. But we did request that a response be made. He did submit a response. And that should, if it hasn't already been posted on our Senate web page, that should be there somewhere, I believe.

That's a big question mark. Yeah, so it did come back to Council. The Council are the ones who promoted and sponsored the two resolutions. And it was discussed in council and agreed not to carry further.

William.

Judith Ozment, Penn State Abington: I put the link up in the chat. Ozment, Abington. I put the link in the chat.

Chair Szczygiel: Oh, thank you, Judy.

Judith Ozment: Was on the web page.

Chair Szczygiel: Great. Thank you, Judy. William, do you have comments for the good of the University?

William Kenyon, College of Arts and Architecture: Yes, Kenyon, Arts and Architecture. Due to the fact that we sent the report on AC80 back, I had a lengthy collection of concerns about the newly restrictive requirements that were being added into AC80. Roger, I'm typing them up in an easy-to-read way to send to you.

But I didn't know if anybody else also had concerns. So, I'd be-- I'll put my email in the chat. If anybody wants to send me other concerns, I'll collate them just so Roger doesn't get flooded with tons and tons of emails. Maybe some of them are along the same lines as mine.

Or if you don't want to send them to me, send them directly to him. But I was trying not to speak on Roger's behalf about that.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, William, for that offer. That's very generous of you. Thanks very much. And John.

John Gerard Champagne, Penn State Erie: I don't know. As you can see in the chat, I feel somewhat ambivalent about these comments about civility. Because I don't know if someone is taking something I said as uncivil. I told President Barron that we are nowhere near herd immunity. That is a fact.

Now, when stating a fact is perceived as uncivil, then I will continue to be uncivil. The thing I wanted to add also is that this response that it is OK to have just two women in this pool of candidates should be unacceptable to every one of us. And again, if that's perceived as uncivil, I am happy to be uncivil in this forum.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, John. That was my comment. So, I'll respond in part to the civility comment, which in my mind simply means that in order to take a discussion further, it wasn't just a disagreement, of course, but it's the tone of voice. It is then falling into an argumentative battle position with the guest speakers.

That doesn't actually get us very far. And then, it is, of course, some fairly outrageous commentary in the chats. There have been actually requests for the chats to be shut down. We have not decided-- I've not decided to go that route yet, but I would respect-- respectfully suggest that we simply do a little self-monitoring of-- in recognition that not everyone believes the same things as strongly as we do.

And that we are a deliberative body, but it doesn't mean that we need to yell at each other, quite simply. And I have nothing else to say on that. I see no other hands raised. And let me just say that I appreciate everyone's comments. And John, I appreciate yours as well.

Right, I think we are done with this segment of the meeting. I don't see any other hands raised.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Szczygiel: We are ready to adjourn this meeting. All in favor, please raise your virtual hands to adjourn.

Edward Fuller, College of Education: Hey, Bonj?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes?

Edward Fuller: Quick question, but it's-- nobody else needs to hear. I mean, people can stay on. I just had a quick question about--

Chair Szczygiel: I don't know who this is. Who's talking to me?

Edward Fuller: Oh, I'm sorry. Ed Fuller.

Chair Szczygiel: Ed, could you hold on until-- I see a whole bunch of hands raised. I'm willing to hang on. Hold on.

Edward Fuller: Sorry, go ahead.

Chair Szczygiel: All right, folks. And I think we are all in favor—most of us, to adjourn. The motion passes. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, November 30, 2021, at 1:30 PM.

The following Senators were noted as having participated in the October 19, 2021, Senate Meeting via Zoom.

- Ax-Fultz, Laura
- Baka, Jennifer
- Barron, Eric
- Bartolacci, Michael
- Bieschke, Kathleen
- Bird, Douglas
- Blakney, Terry
- Blockett, Kimberly
- Blood, Ingrid
- Bolduc, Jasmin
- Borromeo, Renee
- Bowley, Kevin
- Braman, Valerie
- Brown, Nathanial
- Browne, Stephen
- Brunsden, Victor
- Calore, Gary
- Chen, Wei-Fan
- Chetlen, Alison
- Coduti, Wendy
- Cohen, Stephen
- Costanzo, Denise
- Davis, Dwight
- Davis, Felecia
- Demirci, Ali
- Donelson, Raff
- Dube, Sibusiwe
- Duffey, Michele
- Eckhardt, Caroline
- Egolf, Roger
- Engel, Renata
- Eppley, Karen
- Fairbank, James
- Farnan, Kaitlin

- Farrar, Katelyn
- Fausnight, Tracy
- Findley, Samuel
- Fox, Derek
- Fredricks, Susan
- Freiberg, Andrew
- Frisch, Paul
- Fuller, Edward
- Furfaro, Joyce
- Gallagher, Julie
- Gaudelius, Yvonne
- Gayah, Vikash
- Gillespie, Marissa
- Goin, Campbell
- Graham, Joshua
- Grimes, Galen
- Gross, Charlene
- Gross, Daniel
- Grozinger, Christina
- Guadagnino, Frank
- Hanses, Mathias
- Hardin, Marie
- Hardy, Melissa
- Harris, Jeff
- Hauck, Randy
- Hayford, Harold
- Hemerly, Nathan
- Higgins, Jeanmarie
- Holden, Lisa
- Huang, Tai-Yin
- Hufnagel, Pamela
- Iliev, Peter
- Impavido, Donald
- Iqbal, Zaryab
- Jones, Nicholas
- Jordan, Matthew
- Joseph, Rhoda

- Kadetsky, Elizabeth
- Karpa, Kelly
- Kass, Lawrence
- Kass, Rena
- Keleher, Peyton
- Kennedy-Phillips, Lance
- Kenyon, William
- Kim, Agnes
- King, Elizabeth
- Kitko, Lisa
- Klug, Rebecca
- Kramer, Lauren
- Kubat, Robert
- Kunes, Melissa
- Lang, Dena
- Le, Binh
- Lear, Matthew
- Ledford, Savanna
- Linch, Amy
- Linn, Suzanna
- Mahoney, Joseph
- Malcos, Jennelle
- Mangel, Lisa
- Marko, Frantisek
- Marshall, Megan
- Mason, John
- Masters, Katherine
- Mathews, Jonathan
- McCoy, Heather
- McKinney Marvasti, Karyn
- Melton, Robert
- Michels, Margaret
- Mocioiu, Irina
- Mookerjee, Rajen
- Moore, Jacob
- Mulder, Kathleen
- Myers, Christian
- Najjar, Raymond

- Neely, Megan
- Nesbitt, Jennifer
- Noce, Kathleen
- Nousek, John
- Novotny, Eric
- Nurkhaidarov, Ermek
- Ofosu, Willie
- Ozment, Judith
- Page, B.Richard
- Palma, Julio
- Palmer, Timothy
- Parizek, Heather
- Pauley, Laura
- Perkins, Daniel
- Petricini, Tiffany
- Petrilla, Rosemarie
- Pfeifer Reitz, Dawn
- Phillips, Kathleen
- Pierce, Mari Beth
- Posey, Lisa
- Potosky, Denise
- Precht, Jay
- Purdy Drew, Kirstin
- Rhen, Linda
- Riccomini, Paul
- Richardson, Lewis
- Robertson, Noah
- Robicheaux, Timothy
- Robinson, Brandi
- Ruggiero, Francesca
- Rutherford Siegel, Susan
- Saltz, Ira
- Sangwan, Raghu
- Saunders, Brian
- Schaeffer, Lillian
- Scott, Geoffrey
- Seymour, Elizabeth
- Shannon, Robert

- Shapiro, Keith
- Sharma, Amit
- Shea, Maura
- Shearer, Gregory
- Shen, Wen
- Signorella, Margaret
- Simmons, Cynthia
- Sims, Damon
- Sinha, Alok
- Sloboda, Noel
- Slot, Johanna
- Smith, David
- Snyder, Stephen
- Springall, Rob
- Sprow Forté, Karin
- Strauss, James
- Strickland, Martha
- Strohacker, Emily
- Swallow, Nicole
- Swinarski, Matthew
- Tallman, Nathan
- Taylor, Ann
- Taylor, Jonté
- Thomas, Emily
- Tyworth, Michael
- Van Hook, Stephen
- Vasilatos-Younken, Regina
- Volk Chewning, Lisa
- Vrana, Kent
- Vujan McClosky, Andrea
- Wagner Lawlor, Jennifer
- Walker, Eric
- Wang, Ping
- Warner, Alfred
- Watts, Alison
- Wede, Joshua
- Weld, Jennifer

- Whitehurst, Marcus
- Williams, Mary Beth
- Williams, Nicole
- Wolfe, Douglas
- Wong, Jeffrey
- Wright, Suzanne
- Yagnik, Arpan
- Yen, John
- Zacharia, Thomas
- Zorn, Christopher

Elected   **168**
Students   **15**
Ex Officio   **6**
Appointed   **10**
Total   **200**