



PennState
University Faculty Senate

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

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

THE SENATE RECORD

Volume 54-----December 1, 2021-----Number 3

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

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

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

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

Reports that have appeared in the Agenda for the meeting are not included in The Senate Record unless they have been changed substantially during the meeting, or are considered to be of major importance. Remarks and discussions are abbreviated in most instances. Every Senate meeting is recorded via Zoom and recordings are posted on the Senate website. For older Senate Records, please contact the Senate Office or view recordings on Mediasite.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|--|--------------|
| I. | Final Agenda for December 1, 2020 | Pages ii-iii |
| II. | Minutes and Summaries of Remarks | Pages 1-58 |
| III. | Appendices | |
| | a. Attendance | |

FINAL AGENDA DECEMBER 1, 2020

| | | |
|----|--|----------|
| A. | <u>MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING</u> | Page 2 |
| | Minutes of the October 20, 2020 Meeting in The Senate Record 54:2 | |
| B. | <u>COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE</u> | Page 3 |
| | <u>Senate Curriculum Report of November 10, 2020</u> | |
| | <u>http://Senate.psu.edu/curriculum/Senate-curriculum-reports/2021-2022 Senate Calendar</u> | |
| C. | <u>REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL</u> Meeting of November 10, 2020 | Page 4 |
| D. | <u>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR</u> | Page 4 |
| E. | <u>COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY</u> | Page 7 |
| | <u>President Barron Presentation - Meeting the Moment: A Progress Report</u> | |
| F. | <u>COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST</u> | Page 18 |
| | <u>Provost Jones Presentation - COVID-19 Operations Update and Spring 2021 Objectives</u> | |
| | | Page 18 |
| G. | <u>FORENSIC BUSINESS</u> | Page 32 |
| | Senate Council | |
| | <u>Impacts of Cutbacks to Libraries Collections Budgets</u> | Page 33 |
| | Senate Committee on Committees and Rules | |
| | <u>Discussion of the Reorganization of Human Resources and the Adoption of WorkDay</u> | |
| | | Page 39 |
| H. | <u>UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE</u> | Page 42 |
| I. | <u>LEGISLATIVE REPORTS</u> | Pages 42 |
| | Senate Committee on Committees and Rules | |
| | <u>Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article VII - Delegation of Authority, Section 2</u> | Page 42 |
| | <u>Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article IV, Sections 1 and 2, Committees</u> | Page 43 |
| | <u>REPORT REMOVED FROM AGENDA</u> | |
| J. | <u>ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS - NONE</u> | Page 43 |
| K. | <u>INFORMATIONAL REPORTS</u> | Page 43 |
| | Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment | |

Important Changes to Title IX

Page 43

Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology

Faculty Response to the Shift to Remote Teaching: Enabling Technologies for Remote

Learning

Page 54

Penn State Relationship with BOX Application

Page 56

L. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS – NONE

Page 57

M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Page 57

N. ADJOURNMENT

Page 63

The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, December 1, 2020, at 1:00 p.m. via Zoom Webinar and in person at the Foster Auditorium, with Elizabeth Seymour, Chair, presiding.

Chair Seymour, Penn State Altoona: Hello, everyone. It is 1:00 PM Tuesday, December 1, 2020, and the Senate is now in session. We are meeting today totally via Zoom. Let me go through the instructions for the meeting. For most of us, we're familiar with it. But in case anyone's new, I want to go through them again.

Who can speak in a Senate meeting? Only those who are elected or appointed student, faculty, administrative, or retired senators or past chairs have the privilege of the floor. The meetings are public, and others can join and listen, but please do not try to ask a question if you are not a Senator. You can email Executive Director Dawn Blasko or me if you would like to request to speak at a future meeting.

Our Zoom capacity is 500. And if we reach capacity, you may not be able to attend. We create a complete record of the meeting that will be available about three weeks after the meeting. This meeting, like all Senate plenary meetings, is being recorded. We have brought you in with your microphones muted and your video off. If you are presenting a report, when it is time for your report, we will unmute you and put your video on.

Please wait to speak until you're introduced by the chair. When you are finished, we will mute you and turn your camera off. For this meeting, we worked to create a format that is more interactive, and this is how we are going to use our various features. It's the same way we've been using them, but I'll go through it. Chat will be turned on for you to communicate with each other, but chat will not be closely monitored.

You may use it to post a comment, let us know about a technical problem, let us know if you joined late or tell us that you're joining by phone. And please put your phone number in for attendance. But do not use it to ask a question for a presenter or to be recognized to speak and have the floor. If you have an emergency, email Kadi Corter at kkw2. We are also being joined today by Akash and Parth, who are our tech TAs, and they will help us. So, thank you both for joining us.

How do you ask a question? You have two ways to ask a question. You can raise your hands using the Raise Hand function and wait until I recognize you. Like our in-person meetings, you must begin by stating your last name and academic unit for the record. So, for example, if I was a Senator in the audience, I would stand and say, Seymour, Altoona.

Please speak clearly and slowly as the audio is not always clear on Zoom calls. You can also enter your question into the Zoom Q&A with your name and unit. Just like a regular Senate

meeting, we will not be able to answer everyone's questions, but we will capture the Q&A and pass along questions that haven't been answered.

So how do you vote? In order to get an accurate vote, we'll use Poll Everywhere. If you haven't done so already, please log in for Poll Everywhere. Our first order of business is, as with every meeting, a vote on the minutes from the previous meeting. I also have some interesting news. We are going to be using TallySpace come the new year, and we'll be introducing that at the end of the meeting.

We're going to use Poll Everywhere for all of the official voting today. One of the reasons we're switching to TallySpace is it's considerably less expensive, and we find it to be more secure. And that's important. This system will use your PSU ID. So anyway, we'll get to that later.

A final note-- please be patient. Running a meeting like this has a lot of moving parts, so give us time. I want to welcome everyone and thank you for being here. Your commitment to the Senate is more important than ever. I know that each of us is exhausted and that staying focused and committed to shared governance is harder under these circumstances.

Know that I see you and I value your time commitment and efforts. I'm also here to support you. So please don't hesitate to reach out to me. I want to thank our guests as well for attending and engaging in the work of the Senate, and I want to thank the Senate office for their continuing hard work. Without their support, the Senate could not get its work accomplished. So, let us move on with the Agenda.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Seymour: Item A-- Minutes of the Preceding Meeting. Today, we will use Poll Everywhere to take a present vote before we vote on the minutes. This will allow us to easily know how many Senators are currently present in the meeting without trying to count. And it will also ensure that everyone is able to log into and use Poll Everywhere. So, let's get ready to take a present vote.

Thank you, Josh, for putting the voting instructions in the chat, if anyone needs that to pull it up. So, as you can see, this is what you're going to do. You need to go in to Poll Everywhere and cast your vote. There's just one option-- it's present. And it's A. I'll wait for us to tally. I see a question in Q&A. And this voting is just to attend. So, it's the Senators who are all allowed to vote, and so that's just the attendance.

Anna, how's the vote going?

Anna Butler, Senate Office Staff: The votes are still tallying. I'll let you know when they have finished.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Anna.

Anna Butler: You're welcome. Still tallying, Beth.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Anna. I see there's some confusion about the voting. It's really just so that you can try to use it for the votes that matter as they come along. We are keeping your attendance through other methods. This is just for the quorum and just to make sure we have enough that you're able to use Poll Everywhere.

Anna Butler: OK, looks like we had 145.

Chair Seymour: All right. That is quorum. For all those who don't know, quorum for the Senate is 50. And so, we definitely meet quorum. So, let's move on. The October 20, 2020 Senate Record providing a full transcription of the proceedings of the meeting was sent to the University archives and is posted on the Faculty Senate website.

If there are any corrections or additions to the minutes, please send them to Dawn Blasko at dgb6 at your soonest convenience. So now let's do a real vote. Let's vote on the minutes. May I hear a motion to tentatively accept the minutes?

Keith Shapiro, College of Arts and Architecture: So, moved.

Chair Seymour: Do I have a second?

Bonj Szczygiel, College of Arts and Architecture: Second.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Please join on Poll Everywhere to cast your vote.

Anna Butler: I have those votes tallying now.

Chair Seymour: OK, thank you. To accept the tentative minutes, please press A. Reject, press B. Let's go on ahead and move on. Anna can give us those results later in the meeting

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report

Chair Seymour: Next item B-- Communications to the Senate. The Senate Curriculum Report of November 10, 2020 is posted on the University Faculty Senate website. The 2021-2022 Senate Calendar also can be found in Appendix B.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Seymour: Item C-- Report of Senate Council. Minutes for the November 10, 2020, Senate Council meeting can be found at the end of your Agenda. Included in the Minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President on November 10.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Seymour: Item D-- Announcements by the Chair. I just have a few brief announcements I'd like to make before I spend the majority of my time recognizing a few retirements. As we near the end of the fall semester, I want to thank everyone for their hard work. I know that we are constantly reminded about the uniqueness of the times we are living through. And, well, they are, indeed, unique.

I also know the stress and unusual circumstances have made us grow a bit numb. That's just us trying to manage the situation. We are experiencing massive dislocation and stress in our professional and personal lives, and some of us are having to directly deal with the COVID infection. So, my heart and thoughts go out to everybody who's being personally affected by that right now. It is indeed terrible and stressful.

Yet through it all, we are researching, creating, teaching, and learning in new and challenging environments. We're not only managing to do our jobs but are often doing them exceedingly well. I am proud of our commitment to educating our students and managing to create, heal, and care for others. So, thank you for your endurance and ability to face these challenges.

Now, I want to use the remainder of my time to acknowledge three individuals who are retiring. I want to ask Erin to put up this slide for David Gray first. So, David Gray can't join us today, but I want to take this opportunity to thank him for his service and to wish him well in retirement. He's our Senior Vice President for Finance and Business and will be retiring at the end of the calendar year. Next slide.

He served in his role since February 2012 and oversees numerous offices across Penn State, including Auxiliary and Business Services, Commonwealth Operations, Corporate Controller, Diversity and Inclusion, Enterprise Project Management, Ethics and Compliance, Human

Resources, Information Technology, Internal Audit, Investment Management, Physical Plan, and University Police and Public Safety. He has a very large portfolio.

He also leads financial endowment management and business and administrative activities at all Penn State campuses. As part of this work, Gray is a member of the Penn State Health Board of Directors. Gray is also a member of the President's Council and the Board of Directors for the corporation for Penn State and chairs the Penn State Investment Council. I just wish him well in retirement and thank him for his service.

Next, I would like to recognize Dean Dewey, Barbara Dewey. If I could ask Erin to put that slide up. Barbara Dewey is the Dean of the University Libraries and Scholarly Communications. Next slide. She's been with us for a while. She's a leader of Penn State's information resources enterprise since 2010. She serves as the official representative and advocate for the University Libraries and Penn State Press and oversees approximately 500 full time faculty and staff.

The University Libraries comprised the Paterno Library branch, Libraries at the University Park campus, and libraries at 22 Commonwealth campuses, media technology support services, Penn State Press, and University records management program. I just want to personally thank Barbara for her service to the University. I've enjoyed working with her and getting to know her over the last decade.

I just want to say, I'm not sure if Barbara's here with us right now, but that her calm and thoughtful leadership has been an inspiration to me. She's led the University Libraries and supported the needs of faculty, students, and community members across the Commonwealth. I wish her the best in retirement but will miss her kindness and friendship as a colleague. Erin, do we know if Barbara's here? And I'd like to ask her to say a few words, if she is.

Hi, Barbara. I think you can speak.

Barbara Dewey, Dean of University Libraries and Scholarly Communications: OK. Hello, everybody. Can you hear me?

Chair Seymour: Yep, I can hear you.

Barbara Dewey: I just want to thank everyone at the Faculty Senate. I especially want to acknowledge Beth, who I have been on many, many committees with over the years. We have paired up nicely, I think, Beth.

Chair Seymour: I think so too.

Barbara Dewey: And I certainly want to recognize the University Library's Faculty Senate membership. Our members throughout the years have been significant, I think, to the success of the Faculty Senate and to shared governance. And I, myself, had the opportunity to be on Faculty

Senate at one point. So, thank you, everyone. It's been a great 10 years, and good luck in the future.

Chair Seymour: Thank you very much, Barbara. I want to thank you for your service, and I wish you so well in retirement.

Barbara Dewey: Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Erin, could you put up the slides for Rob Pangborn?

So finally, I want to thank Rob Pangborn, a Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education. Next slide. As Vice President and Dean, Pangborn has played a critical role in Penn State's educational mission by providing vision and leadership in the many areas of undergraduate education across the University, including student orientation and transition programs, undergraduate research experiences, internship and engaged scholarship, cross-campus curricular coherence and integration, general education and learning support services, prior learning assessment, and student academic advisement and success.

The Office of Undergraduate Education he oversees is the home for administrative units addressing these areas as well as the ROTC programs, summer sessions, the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence, the Division of Undergraduate Studies, the Sokolov-Miller Family Financial and Life Skills Center, and the Morgan Academic Center for Student Athletes. Pangborn also provides oversight for the Offices of Undergraduate Admissions and the University Register in Student Aid, serving Penn State's 20 baccalaureate degree granting campuses. Next slide.

We asked a few people to acknowledge his service who had served with the Senate. So former Executive Director Emeritus Susan Utes wrote: "He's very knowledgeable about the University at both the UP and the campuses. During my tenure, he was frequently turned to for advice, support, and consultation. I am privileged to have had opportunities to work with Rob over many years."

We also had a former chair, John Moore, write: "I served for over two years on the general education task force that Rob Pangborn chaired with Ingrid Blood. Because of Rob's intensive seminar and training, everyone became an expert on general education. Rob's guidance was forcing all of us to dig deeper into what and why we thought as we did. We were having to leave our comfort zones.

We were experiencing collective intellectual pain. We were learning as something new. The task force ultimately succeeded because of Rob Pangborn's intellectual leadership. Personally, serving with him was one of my best academic experiences." Next slide.

We've got a younger picture of Rob, but he's served the Senate for 29 years as an officer. He was the secretary from '91 to '92, chair elect '92-'93, chair '93-'94, and immediate past chair '94-'95. Next slide. And he's had a variety of committee service, University planning, committees on committees and rules, joint committee on tenure, undergraduate education, intercollegiate athletics, faculty advisory committee to the dean, and Senate Council.

I want to thank you, Rob, for your service to the University and the Senate. As our colleague shared, your leadership has left its mark on our institution in a variety of ways. It has been a pleasure working with you. Rob, I see you're up here. So, could you make a few comments. Rob?

Rob Pangborn, Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education: Yes. You can hear me?

Chair Seymour: Yep, I can hear you. Can you make a few comments?

Rob Pangborn: Sure. Well, thank you very much, Beth. We go back a long way too, I think. It's hard to believe it was 20 years ago that I was the interim at Penn State-Altoona and got to know you there. And I'm so glad to see you rise in your role at Penn State to the Chair of the Senate. It's just great.

But I do want to say what a privilege it's been to be involved with the Senate these many years. And in a lot of different ways, the experience in the Senate really gives you a feeling for the contribution that faculty can make to the shared governance of the University and the powerful impact that our multi-campus structure has in terms of providing a great education for students and all the other dimensions-- research and outreach that the University provides.

So, it's really been a great experience. I've loved every minute of it. I will say there's probably one thing I won't regret, and that's having to sit in the tight seats in Kern for long meetings on several Tuesdays each semester. But that was a small price to pay for all the things you can learn by participating in the Senate. So, thank you very much.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Rob. And it's been a pleasure working with you. I really hope you enjoy your retirement. It is well deserved.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

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

President Barron Presentation – Meeting the Moment: A Progress Report

Eric Barron, President, Penn State University: Thank you. I appreciate that. So, first of all, thank you for thanking those three incredible individuals. And I am pleased that Sara Thorndike has accepted our offer to be the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business. She will join us in January, but she's already actively working with David for a smooth transition. I think my presentation can be put up. Great. Thanks, Jake.

So, I would like to have a conversation about diversity, inclusion, and equity and the progress we're making. We're about to post, I think Thursday, the Select Commission's report and the student code of conduct report and invite comment. Last week, I presented to the board of trustee's subcommittee on racism, the progress report. And next week, I will report it to the full board.

There are many other instances where I think we will do a deliberate discussion, but I wanted you all to see where we are and to begin the process of getting feedback. There will be an invitation for feedback when this is posted on Thursday on Action Together, the website for diversity, inclusion, and equity. If I can have the next one.

So, we have a long history of working to make our campus more diverse and welcoming-- Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity playing an important University-wide role. I came into office in 2014, describing diversity as not just a moral imperative and an educational imperative, but also a business imperative for Penn State. It's one of the six foundations of this strategic plan. It's articulated a commitment in Penn State's statement on diversity, equity, and inclusion. We have a long history. Next.

But we have a new urgency. And it's difficult to use the word, urgency, because we have situations that spur us to action, but many times, to do something thoughtful takes more time. And my particular feeling is we can't allow the issues we face to fade from view. And we need to continue to press forward even though we have to be thoughtful about what are the best things to do.

But the urgency to act certainly comes from the death of George Floyd and other senseless tragedies-- the Black Lives Matter movement, the focus on the fight for freedom, liberation, and justice. And just to give you an idea-- from June through the present, Penn State's received over 4,000 emails related to diversity, racism, and hate speech, most of which have urged us to action. Next.

So on June 10, I suggested that we should convene a task force to initiate a full review of the student code of conduct, that we should work across the University to initiate mandatory bias training for all employees, that we should support student leaders' requests for required racism and bias coursework, that we should continue to develop improved policies, procedures, and expectations that will increase the hiring and retention of faculty in underrepresented groups, that we would work with the board of trustees on educational and employment equity, that we would re-convene a task force on policing in communities of color to see where our progress was and

what we still must do, that we would prioritize the well-being and safety of the Penn State community. And I named a select Penn State Presidential Commission on Racism, Bias and Community Safety. Next.

So, we have had progress on many of these fronts. The Select Presidential Commission recommendations have been put forth and will be posted on Thursday. The Student Code of Conduct Revisions have been written and will be posted on Thursday. Police and communities of color is reconstituted, and I think some very positive things coming forth. And there's a lot of other University work underway. And so, I would like to review some of this progress and my thoughts and promote some discussion here. Next.

This is to remind you of who the co-chairs were and remind you also that I decided I should have hands off and get the recommendations and have them come from within Penn State, and for me to react to them and also to present these to the board of trustees and get their reaction as well. Essentially, I put myself in the midst of a sandwich, hopefully with pressure on both sides to move forward on these. And so, I selected the chairs. But the chair is based on nominations, and volunteers selected the representation from leaders and scholars at all levels of the University.

OK. Next. So, there are several elements here. One of these is an overarching strategy-- the notion that we should look at this as an enterprise approach. And when I look across the University following what the report says, you really see that there's a tremendous amount of effort. And so, the question is, how well integrated is it? How many times are we learning what others are doing and making sure that we're doing it efficiently and effectively?

And I think we could even say that we can't go to one place and say, here are all the activities that Penn State does. OK, so part of this, and the Select Commission is creating a subgroup to look at exactly where it is, we invest, where it is so we have a comprehensive look at this particular topic. The objective here is to add more coherence, not to sit there and say, OK, we should spend less, because we can be more efficient, but to make sure that we're very efficient in delivering what our objectives are in diversity and inclusion.

And the other part here is that there should be a direct reporting line to the President. And so, this is an important topic. I intend to accept this recommendation, both from the viewpoint of seeing across the board what it is that we're doing, but also to have this be a direct reporting line to the president so that there is at the highest possible level of interest and focus on this topic. Next.

Recommendation one was a truth and reconciliation process. And I would have Beth Seymour comment on the level of debate that this got, because it is an issue that is both important and one that is likely to garner a lot of debate about exactly what truth and reconciliation means. But in my view in looking at this, we really need to learn from the past and the present in terms of policies and practices and use that as a way to issue recommendations that are aimed at healing different communities and doing a much better job.

And whereas this might have a lot of debate to it, I see the potential here, a part of the mission of Penn State-- the educational mission of Penn State. And so, what I'm thinking about is actually commissioning a historical look at-- historians look at the entire history of Penn State in terms of bias and racism.

And I think as a scholarly enterprise that we could learn a great deal. So, this is what I'm thinking about as a first step in addressing this particular recommendation, just to give you an idea of the way that I am thinking about this currently, although I'm expecting to get a lot of feedback on each one of these recommendations. Next.

Recommendation two also, I think, focuses on our mission-- research, teaching, and learning that furthers anti-racist scholarship, pedagogy, and culture. And so, this talks about creating and funding an anti-racist scholarship center, linking all-of our campuses and making it a central part of an education. In my mind, this makes an incredible amount of sense as a recommendation. And I've already discussed with the provost setting aside the funds to make sure that such a center will be successful.

And we're in the midst of debating. And again, the Select Commission has agreed to participate in making a recommendation on exactly how it is we do this-- does this stand on its own? Is it part of an existing structure? Do we seek a leader for this first? How is it that we set this up so that we give it the greatest opportunity for success? But I think this also has a tremendous potential to put Penn State in a leadership position in this space, because I don't personally know of other successful scholarship centers that focus in the way it is that I believe the select commission is proposing. Next.

Recommendation three is the most detailed in terms of the different elements here of how it is that we do onboarding and mentorship of students, staff, faculty, and administration. And so, there are many, many parts of this that I think are extremely important and we should move forward with. I note that in that second blue box, there's curricular requirements, something that our students have been asking for, and that squarely fits within the scope of the Senate.

And I know you're working on it. And this is an extremely important element. But also, we have to recognize that the onboarding and mentorship of faculty is key to the success of this recommendation and key to the success of the University. And I'm really very eager to work hard in partnership with you to change how and what we're doing here in a way that could have a really positive impact. Next.

And I know this is relatively quick. And obviously, the full report will be posted and there'll be an invitation for comment. But this gives you, I think, a good flavor of the recommendations. And these slides from the Select Commission were actually provided to me by the chair so that I could both comments. Well, one of the areas of recommendation four, which most people believe is a weakness, is accountability.

And in my viewpoint, this has a lot of value, is extremely important. It is not clear that we have a very strong accountability. And I think this becomes when there is a direct report to me in diversity, equity, and inclusion, this is an opportunity to have much more leadership and accountability. And that is my intent to have that be a part of that office, unless the advice I get is something that causes me to rethink that. But currently, I believe the success of this depends on having an enterprise-wide approach. Next.

OK, Student Code of Conduct Review Committee. The co-chairs there-- one faculty member and one undergraduate. Again, I selected the chairs and asked them to develop their own committee based on volunteers and nominations. Next. It was a majority student committee. I think you went back one. OK.

Convened in mid-July, Action Together website invited ideas. They focused on promoting equity and removing ambiguous language throughout the code. And the committee benchmarked Penn State's Student Code of Conduct against other codes within the Big Ten. Next.

So, they had a number of major recommendations. One is to include a mandatory module for students about the Code of Conduct-- have all students when they come on onboard, that they understand what the code is about and what it's for, because I think most people realize that most students do not. Reimagine and modify substantial University interests to expand the scope for off-campus conduct.

If off-campus behavior is having a substantial impact on the University, then the University has more interest in that conduct. Include acts of bias as a code violation. I would be quite frank-- this is one of the areas for which there is some debate and discussion, as this Code of Conduct, which will be posted exactly the way the committee did it, has then been examined by Student Affairs and our general counsel's office to make sure that it is functional and can be implemented and wouldn't get us into any legal trouble.

And so, this notion of a code violation because of bias or an amplifying factor in a code violation is a topic of some discussion. The Code of Conduct should be aligned with other policies within the University. We should have more equitable conduct procedures for students. This includes, because hate speech is protected speech in many instances, a restorative justice practice that is volunteer that would allow students who act in that way to understand the implications and the impact of what their speech was in a restorative way.

Diversify staff and volunteers for their Office of Student Conduct and incorporate explicit public reporting requirements to improve transparency. This is a case where many students will sit there and say, well, I don't know why I would report that or what difference it makes. They don't do anything anyway. Because as an educational institution, we protect individuals.

We do this in a lot of other things, including Student Code of Conduct along these lines. But that doesn't stop us from providing summaries per semester of a number of reports and actions by the

committee that protects the individual but demonstrates that we as an institution take very serious the violations of the Student Code of Conduct. Next.

OK, so Student Affairs and general Council review has been completed with a green light with some changes to the language for implementation. And there has been discussion with that committee on some of those changes. The intent is to adopt this new code for the spring semester and test its effectiveness with our students and their behavior, although some parts of it, like the module, will not be ready. And the goal here is to ensure that Penn State values are part of and reflected by the Student Code of Conduct. Next.

The Task Force on Policing Communities of Color-- Emil Cunningham is the chair. There is broad representation. This crosses our community. It's not just Penn State. Next.

First organized in 2015 with improving the relationship between law enforcement and underrepresented racial and ethnic minority communities, it was reconvened and charged by David Gray and Tom Fountaine from the Bureau on October 7. Next. The overview of the current focus is to understand the state of affairs related to policing in communities of color, identifying accomplishments from the previous reports, identifying areas that still need to be addressed, and offering recommendations for future work that might lie ahead for the task force. Next.

Initial steps and outreach-- obtain a consistent holistic update from local municipalities and Penn State University Park on progress, and review and reflect on what data from all of those areas suggests regarding the current climate. Engage in benchmarking and look at the literature of scholarship concerning what are the current best practices to help position this task force to provide new and updated recommendations. And so, they're in the process of requesting information from local municipalities and UP to inform the work. Next.

We've appointed Iris Richardson as the department's first Director of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. And I think you may have heard that we committed to purchase body cameras for all police officers at 22 campuses. This was actually a budget request that is about a year old. And as we were looking at the budget going forward, we were in the process of making the decision to do this, started to worry about what the issues were with the pandemic in terms of the budget, and decided that the budget request was there, and it was too important for us to continue, so we committed to the purchase of body cameras. So, these are two developments that have occurred in this process since the task force from the University side of things. Next.

The University Police and public safety initiatives are also important. They sit outside of the task force. This is our own police force taking the steps to have transparency and appropriate policies. So, I have had the opportunity to look at their web page that they have developed on this. It has an incredible amount of transparency. You can go see the policies of our police force. You can see what their training is like. For the first time, you can see statistics on arrests and a lot of other characteristics.

This may prompt some difficult questions and discussions, but this is a commitment by our police force to be incredibly transparent. And if the data leads them to a decision because there is any view of bias or racism that's apparent, they can take action. They also committed to the 8 Can't Wait recommendations that are items like no chokeholds.

And so, I'm quite proud of the fact that they didn't stop and come to the administration and say, what would you like us to do in this space? But instead, they stepped up and said, these make sense, and we're going to commit ourselves to them. Next. I know I'm taking a lot of time, Beth, so hopefully I can just finish the last part of it here relatively quickly. Other actions-- three-part livestream series, equal opportunity planning committee as providing the seed funding for innovative pilot programs promoting equity. So, these are some very positive steps. Next.

The board created an oversight task force on racism, bias, and community safety led by Trustee Brandon Short. This is a group that I presented to just the same way that I'm presenting this discussion. The board has also set a goal of at least 50% underrepresented groups on the board by 2025. And they've repurposed the standing compensation committee as the Equity and Human Resources Committee with a focus on advancing equity, inclusion, and diversity at Penn State. So, these are positive steps by our board to commit the same way in which the University is committing. Next.

Philanthropy is an important part of it, we've set up a program for educational equity scholarships with a matching program. I won't go through the details that are sitting here. I know this is recorded, so you'll be able to look at this. But in just about three months, we ended up with a total impact of committed gifts of \$25 million in equity scholarships at Penn State. And to go from a point of \$0 to \$25 million, this is a huge impact in terms of our potential to promote the success of our student population. Next.

This just gives you a list of the ones for people that University wide scholarships matched millennium scholars matched Bunton-Waller scholars matched scholarships in a unit or matched a grad scholarship focused on educational equity-- significant impact here in a very short period of time. I believe that it is a message from our donors that support our efforts in racism, bias and equity. Next.

There are a number of examples of scholarly work in these areas-- College of Liberal Arts cluster hires, Clinical and Translational Science Institute, arts events at the Center for Performing Arts and the Palmer Museum of Art, McCourtney Institute for Democracy-- so all of these are areas for which parts of our University are taking steps outside of these efforts that were announced on June 10. Next. University Faculty Senate passed landmark legislation to update hiring. You know this, but it's a significant step.

And we also have some significant new hires-- an Assistant Vice President for Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging in the Office of Human Resources, and new associate deans for diversity, equity, and inclusion hired or about to be hired in colleges. Next. This is the website--

ActionTogether.PSU.edu. There are a couple of extra slides there, but I think this is a good place to end because it was largely a summary.

We took this pass on June 10. I think we've made significant progress due to the hard work of these task groups. In this Action Together website, you'll see the reports posted on Thursday and invitation for comment. And I will be working hard to present this to the board and elsewhere and get as much feedback as I work to implement many of the recommendations that come from these two groups and from the other groups that are still working. And so, Beth, thank you for letting me take extra time here to do this. And I welcome any kind of discussion if that's possible in this format.

Chair Seymour: It is. Thank you, President Barron. Thank you for those comments. Just to remind everyone, if you want to ask a question, post a question in Q&A. Remember to mention your name and your unit. Also, you can raise your hand. Bonj is helping me with the Q&A.

And just to remind everyone, you need to be a Senator or get a Senator to ask a question for you if you've not sought approval beforehand for the floor. Let's go with the Q&A first. We're going to alternate back and forth. But the Q&A questions were there first, so can we do one of the Q&A first, Bonj?

Bonj Szczygiel: Thanks, Beth. And I'll choose one that is directly related to President Barron's presentation. This is from Rena Kass, Hershey Medical. Would there be any benefit from gaining input or partnering with any historically Black College or University and/or national organization such as ACLU to help us to be a leader in this area?

President Barron: Yeah, I do think there is potential. I'm hoping that even some of the analysis of what we're currently doing reveals a number of programs that are directly related to what that question is. I know that several colleges and departments have very specific programs with HBCUs and are likely to be part of a discussion about whether or not we have potential to go far beyond what those individual partnerships are with different campuses. So, I think that does make sense.

Chair Seymour: I'd like to-- so, Akash, if you can help me, I'd like to recognize Julio Palma. So, if you could unmute him for me, please.

Julio Palma, Penn State Fayette: Yes. Julio Palma, Penn State Fayette. My question is, we know that there is some systematic issues when it comes to inequalities, bias, racism, sexism. So that happens in many workplaces. And unfortunately, academics is not an exception.

So, I see many recommendations that are in the report, I agree with them. But my question is, there are some inequalities and disparities in salaries and workloads when it comes to minority faculty, people of color faculty, and women faculty. So, I think transparency is key. I would like

to have an analysis, a transparent report of those disparities and a commitment from the administration to get rid of these inequalities within our University.

I actually think this will help the retention of faculty, of a diverse faculty, and also it will help the recruitment of a diverse staff of faculty and students. I think it would put Penn State in a leadership position. So, has this been considered to get rid of the salary and workload disparities with diverse faculty in Penn State University?

President Barron: So, we actually spend quite a bit of time analyzing data all across the University to look for disparities and to raise questions if we do see it. And we've had some discussion in the past about whether or not we're viewed as a trusted source of the answer to the question about not seeing except in cases where, actually, statistically it's hard to make comments, for which there might be such a situation.

We've wondered whether we're really viewed as a trusted partner. And I actually suggested to the Senate that we could have something equivalent to the Group of 8 in the US Congress that gets to share intelligence in a way that we could be much more transparent of saying, OK, yep, a group has looked at this, and the data is open-- although we're not going to put charts out there where someone says, oh, that's me, look how I sit compared to someone else, but to assure people that we pay a great deal of attention to this. And I'm still open to such an idea.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Bonj. Do we have a question from Q&A?

Bonj Szczygiel: We do. This one is from Annie Taylor at the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences. With regard to the revised Student Code of Conduct, were any provisions put in to protect faculty and staff from unacceptable student conduct toward them? I know several cases in the past few years where instructors were deeply impacted by a student bullying them in their course, each was in an online environment, and where those instructors felt there was almost no protection for them in those cases. One of them stopped teaching altogether because of what they experienced.

President Barron: Yeah. So, I don't know about whether it says explicitly in that way. But I can't imagine that that isn't a violation of the Student Code of Conduct for which a student reported would go through that process.

Chair Seymour: All right. I see a hand raised is by Greg Shearer. So, if someone could unmute him.

Greg, can you speak?

Greg Shearer, College of Health and Human Development: There we go. I got it.

Chair Seymour: OK, good.

Greg Shearer: I just wanted to point out that this conversation is occurring actually at the same time, and I wanted to extend my thanks to you and the Provost, President Barron, that we were actually called out this month for our commitment to academic freedom and helping faculty navigate themselves and some of the organizations doing that this month were the Fire and Heterodox Academy, which is really exciting to see us make that commitment, which I think matches well to what you've just been talking about. So, thank you, to start with.

It's exciting to hear you talk about how we're responding to these important social issues. But some of what you mention, and I can't go through it all, but the bias classes and the panels-- they sound remarkably anti-libertarian. And my concern is that we are a community that really lacks a lot of viewpoint diversity.

And I'm concerned that regardless of our initial intent, it will descend into a liberal thought police panel. And I'm asking, are we doing things to ensure this doesn't happen? And maybe we could vet some of these things with organizations like Fire or Heterodox Academy-- those aren't the only ones. But what are we doing to ensure that that doesn't happen?

President Barron: So, I think that's an interesting point. When it turns to things like the coursework, this is largely up to you and a debate by the Senate. So, whatever the valves there that you can turn or allow relief of pressure from any particular directions, I'm assuming that it's through the intense and detailed debate within the Senate to make sure that we're doing this in the best possible way that promotes our mission as an educational institution.

I do think probably no matter where you sit in this space, there will be people that believe you lean one way or the other way too far. That seems to be typical. But I'm committed to taking this on as an educational mission in which we see our role as one that promotes thoughtful discussion and education in this mode and not some specific leaning that might occur. But this really depends on the Senate in terms of how it is that they develop this part of the educational enterprise.

Chair Seymour: Bonj, do we have any questions in Q&A?

Bonj Szczygiel: We do. We've got another one from Angela Linse – Undergraduate Education. Would it be possible for the University to commit to posting all positions in diverse issues in higher education?

President Barron: We certainly could contemplate this. I visited their office and actually had a discussion with them on how the University could have a stronger interaction and that many of the things that we're doing could find a home within that outlet. And I know a lot of groups do post. So I don't know whether it works to have a rule, but certainly to promote posting it in diverse issues in higher education makes sense to me.

Chair Seymour: Well, let's take two more questions. We have one hand raised-- Sarah Townsend. Could you unmute her?

Sarah Townsend, College of the Liberal Arts: Hi, yes, thank you. Many of these recommendations sound very good. As you mentioned, what happens here at Penn State obviously is connected to broader social issues. And I think certainly in terms of access to education at the University and also in terms of hiring a diverse faculty, part of the problem begins much earlier in primary education and racial disparities in terms of access to education and quality of education, funding, et cetera.

And so, I was just wondering, the University has lots of partnerships with business, et cetera-- lots of initiatives to help stimulate small businesses. Does it have similar kind of partnerships or efforts to address issues of racial and class disparities starting at the primary level? Because it certainly seems to me like addressing some of those issues is important to us.

President Barron: Yes. Certainly, I think the first place to think about there in that space, but not the only, is the College of Education for which there are, I think, a number of significant efforts. There are a lot of other partnerships that are in the same vein. And there are programs like Raise Me which are intended to promote a college-ready path in school districts that are underrepresented, either in an urban environment or a rural environment. And so, although I don't think we take a University-wide stance on such issues, we certainly do from a departmental perspective and from a viewpoint of recruiting and enabling students, particularly in Pennsylvania.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Bonj, let's take the final one from Q&A.

Bonj Szczygiel: This is from Susan Fredericks at Brandywine. How long will you be accepting feedback on the report and recommendations? What would be the best way for faculty and staff to get back to you with comments?

President Barron: So, when these are posted on Action Together, there will be a mechanism by which people can comment. And then I've assigned a staff person from my office who will collate all of these, provide them to the co-chairs, and to provide them to me so that we get a good sense of all of the different comments and recommendations.

And so that probably is the very best way, because then it will be incorporated with other comments, but it won't just be my office that sees it. It will also be that the co-chair. So, this gives it the greatest opportunity to have a significant impact, I believe. And you will see more and more things emerge as we get this feedback, that we start to commit ourselves to accomplishing a lot of the recommendations that are coming from the task group.

Chair Seymour: And if I could just add-- I can at least comment on the Select Commission on Racism, Bias, and Community Safety. And we're going to be creating subcommittees that are

going to be working on the various recommendations. And so please keep an eye out for that. We'll be asking for volunteers for that subcommittee because we really want to connect it across the University and to get people involved in that work. So, thank you. Thank you, President Barron. Thank you.

President Barron: No, thank you.

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

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

Provost Jones Presentation - COVID-19 Operations Update and Spring 2021 Objectives

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: Thanks very much, Beth. And, Erin, if you can pop up my presentation, please. All right. Thanks very much, Erin. And I'll count on you to advance the slides. Just an apology in advance-- because Erin is controlling this, I may be a little wordy, because I can't move my cursor around and point to things. So please stay with me as I try to navigate some of these slides.

I thought I'd take a few minutes to just give you update on COVID and all things COVID-- a bit of a reflection on the fall, where we are now, how the return home process went, and then give you a little bit of insight as to what we are thinking for the spring semester that awaits us.

Just to be clear, we don't have a definitive plan yet announced, but I wanted to share with you at least our objectives for the spring and some of our thinking and where we are in the process. So next slide, Erin, please. So, these are the topics I'm going to cover in this presentation.

Just a snapshot retrospective looking back at the fall and how we did in terms of numbers, a specific focus on the return home effort, where we are now until the end of the year, and then objectives for Spring 2021, as I said. Next. So, here's key data, and this is through November 19. That was Thursday the week before-- so one week before Thanksgiving. And that seemed to be an appropriate period to report out, because we set that as a target back in the summer for us to meet and for us to end in-person instruction at campus locations.

So, through the period of August through November 19, you can see we did almost 135,000 tests, including 97,000 of them Vault tests, both pre-arrival and pre-departure testing. I'm not sure if any of you here had an opportunity to see how this works set up at University Park in the Bryce Jordan Center, and it was an extraordinary effort that was set up there to move about 17,000-odd students through that space in a period of several days.

In total over the fall semester, we had a little over 4,500 positive cases among our students. As of November 19, 318, were active meaning they had tested positive within the preceding 10-day period. And again, as of November 19, 31 in quarantine, 48 in isolation. Across all of our other campuses, the numbers were considerably lower in aggregate-- almost 550 confirmed student cases.

And there is the data on the departure tests-- almost 18,000 tests over an eight-day period, contact tracing throughout the semester, 12,000 interactions that were identified students contacted and asked to test and be quarantined. And we've stood up a call center. And in the first five weeks of that effort, almost 1,000 calls with a good proportion of them coming in the week before departure are generally associated with the logistics for the return home safely program. Next.

We, of course, have been trying to capture much of these data in our dashboard. And this is a vehicle that we use to share data broadly. And its format evolved considerably over time as we got feedback and learned more. So, some of the numbers that I just reported are shown in this dashboard. This is the one you can see-- the grayed areas.

This is students at University Park. And you can go to, of course, any of the campuses and click student or employee for more detailed data. You can see from the first bar chart there, the number of positive cases per week we went through a surge in September, as we expected. Our goal was to manage that surge so that it didn't continue to increase and drive the numbers lower in the remainder of the semester.

And this figure indicates that we were reasonably successful at doing so. The number of tests performed by week is shown in the lower bar chart. The dark blue component of each figure is the random testing component. And the lighter blue is the on-demand testing-- this was students voluntarily showing up for testing. The large jump in the last bar there, of course, is associated with the departure testing.

These are data that were in the dashboard a week ago. So, they're out of date today. A new dashboard is being published and reflect much lower numbers, as you would expect over Thanksgiving week. This is a zoom-in on the tests performed on University Park students-- so that lower bar in the previous figure. And again, you can see the large uptick in testing in the week before Thanksgiving.

I will point out that the on-demand testing, it was an important part of the strategy in addition to the random testing. These were students who showed up to be tested because they were either informed or were aware personally that they had been in close contact with somebody who was positive for coronavirus. And so, whether it was through the formal contact tracing process or just the ad hoc process that students adopted to come forward when they were concerned about exposure, that generated quite a bit of activity and traffic for us.

And that's all good, because the more students who showed up without being told to do so, the better in our view. Next slide. This shows positive cases by week. It's another zoom-in on now the upper bar chart in the dashboard presentation. You can see the surge quite clearly that happened through those first three weeks of September, and then we saw a reasonably steady decline until we're in the range of 200 plus or minus positive cases per week for the last six weeks or so of the semester.

Again, the number of positives that we captured through the on-demand testing is important. This is students who were either identified through contact tracing or showing up because they were concerned that they had had exposure. And this was a very important mechanism that worked well for us to identify students who had been exposed and were, in fact, infected. Next.

Quarantine and isolation data-- this was one of our important considerations in planning for the fall. We knew that we had limited capacity-- the number in parens in the first sub-bullet of 400 was our nominal capacity. We did have surge capacity available to other facilities within, in particular, University Park, and also arrangements with local hotels if we, indeed, needed additional space.

You can see that at UP, we ranged from up to 45% of that capacity used at any one time, and at the Commonwealth campuses, up to 38% of the capacity that was available. So, we did well there. This refers to on-campus quarantine capacity. We know that a large number of students quarantined in their apartments off the campus proper.

As of just the day before November 20, we were at 11% of capacity at University Park and 14% at the Commonwealth campuses. And there's a listing there of the campuses that were impacted through this. Next slide. There's a lot of numbers here-- we will make this presentation available so you can look at these at your leisure. I won't go through them all.

But you can see that we had almost 18,000 test appointments scheduled. The vast majority of them were at University Park. And what we determined from that was 325 positive cases, of which 237 were at UP, that's a positivity rate a little under 2%, which actually is quite consistent with the inferred prevalence that we had been estimating through the surveillance testing program in the last six weeks of the semester.

So that was a good verification, that that surveillance and inference process seemed to be working reasonably well. There's a lot of richness in these data we're at. We're still looking at it, and there'll be more results available, of course, as we process the last bits of data. Overall, the return home process, which was a pretty intense effort, worked quite well. Students were very responsive and responsible.

I spent some time at the Bryce Jordan Center, as did the president and senior vice president for finance and business-- I was really struck with the demeanor of the students. They were very

positive. They were in there doing the right thing for the right reasons, were in very good spirits. So, we were really very pleased with how that went.

And just tremendous kudos to Kelly Wolgast and her team who pulled this off-- did that pivot in the last week, got all of these tests done, and notifications out to students in a very short time period. So, we're quite pleased and learned a lot from that effort. Next.

Just a little bit of housekeeping for the rest of the year through to the holiday period. Of course, Pennsylvania's guidance keeps evolving. There was new guidance issued just on November 17-- just a couple of days before all our students were scheduled to go home. That created a little bit of a wrinkle for us, and probably for many of you who are listening.

We're planning on continuing our campus operation through December 23. Opt-in testing availability will continue to be there for anybody who needs it, as will access to campus facilities. We have a detailed plan to keep facilities accessible even though all of our instruction is now in remote mode.

The call center continues to be up and running. Anyone who has questions about anything can call. Just go to the virus info site for the number for support. And those calls continue to come in. The next bullet about Salesforce is we've approved an investment in the Salesforce platform to help us better manage the data.

The IT team and our data folks did an amazing job basically starting from scratch back in August to pull together a means of keeping track of all of the data. We had data coming from different vendors, from the registrar's office, from Lion Path, from here, from there. And keeping track of it all and reporting that was a pretty complex process.

Salesforce offers us the opportunity to do much better management of the testing and contact tracing, not to mention the reporting process. So, we're excited to make that investment. And that will certainly facilitate the process. We decided to apply for CLIA certification for the TASC-- the Testing and Surveillance Center. The great news I can share with you is just today, actually this morning-- we got an electronic copy of the provisional certification of the TASC Lab, which is very important because it means now we will be able to actually provide individual diagnoses out of the TASC facility, which we were not able to do in the fall.

And so, this is just a significant boost to us and significant opportunity to improve our operations. And of course, I think as many of you are aware, turnaround times has always been a bit of an issue. Back in the beginning of the fall, they were the horror stories of some turnaround times being seven to 10 days which, of course, renders the test results practically useless.

We got down fairly consistently with Vault to be less than a 48-hour turnaround. That was pretty good. But our ability to really manage virus spread at campus locations really critically depends

on being able to identify people who test positive very quickly. And so, we are making a major priority for the spring having rapid test capability available at all campus locations.

And we're in negotiations now with a vendor to provide that testing. The one comment worth making is that a rapid test alone needs a confirmatory PCR test. And so, our rapid test approach will be backed up by the Now CLIA-certified TASC process. Next slide.

Just wanted to share with you what our objectives were or are for the spring. This is an expanded list of what we had as objectives for the fall. Just a reminder-- the core objectives for the fall were obviously prioritizing health and safety of our communities and the communities in which we live and work, first.

Second, ensuring that we had sufficient quarantine and isolation capacity to manage growth in the virus at campus locations. And third, really ensuring that we did not overwhelm local medical or health infrastructure. So those were our core goals or objectives for the fall. We've expanded upon those.

Number one, obviously, is still prioritizing health and safety of our campus communities and our home communities. Second, not overwhelming local medical and health infrastructures. And I think many of you are aware that right now, this is a big challenge across Pennsylvania and, indeed, across the nation-- not that we are doing it, but that it is happening without us. And so, this is something about which we must be very mindful.

Then we put some additional objectives in. First, given everything that we learned through the fall, we really want to place a premium on minimizing the number of positive, returning, and initial student cases through pre-arrival and immediate post-arrival testing. We learned in the fall that the pre-arrival testing strategy was really, really important for us to get off on a good vector.

We learned a lot. We're going to do it better. It's going to be more comprehensive, and, we think, more effective. So, this, again, is a key objective for us. Next slide. Number four really places a premium on improving all of our processes to improve detection and reduction and management of the number of positive student cases.

So clearly, this is where our ability to do rapid testing now gives us a significant advantage over where we were at the beginning of the fall where that simply wasn't available. To be able to get a test result back to a student within 30 minutes, basically while they wait, is really important for us to be able to minimize the number of positive cases.

Obviously, continuing to provide adequate quarantine and isolation capacity, minimizing delays, transitioning students in and out of that space, and improve the experience. This shouldn't feel like you're being sentenced to 10 or 14 days in jail. And I think our staff did a remarkable job here, but we're looking for ways to make this a better experience for students.

Obviously, support, faculty, and staff in their return to workplace activities and testing needs. And number 7 is really important. Everything that we did last fall and need to continue to think about is, how can we continue to deliver a high-quality Penn State experience and engage our students? When we invite students back to the campus and say that we are going to provide a residential experience, we better put our money where our mouth is and make sure that we are doing that. And so, number 7 is important as well-- just emphasizing the quality of the experience. Next.

Some of the things that we're thinking about for the spring-- and again, I'm keeping these deliberately generic at this point, because there are lots of t's to cross and i's to dot. And we will plan on making a formal announcement in a few weeks. Required pre-arrival testing for all students, on-arrival rapid testing as a backup strategy.

When students are back, within the first two weeks of arrival, we'll retest everybody just to catch the ones that may have slipped through the cracks. So that'll be comprehensive testing with rapid testing of every student again. And then now with our CLIA-certified laboratory, we'll continue the surveillance and really what I would call strategic screening of critical areas where we might see a hotspot occur. And now we have the capacity to go with the CLIA certification up to 2% per day with that surveillance program.

We will continue walk-up capabilities emphasizing the rapid testing with the PCR confirmatory tests. And then, really important bullet, which I'm sure is on a lot of people's minds right now-- we have to remain flexible for possible delay or shift due to changing public health conditions and guidelines. It doesn't take rocket science. You know, we know the situation in the country and in the region and in the Commonwealth is just not great right now. And we are keeping a very careful eye on the trajectory.

And we need to be prepared to be responsive as appropriate to make sure that we're doing the right thing and, of course, following the guidance that comes out of burg. Next. I'll make this presentation available. There's not a lot of point in going through these numbers, there's just too many here.

But this is just a summary chart that shows all of the cases for employees and students at all campus locations for the semester so you get a sense of what the numbers and the distribution of the numbers are. And you can see that obviously the biggest numbers were at University Park, but there were a few other campuses, Altoona in particular, and Behrend, where we had flare-ups and some double-digit numbers at a handful of other campuses.

But all in all, at most campus locations, the impacts were relatively minor. And all credit to those campuses for managing their situation really very, very well. Next. That's it. Thank you, Beth. And happy to take any questions, of course.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Nick. Let me go to Bonj first with one of the questions on Q&A.

Bonj Szczygiel: Sure. Provost Jones, this is an issue, I suppose, more than a question from Simmons in the College of Communications. My constituent, Michelle Rodino-Colocino, President of Penn State's American Association of University Professors, raises this issue for the administration. Quote, "we would like to see the 12-month language rescinded from faculty contracts. The language that stipulates the University can terminate faculty appointments before the appointment expires with 12 weeks' notice. That is not OK by National AAUP standards, and it is not OK with faculty. Tenured and tenure track stand with fixed term faculty in wanting to see this removed," end of quote.

Provost Jones: Thank you. We've had a lot of discussion on this topic, as you all know. I've spoken to it. President Barron has spoken to it. The intent of the language was to provide more flexibility for the Chancellors, not in ending contracts early, but in making contracts. We understand that there's been a lot of concern around this. There is a group that is working on the language. Kathy Bieschke is working with some folks from the Senate to see if we can come up with revisions to that language that make sense.

If we are not successful, it is likely then ultimately that the language will be removed. I hope that is not the case, because I am concerned about the impacts that may have.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Provost Jones. Rosemary Jolly has her hand raised. If we could unmute her.

Rosemary Jolly, College of the Liberal Arts: I should be unmuted at this point.

Chair Seymour: You are.

Rosemary Jolly: OK, Jolly, Liberal Arts. Provost Nick, I just want to ask you about something that has been troubling me about the testing, which is that the-- and this is not given in the light of an attack, this is more like in the area of I really think this needs to be seriously improved-- which is that if you are non-symptomatic and you don't turn up because you're ill, there is no contact tracing follow-up.

And I just think that that's really not a good idea. So, for example, if you are called in for asymptomatic testing and you call in that day, whether it be because you've got a cold or you don't know if you have COVID or you just don't feel well, there is no follow-up. So, I don't know how that's dealt with in the statistics.

And I'm just convinced that the ethics of public health testing require somebody to follow up with that person to make sure that they have indeed gone to avail themselves of medical services if they have, indeed, continued to be ill. And it would also be, obvious, to create much more accuracy in the statistics.

Provost Jones: So, I'm not quite sure what you're referring to, Rose, but I appreciate you bringing that issue up. Absolutely the priority always is-- priority one, you saw it in the list of objectives, is the health and safety of our faculty, staff, and students. So, if somebody was called in for random surveillance testing and they appeared to be symptomatic or reported that they were not feeling well, we would pull them out of the random pool and direct them to University health services so that they could be handled differently.

So that was absolutely done. And then the data, that, of course, creates a potential bias in the surveillance data, that we were aware of and would correct for in all of our reporting.

Rosemary Jolly: I've heard from faculty, at least three of us now-- I wasn't personally involved-- I did get in touch with the professional who runs the testing center about this, but I was told that they wouldn't do it because it was quote unquote, "a population level study." But this has been where faculty have not gone in on the day they were called in because they didn't feel well and there was no follow-up.

Provost Jones: I'm surprised there wasn't follow-up, Rose. I would need to know the specific people and the circumstances. That's the only way we can get to the bottom of this. Because I know that we were pretty relentless in following up with people when they were sent invitations to make an appointment if people didn't make appointments or didn't follow up on appointments. We were following up on them.

I've heard some of these stories. And in a few instances, we've gotten a little bit more detail and been able to track them down-- or track the stories down. And often, there is more to the story than meets the eye. There is an explanation. So--

Rosemary Jolly: I'll get back to you on that, because I don't think we have the time.

Provost Jones: That'd be great.

Rosemary Jolly: Yeah. cold and ill and weren't followed up on. So, I'll get back details to you, because it's really in the spirit of going forward with better contact tracing.

Provost Jones: Yeah. Well, it is certainly our intention to do that, Rose. And so, in these instances if that didn't happen, then that is clearly a gap we need to address. But it is certainly our intention that the health of individuals-- faculty, staff, and students-- has always been our highest priority. And people who are not well for whatever reason, if we're aware of it, we certainly support and encourage them to get the help that they need.

Rosemary Jolly: Thank you. I'll follow up.

Provost Jones: Thanks, Rose.

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

Bonj Szczygiel: We have a few. This is a pre-departure question-- from Tallman in Libraries-- what was the University Park on-campus student population? 15,000 students getting tested on departure sounds good, but what percentage is that of the total?

Provost Jones: Yeah, well, we don't know. And they weren't just on-campus students, of course. They were students who were living in State College area. And we have a reasonable estimate of, obviously, of who was living on campus based on who was in the residence halls. But we don't have a good sense of who was actually in the broader State College community.

We've tried to get some insights into that. But the data are a little fuzzy and, of course, change quite quickly from week to week-- certainly as the situation started to deteriorate nationally within the several weeks leading up to November 20. We expect that there were a number of students who probably left town in advance of November 20.

So, we don't have a good sense, Nathan. But Kelly and I were talking about this earlier today-- if we just put a stake in the ground and assume that normally we have 45,000 plus or minus students in and around University Park, and if we map from what we observed in the residence halls and apply a factor of 0.7 to that, what is that, 32,000 students. So, 15,000, 16,000 students is probably about half of the students who were in the community through the fall semester.

It may have been a slightly higher proportion of those who were present during that last week of the semester. It's just really hard to tell. But it's somewhere in the middle percentages there, I would think. So, if I had to range it, I'd say a 40% to 60% range. I'm just making those numbers up. I really don't have good data to support them, but that's just my sense based on the inferential data we have.

Chair Seymour: Bonj, do we have another question? You're muted, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: Folkers from York campus. If you look at our campus' dashboard information, we show what just one positive COVID case that took place back in September. However, I know of at least three recent cases of York staff and students testing positive locally, but they do not exist within University reporting. Are there any plans for trying to more completely capture COVID cases on the campuses during the upcoming spring semester?

Provost Jones: Well, yes, certainly. All through the fall, we tried to improve our processes. Again, we're well aware that people were being tested outside the system. And if they were tested outside the University system, then it was hard for us to keep track of them unless they took it upon themselves to report to us so we could include them in our numbers.

Some of that, we were able to do indirectly. Kelly had maintained good contacts with Department of Health and other testing providers, certainly in State College area. So, we had a sense of how much leakage there was in the system. My recollection is that it wasn't a lot. But there was some, to be sure. And it may be even more pronounced at some campus locations.

It certainly is a problem if the positives were determined as a result of our testing and then we didn't report them. I'd actually be surprised if that was happening, but, of course, can't completely rule it out. Moving forward, as I indicated in the presentation, we're using Salesforce, which will provide much more robust ability for us to be able to manage every part of this process, from scheduling testing, to contact tracing, to reporting.

And so, I think we will do better. But we know that at some locations, there was leakage. And some of it probably were cases where we could have done better. Others were cases where we simply just did not know.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Bonj, can we keep going with Q&A?

Bonj Szczygiel: Sure. We've got Sharp from the Graduate and Professional Student Association at U Park. Provost Jones, could you please describe the First Day Complete program? And then second, please describe why the First Day Complete is the best program for Penn State students. And if we don't think it is the best program, why are we as a University pursuing it?

And that was followed up by Tallman from Libraries who writes, this topic really needs broad Senate consultation. There are real detractors for the First Day Complete program.

Provost Jones: So, the First Day Complete program is an initiative that the University has been working on for a couple of years now. There was a bit of a pause in the process about maybe a year ago for two reasons. One was some of the initial concepts that were being proposed didn't seem especially workable. And then, of course, there was COVID, which delayed it.

We were approaching a deadline, which meant that if we wanted to get this initiative piloted next fall, we need to make a decision fairly quickly. And so that's what brought forward that. What First Day Complete it is a program with Barnes and Noble where students pay a certain amount per credit and then have all the textbooks that they need made available to them.

It is a process that is done through opt-out. So, everybody is signed up for the program, but they are able to opt out, and no penalty in doing that. Our assessment and analysis of the data shows that this for many students could be the equivalent of-- it's not a reduction in tuition, but just to put an order of magnitude on it, it could amount to an effective tuition decrease or cost of attendance decrease of 5% of tuition. So, it's not an insubstantial number.

We have come to understand that this had not, perhaps, been discussed or presented quite as broadly as we would like. We're slowing up the process. We may miss the window to implement this in the coming fall. But there are clearly some important constituencies that need to be involved.

I just would like to clarify that the University did not make a decision to adopt this as a University program. The only decision that was made was to look into piloting this program at a

couple of locations where the faculty were supportive of the initiative. So, to respond specifically to the question about whether this is the best program or not, we don't know. That was really going to be the purpose of the pilot was to see with data from a couple of campus locations whether this really worked well, number one, and number two, really had the positive financial impact on our students that we predicted.

And so, it was very much no across the board decision made, other than to take a look at this and try to gather some data by piloting it at a couple of willing campuses. It appears that there is a lot of concern emerged about the program where we've slowed it up. And we will be having broader discussion with Senate and other groups before proceeding.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Provost Jones.

Provost Jones: And we may not proceed. If there is resistance to it or people really just don't like it, then we do not have to proceed with it. But I do urge everybody to understand what the nature of the program is and how it works before reaching a conclusion about it, because it really does stand to benefit our students greatly vis-a-vis cost of attendance.

Bonj Szczygiel: Another question from Geoff Scott, Law School. Any insights into the interrelationship of leisure days or wellness days and snow days? With the loss of days of instruction to leisure days, it is difficult to accommodate loss of days to weather. Would it be possible to eliminate cancellation on snow days and require more remote teaching on those days?

Provost Jones: Yeah. So, we've been working very hard on that, and if Kathy Bieschke's on, she can maybe help me clarify exactly where we are in this process. We've got many threads that we're monitoring right now. But there is pre-existing Senate policy that does govern this.

And so, we're trying to be very respectful of that. But, Kathy, I see you raised your hand. If that's OK, Beth, can Kathy speak to this? She's probably more probably to the latest and greatest details on this than I am.

Chair Seymour: She can. Kathy, you've got it now.

Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs: Yes, I'm unmuted. So, what we are doing is based on the Senate policy, and I want to credit Yvonne and Abby Diehl and others-- Shelli Stine-- we've come up with ways of thinking about snow days so that it's consistent with the Senate policy but still provides instructors opportunities to offer instruction. So, for COVID in-person classes, instructors can cancel or offer the classes asynchronously.

But consistent with Senate policy, they may not meet remote synchronous. And then we follow that for a COVID mixed mode. Classes can be canceled or offered asynchronously. For remote synchronous, the decision was to continue to be taught remote synchronously if the faculty

member wishes and is able to do so, or those classes can be canceled or offered asynchronously. And then classes will be continued to be offered for remote asynchronous.

So basically, we are not saying you can't teach on a snow day, but telling faculty that they can offer their classes asynchronously for CP and CM. And for remote synchronous, it's their choice as to whether to offer them synchronously or asynchronously. So, we think that that's reflective of Senate policy, but then also provides instructors the opportunity to offer instruction.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Kathy.

Provost Jones: Thanks very much, Kathy. Appreciate that detail.

Chair Seymour: Bonj, do we have another question?

Bonj Szczygiel: We have several. We've got Steinn Sigurdsson from Eberly. Does Penn State have any arrangements for vaccinations for any part of the University population through University services? And if so, are there guidelines to set priorities for sub-populations?

Provost Jones: That's a great question. Steinn, I would just say at this point, we're at a very early part of the vaccine runway relative to some of the other more pressing issues that we have. But we do have a group that is coming together to talk about how Penn State will manage vaccine distribution to the community.

It's really very, very early. We don't seriously anticipate any vaccine being available to Penn State in the next several months. So, we've got a little bit of time to think this through. But we're on it. And of course, we need to work with our folks in government, community, and public affairs and the State Department of Health in thinking through how best to do that.

The good news is that we have both infrastructures to support vaccine and people who can actually administer vaccines distributed throughout our campuses. And so, we're actually, I think, fairly well poised in the space. We just need to put a plan together and make sure that that comports with what the expectations are of the Department of Health.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Provost Jones. Bonj, I think we have another question.

Bonj Szczygiel: This is from Najjar, Earth and Mineral Sciences. This is a comment-- maybe it's obvious, but it seems no one is saying it. There have been 57 COVID deaths in Center County. I believe there were 11 deaths before the students arrived in late August. It seems to me that efforts to limit the spread of COVID from students into the community were not successful.

Provost Jones: I guess that was a comment, right?

Bonj Szczygiel: If I might, it was followed up by Townsend, EMS also, I believe. Penn State claims there is no connection between the University and the spread in the community, but that has been refuted by non-Penn State scientists, and it seems like common sense.

Chair Seymour: The next question, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: This is from Rogerio Neves from Medicine. Provost Jones, should we not have been enforcing the use of the app COVID Alert PA? That really is the best contact tracing available and is being used by many states and countries, I particularly use, and it is a phenomenal app.

Provost Jones: You mean this one, right? Yes. So actually, we did develop our own COVID app, I think, as many of you recall, and strongly encouraged its use. Actually, when we saw the COVID Alert PA come out, we looked at it and thought, wow, this is actually better than our app in many ways.

And so, we changed our messaging and strongly encouraged our faculty, staff, and students to download and use this app. I did. I use it every day. I keep my phone with me. I have the proximity alert feature turned on. Fortunately, it hasn't gone off yet.

But I agree with you that it is a terrific tool. And the more people who use this, the better. Unfortunately, we're not in a position to enforce what apps people download on their mobile devices. And so, we do our best to encourage it, and we certainly put all of our support behind the COVID Alert PA app.

Chair Seymour: All right Bonj, can we go with another question?

Bonj Szczygiel: One from Tai-Yin Huang, Lehigh Valley-- how reliable are the tests given the large number of positive cases statewide? I found the small number of cases reported in the dashboard hard to believe.

Provost Jones: The data are what the data are. We believe that we were actually apart from that initial surge when students returned to campus. As you saw, we saw a decline after the first three weeks in September to positive cases of around the 200 level. And the fact that the data that we saw in the pre-departure testing aligned very well with what we had inferred from the surveillance testing over those last several weeks gave us, I think, some confidence that those two approaches were yielding similar data.

I attribute it to behavior, actually. What we saw across the board at Penn State at all locations was, after that rough patch at the beginning, people were following the guidance. People were masking. People were physically distancing. People were washing their hands. People were doing all of the right things-- both on-campus and increasingly off-campus.

It really is quite noticeable compared to what you see in other parts of the state or the country. And at the end of the day, it was people's behavior that helped us keep those numbers to manageable levels.

Chair Seymour: I see that we have a hand raised. So, if we could recognize Indrit Hoxha. So, I think you can unmute. There you go. Please state your name and your unit.

Indrit Hoxha, Harrisburg: Hoxha, Harrisburg. In a rash decision, the Senate approved alternative grading for fall 2020 by calling a third special meeting within a semester. Are there any plans to prepare students for a more regular semester in spring 2021? How do we prevent using emergency solutions as continuous means for an unlimited number of semesters?

Many professors were shocked by this decision. And I have already been told by students that they cannot get an A in my class so they will work enough only to get a C and even refused to submit assignments even when I gave them extensions. These kinds of decisions will lower quality of education, will provide opportunities for less hard-working students to cheat the system, and eventually, they will diminish the rigor of Penn State degrees. Are there any plans to prevent this from going on?

Chair Seymour: Provost Jones, I think I have that one, since it's really directed to the Senate.

Provost Jones: Yes. Happily, yeah.

Chair Seymour: We formed a task force to look at this question for spring. We hope to have a recommendation from that task force into both the ARSSA and the Education Committee before the semester starts next semester so that we won't be faced with the same kind of situation that we were faced this semester.

Indrit Hoxha: I would rather be told by my advisors that they want to have one easy class and load up on every other class that they can so that they can go through this. And I've been advising them not to do it, but I can't force them to take--

Chair Seymour: I would continue your advice being the appropriate advice. I'm not going to get ahead of the work of that task force, because that would be inappropriate, but their recommendations should be out before the semester starts.

Indrit Hoxha: Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. We have four minutes. I'm going to kind of cut our time a little bit, if you don't mind. Provost Jones.

Provost Jones: Not at all.

Chair Seymour: Do we have any other questions, Bonj, in Q&A?

Bonj Szczygiel: We've got two more. Simmons from communications-- the student member of the Outreach Committee of Senate said this morning that students hate First Day Complete because of the cost and that they have to opt out. And I'm just going to add a personal observation-- and I think that the issue of asking or having students opt out of something or else they are committed is a very serious one, because anyone who's taught students, or even as faculty to do that, our lives are very complicated and busy, and it's a very easy and overwhelming time of the year to then lay upon it an additional thing that they have to keep track of and to make sure that they do is not a small ask.

Provost Jones: Right. So, I think the issue of the cost, it is cost advantageous to students, clearly. And we're happy to present data on that. Bonj, to your point and to the Senator's question-- we would clearly have to ensure that there was a full and appropriate communication plan to ensure that students were not being entrapped into paying for something that they did not want.

And so ensuring that there is flexibility in terms of when students are able to opt out is really very, very important, because we acknowledge that people are busy, people get distracted, particularly at that time of year. This is not an opt-out program in any way to sort of entrap students. That is not the intent of it. It's just sorts of a convenience to make it available to all students for planning purposes. But if students do not want to be part of it, they do not have to be part of it and we need to make sure that they have the ability to remove themselves if that's what they choose to do. And that's the intent.

Chair Seymour: Well, I think we have time for one last question, Bonj. Do we have anymore?

Bonj Szczygiel: That works out well, because we do have one last question. This is from Kenyon in the College of Arts and Architecture. We've been forced to install Duo Mobile on our mobile devices, so why can't we do the same for the contact tracing when?

Provost Jones: Well, actually, you haven't quite been forced to install Duo. But in order to access things that are behind Penn State's security perimeter, you need Duo. So, you can elect to not do that, but it limits your access. We really don't have the same control over the COVID Alert PA app. There is nothing that you need that for to access. So, I think it's really a different circumstance.

As with everything COVID, in many instances, enforcement is something that is difficult to achieve. We communicate. We encourage. We issue guidelines. There are some areas where we're much more specific and definitive and there are consequences for noncompliance. But the idea that somehow we can force somebody to install apps on their phone or their mobile device and have a means of enforcing that, I don't think that that's where we are or necessarily where we particularly want to be. We just think it's a really great idea to download and use that app.

Chair Seymour: Well, thank you, Provost Jones.

Nicholas Jones: Welcome.

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Seymour: And let's move on to Item G. We've got two forensic reports that we need to have some discussion around. Our first forensic report is from Senate Council, and it's titled, "Impacts of Cutbacks to Library Collections Budgets," found in Appendix C. Our panelists today are Barbara Dewey, Dean of the Libraries, Diane Zabel, Business Librarian, Mihoko Hosoi, Associate Dean University Libraries, Julie Proctor, Head of Acquisitions. Stephen Browne is here. He's the Liberal Arts Caucus Chair and a Senator, of course.

Impacts of Cutbacks to Libraries Collections Budgets

Chair Seymour: The rationale for the Forensic and the questions can be found in Appendix C. Stephen, I turn the floor over to you to lead the discussion around the questions provided.

Stephen Browne, College of the Liberal Arts: Thank you, Beth. And thank you all for this opportunity to bring this important matter before the body. The genesis of this statement in fact rests in the Caucus of the Liberal Arts, for which I have the honor to serve as chair this year. But we thought it for reasons that I think are evident in the text of the message, of obvious relevance to matters to the College specifically. But at the same time, it seems self-evident that the implications of these kinds of cuts can be generalized to the University itself.

You'll be pleased to hear I have no intention of reading the text of that letter necessarily. But perhaps-- look at that. But I know there's various people, and we want to have a good, robust conversation here. So, like I said, I'll try to keep it brief. But let me just underscore a few matters. Especially I'm thinking here with Dean Dewey among us, thank you, and congratulations. But I sure hope it's clear, and it seemed to be quite clear in the language of that letter, that clearly, we recognize, are mindful, and appreciative of the long standing and positive productive relationship between the Senate and the libraries.

That's clear on its face. And at the same time, this is just me perhaps, but anybody who's handled the budget knows that these are tough decisions, much less in the context in which we're living today. The idea, rather, is to make clear and pointed our concerns and reasons why those concerns need to be expressed and to see what the wisdom of this body has to say about the matter.

It prompts, among other things, a finite set of questions that, again, you'll see here, we're interested in what kind of short term impacts on faculty and students are being imagined here--

what roles the faculty can play or should play in helping to set priorities and maintaining libraries in various fields, and then a longer set of perspectives on what the implications are for collaborative work between and among libraries, departments, and various units and programs.

So, the rest, as I say, is composed and has been sort of incubated through the process thanks in major part to Senator Eckhart and others. Now we offer it before you for a conversation, suggestions, questions, and so forth.

Chair Seymour: Just to remind everybody, if you have questions or if you want to engage these questions, please post them. We can start with question 1. So, what are some of--

Barbara Dewey: Could I make just a couple of--

Chair Seymour: Sure.

Barbara Dewey: Remarks. And I do want to thank all of you who brought this forward. A library that is truly failing will never have this kind of dialogue, because people just don't care. But it's obvious that there's passionate support, and I really appreciate it. I do want to let you know a quick thing, and that is we have secured additional funding from the provost. And within the library's budget, we've done quite a bit of reallocation. So, I did want to mention that, so we're really wanting to know what needs there are.

This money is for this year only, but it still can certainly help, especially with monographs. And the other thing I just want to say is that I would like to think, in addition to the faculty and all of your patience, the incredible efforts of the librarians and the staff of the University Libraries to pivot on a dime and continue to, albeit sometimes under difficult circumstances, provide services. And so, I do want to take that opportunity. And I'm certainly happy to talk about these topics today.

And I should also mention Diane Zabel, who is here, is a very important person for all of you, because she is the interim dean as of January 1. And even today and right now, she is handling the transition to our incoming Dean, Faye Chadwell, who is actually quite an expert in collections. So, you can look forward to that. I'll stop now.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Thank you so much. I think Rose Jolly has her hand up.

Rosemary Jolly: Yes, thank you. So, Jolly, Liberal Arts. I have questions that are related to the first question here-- what short term impacts on faculty and students are the proposed cuts to the library's acquisition budgets likely to have, and how can they be mitigated? The first relates to, and once again, I'm saying this not in the kind of hostile way at all.

It's just that it's very difficult for us from our perspective as teachers and researchers to be able to understand what the acquisition budget diminishment is going to mean when we don't know precisely what is going to be affected, right? So that's really a very big concern.

So, for example, I do know that there is at least one donor interested in supporting the library over the next two years in terms of trying to mitigate this cut. But I just have concerns about, A, the fact we don't seem to know exactly what is being cut, and I don't think that that's in any way any maliciousness intended by that lack of knowledge, it's just that it's very hard for us to comment on something that's very close to our heart when we don't know exactly what will be impacted if it's only monographs or whether it is rolling over commitments. That's number one.

Number two, and I think this is very important, is what kinds of strategies are in place to make sure that when we replace materials or when we have funds to replace materials, there is some consultation with researchers involved. So obviously, as Barbara Dewey has made very clear, we care deeply about our library. And I think that we would like to understand as faculty who teach and research what kinds of roles, we can have in any funds that will be used to mitigate the losses, of which we still have little information. So those are my kind of two related questions that really have to do with issue one raised in the slide. Thank you.

Barbara Dewey: One thing that I also wanted to mention too-- we talked about new leadership; this is a very good time to talk about the role that faculty play. And I've been at a number of libraries prior to coming to Penn State, and there are different models of faculty consultation and participation. And I've talked to some faculty around Penn State about what they think. And so that's one of the areas that will be an opportunity to see, well, how can we improve communication and consultation?

And there's two parts of it that I wanted to mention. One is that it's clear to me that we need to improve internal consultation and communication within the library. And that sounds simple, but it's not, because big Penn State-wide, it's a big system. But also, what we would like to see and what we would encourage you to do too in the academic departments, and colleges, and campuses is to invite our library faculty to come to meetings so we can know more about your strategic directions for your curriculum, for your research, and any other topics.

And I know this happens in some areas, but it doesn't happen in others. So, if we could look to a two-way street with the communication, I think that will go a long way in understanding what's going on. I would say too, it's not just monographs, and it's actually not even so much of a cut as a shortfall which we've been facing for a long time.

And on top of that, you need new types of materials to do your work. We know that. So, it's very complex. But the communication piece of it is critical.

Rosemary Jolly: If I could just follow up with one still question is, so you're now suggesting something which hasn't been suggested for, which is there's been a shortfall prior to COVID that-

-

Barbara Dewey: Right.

Rosemary Jolly: We're trying to backfill. So that is new, to me anyway. And then the second piece of it is when we are looking to donors and other folks to potentially help us with the shortfall, it's very difficult to do that without knowing what has been affected. Is there any report that the library has on what it has been affected?

Barbara Dewey: Well, there was a fairly detailed news release this summer. It's already out of date because of this additional funding that I mentioned. But it talks, at least in general terms-- again, it's very difficult to go into all the details. I guess I'd stop here and see if my colleague, Mihoko, or Julia want to weigh in, because they work with the collections every day.

Mihoko Hosoi, University Libraries and Scholarly Communications: Sure, Dean Dewey, I can share some observation from my point of view. So, Penn State Libraries are fortunate to have many library subject specialists. And actually, at least 100 librarians work as liaison librarians. So, one of the things they do is to communicate with instructional faculty to make sure that we are supporting their needs. So, we would communicate with those faculty members about new acquisitions as well as any changes that we are making.

So, if you are not getting that kind of information from the liaison librarian, then we would need to make a better effort in reaching out so that those changes are accurately communicated. And I want to emphasize what Barbara, Dean Dewey, has already mentioned, which is that we do have significant financial support, both from the library operation as well as Provost Jones' office.

And so, we do not have immediate financial crisis this year. So, we have enough temporary funding available. So, we are at the point where we are trying to figure out how we can best utilize this funding. So, it's very important for us to know what's needed to support faculty research and courses.

Diane Zabel, University Libraries and Scholarly Communications: I've been a frontline librarian at Penn State for 35 years, and librarians have always collaborated with faculty to build collections. So, we welcome faculty requests to support their teaching and research. So, tell us what it is that you need. But I do also want to state that librarians also have to take a broader view, because we have to serve the needs of the entire University.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Diane. I think, Stan, you're on the panel, and you have your hand up, I believe.

Stan Kranc, College of the Liberal Arts: Thank you. I wanted to speak to the third question about the sort of long-term implications, since that seems to be the direction this was moving in. I've spoken to a number of different faculty who have expressed some concerns about the uncertainty surrounding these cuts-- whether they are long term, how they'll affect things in the future.

Faculty have spoken to a broad range of potential issues-- everything from very, very narrow, am I going to have what I need to do my research, to sort of broader concerns about department missions and curriculum. Some of the things that I was kind of surprised that people brought up were the implications on how this will help us to attract visiting scholars, what this says to the support of academic process.

But as a teaching faculty member, and specifically someone who teaches in composition, I wanted to share an observation that one of my fellow faculty made, which was over the years, liberal arts faculty have often been told that the libraries and liberal arts work hand in glove, and that, to a certain degree, it's our responsibility to support the libraries by making use of programming, by making use of the collections, and things of that nature.

And during conversations as part of the LIST committee, we were told that some of the acquisitions were not being used. And I requested to see that data as well as master list of acquisitions so that I could better inform the faculty who had expressed concerns about the uncertainty of whether or not collections would be available in the future, materials would be available so that they could form their syllabi, instruct students and graduate students into what resources were available to them. And I requested these things, and they did not manifest.

And I guess the question that I would ask is that if we're supposed to take co-governance seriously, I understand that some data cannot be provided because it's for confidentiality reasons, but certainly there should be an opportunity for senators to be able to see this kind of information and have some kind of input in that regard. So that would be my question.

Barbara Dewey: Well, I'm sorry you didn't receive information, because I thought that was being followed up on. And we'll try it again. But what we're talking about, too, is-- and this is not Penn State-specific, this is research libraries across the board. We've seen the trend lines go down in the circulation of print materials.

And also, Penn State is unique because we have all these locations. And so, we're particularly interested in equity of access and making sure all of our collections are available as much as possible. But I have heard-- and again, we need to see if we have data-- that indeed we have quite a few items in our collection that are not used-- have not been checked out, have not been used.

However, and I think I said this in the meeting too, I understand that in the humanities, for example, they may not be used until that one person with that one research interest comes along. I understand that very well. But I guess the part I'm not sure of-- you said something about a list of acquisitions-- I'm not sure what that would mean.

Because, again, we're one of the largest libraries. That would be very long and involved. And so, we would want to provide what would be the most useful for faculty and faculty senators. And

perhaps we need to talk on a smaller scale with a smaller number of people to figure out what it is that we need that would be helpful.

Chair Seymour: No, that sounds good, Dean Dewey. We are almost out of the allotted time. So, if I could suggest that we continue to work on that within the LIST committee, I think that would be appropriate for us to try to figure out how we can tackle that nugget a little bit more directly. Does anybody on the panel have a final comment that they'd like to make?

Carey Eckhardt, College of the Liberal Arts: Yes, Eckhardt, Liberal Arts. Is this an appropriate moment?

Chair Seymour: Yes, it is.

Carey Eckhardt: OK. I'd like to, as we are moving towards wrapping up, I'd like to emphasize again how important the library is. I personally am always so grateful to the library. I'd like to add a couple of specifics to what has been said about, I think it comes down a lot to the need for greater communication and for greater clarity about potential faculty roles.

One is that we honestly, a lot of us, do not know what might have been cut. I'm thrilled to know that the recent availability of additional funds means that those cuts may not actually be implemented right now. But I can remember from a previous time when there had to be cutbacks receiving in advanced, for example, that point was a question of journals in the humanities. We received lists of journals we had the opportunity to consult our colleagues and to have input into which journals might be kept, which journals perhaps were not so important.

I think perhaps there wasn't time for that this time. But the absence of that kind of proactive, collaborative sense of what might be done I think has led to a lot of faculty anxiety and frustration and worries on the part of faculty that we ourselves are going to be responsible now for keeping an eye on things and for trying to advocate for our own specialties, and that as an additional workload might fall inequitably on some faculty who already have heavy service loads, perhaps including junior faculty or career faculty.

That's not really a very workable way of going about it in the long run, of expecting each of us to try to be watchdogs for our own fields. Nor can we really expect the subject area librarians to be equally expert in all fields, as some of them seem to have multiple assignments across different specialties.

So this question of who is going to be collaborating with whom, how can the faculty have input in a way that is efficient and doesn't overload particularly faculty, how can we make sure that voices that can't be heard right now, because, perhaps, for example, faculty positions are vacant, and some may be vacant for a couple of years, but we don't want those fields to not be represented-- that if we can work together to create more pathways or constant ongoing communication for broader communication, but not offloading that labor, at least not without

recognition to individual faculty, that those, I think, would be important steps going forward. Thank you.

Barbara Dewey: Thank you very much. I appreciate those comments.

Chair Seymour: Yep. And thank you, Senator Townsend, for putting your question in the Q&A. I was going to ask you to do that, because we're going to need to move on. And what I'll do is if I could ask someone to copy those questions off for me in the Senate staff so that we can give that to Ann Clements, the chair of the LIST committee, so that we can focus the work there.

So, thank you, everybody, for taking part in this forensic. Thank you for the guests that came to the panel, because I think that made it a productive conversation. And again, thank you, Dean Dewey, for your work and your service. And congratulations again on your retirement.

Barbara Dewey: Thank you.

Chair Seymour: So, let's move on to our second forensic session, which is from the Senate Committee on Committee and Rules— “Discussion of the Reorganization of Human Resources and the Adoption of WorkDay” can be found in Appendix D. We've allotted 15 minutes for this discussion. Chair Brunsden has the floor. So, I think he's just been added to us. So, I think you can unmute.

Discussion of the Reorganization of Human Resources and the Adoption of WorkDay

Victor Brunsden, Penn State Altoona: Can you hear me now?

Chair Seymour: I can.

Victor Brunsden: Excellent. So, the genesis of this report was a question from a Senator who happens to have program oversight responsibilities. And since the adoption of the WorkDay software and the reorganization of Human Resources, their workload had increased considerably in the following way.

As part of their program oversight, they hired faculty, adjuncts, et cetera, and tasks that used to happen, that used to be handled by the Human Resources personnel, were no longer being handled by them and had to be handled by the faculty member. This involved a considerable increase in their own workload.

So, this was brought to the committee. And when the committee did what was admittedly a relatively cursory examination, we did not find that there appeared to have been any sort of assessment of the effect of both the adoption of the WorkDay software and the reorganization of the Human Resources department and its effect on faculty.

And I should add here that we are also interested in any news that faculty might have had from staff, since they also had many staff interact--

Bonj Szczygiel: --pursuant to the previous--

Deirdre Folkers, College of Information, Science and Technology: --and would improve processes due to their professionalization of HR. For many of us with managerial responsibilities, however, the net impact has been a significant increase in workload along with a decrease in control of outcomes. Communication from shared services and HR is sometimes limited and sometimes contradictory.

Calls to the HR 800 number are now a friendlier version of calling Comcast. So, I thought it might be useful to provide one small aspect or one small illustration of one aspect of the managerial role. And I do want to say that this is shared not just by faculty, but by staff who have similar responsibilities. And I'm going to apologize in advance for being in the weeds.

So, on my campus, I hire and manage adjunct faculty. Under the old system, to reappoint an ongoing faculty member, I would manually calculate salaries for each course being hired based on credits, contacts, highest educational degree, and years of service. I would then pass this data on to the relevant personnel, and I would sign and review contracts prior to their disbursement.

So, in this system, 100 courses equal 100 pieces of data. Under the new work-based system, to reappoint an existing faculty member, I still manually calculate salaries. I then fill out a spreadsheet with a line for each course for which hiring is taking place. Each course line requires the completion of 42 distinct fields, two of which can only be completed by visiting a separate site to complete additional calculations.

For local financial tracking purposes, each of these visits requires the saving of an additional file. However, the form does not allow for savings of screenshots-- must be taken and saved in a separate Word doc for each course. The site also does not allow for copying, so the calculated figures must be manually entered back into the original spreadsheet.

In the new system, 100 courses equal 4,200 individual pieces of data plus the original 100 pieces of data that would have been generated under the old system. If a given faculty member does not teach for two consecutive semesters, perhaps because their course is only offered every other year, then the faculty member is purged from the WorkDay system, and the reappointment becomes a rehire, which requires posting a public advertisement and going through multiple sometimes lengthy steps.

The faculty member must in turn submit a resume and cover letter and go through a formal onboarding process, even if he or she has worked for the University for many years. The new hiring process has thus been a point of frustration for both new hires and re-appointments. This is

just one example, but it does mirror the experiences of others I have spoken to, both faculty members and staff members.

So, in short, while WorkDay has likely brought about some improvements for individual faculty members, it has been very much a mixed bag for those of us with managerial responsibilities, and it has unequivocally increased the workload of those who have a managerial role. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Deidre. And thank you for reminding us that staff are also impacted by these types of changes.

Chair Seymour: Nathan, you should be able to unmute yourself.

Nathan Tallman, Library Science: Thanks. I think I'm unmuted now. I just wanted to share some from the caucus within the libraries about this. I think Deidre just gave really excellent examples that illustrate these points. But in general, there was felt that the faculty workload, and again, staff and managing staff, has increased, that a lot of clerical work is now pushed onto faculty specifically, that WorkDay and WorkLion are not very intuitive.

And this, I guess, goes more to the second question, that it's really hard to find information, it's hard to know who to ask for information. And the comment about the shared services kind of being the Comcast help line resonates. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Nathan. We don't have any Q&A, but I see we have a question from Renee.

Renee Borromeo, Mont Alto: Borromeo, Mont Alto. And I would just like to say, I have a position where I have minimal hiring abilities within the physical therapist assistant program. I'm involved in the kind of search committee work. But once the person gets the word that they're hired, a lot of the work kind of comes back to me that didn't used to.

And by this, I mean phone calls, the most recent hires-- this was someone who had been with the University for years before-- phone calls, often daily, me apologizing daily for the difficulty of the situation, and me not having training on what to do. Questions like, I submitted my clearances, but they're not showing up, what do I do for this?

Those kind of questions have started to fall on these kind of people like me who we're just kind of in the middle here-- have no training, no expertise, but are the only connection with the new hires with Penn State. And I think that's the issue. There's not a person or office that they're familiar with to go to, so it becomes that person that's sort of stuck in the middle who, in my case, like full time faculty, I don't really have the expertise or, frankly, the time to take on this additional responsibility.

And I think the worst part of it is that constant apologizing. I'm sorry the system is so confusing for you. I'm sorry this is so difficult. Please don't not come to work. Please, please, stay with me. We'll work with it for some more days. I think that, for me, is probably the most frustrating part of it all.

And I guess if it is going to be part of my job, I think it needs to be recognized as part of my job. I need to be trained for it. And then there needs to be maybe release time of some sort to make up for this new responsibility. Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Renee. Does anyone else have anything to say to these questions? Chair Brunsden, do you have anything else you want to say?

Victor Brunsden: No, thank you very much. If you have any further thoughts on this, feel free to email me. My email is vw2b2@psu.edu. And thank you very much.

Chair Seymour: And thank you. Thank you, everybody who contributed. And I'll work with Chair Brunsden to see how we want to move forward with this, maybe, into the work of one of the committees. So, thank you very much, everybody, for this discussion.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Seymour: Item H-- there is no unfinished business.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article VII - Delegation of Authority, Section 2

Chair Seymour: Item I-- Legislative reports. The Senate Committee on Committee and Rules has one report today. That can be seen in Appendix E, "Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article VII - Delegation of Authority, Section 2."

As a revision to the Senate Bylaws, it will be presented today and voted on at the January meeting. Just to remind everyone who's been here before, that's how we manage changes to the Bylaws and constitution-- that we have to present them to the Senate at one meeting and then come back and vote on them in another meeting.

Changes to the standing rules, we can do it the same meeting. So, Chair Brunsdn, do you have any comments?

Victor Brunsdn: Thank you. So, the rationale for this is that the graduate school and graduate council have different roles. The graduate council is the body that the Senate delegates authority over graduate curriculum to. So, it is envisioned that the kinds of reports that might come from either the graduate council or the graduate school might be different.

Graduate school, of course, would have information of interest on programs, the composition of our graduate student population, et cetera. There is, of course, no reason why those two reports can't be collaborated on. But this is something that is somewhat of the gap in our Bylaws that we've had for a number of years. And so, this is a rectification of that.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Nathan Tallman has his hand up. I don't know if it's an old hand. He just dropped it, so it's an old hand. So, thank you, Nathan. Any other questions or comments on this? We're not voting on it today. We will vote on it in January.

Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article IV, Sections 1 and 2, Committees

Chair Seymour: Well, thank you, Chair Brunsdn. There was a second report on the original Senate Agenda in Appendix F, and it was my bad. We had actually voted on that earlier. So, it's been removed, and we're going to implement it. Sorry about that. So, in case you wondered why that disappeared.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Chair Seymour: Item J-- Advisory and Consultative Reports. We have none today.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Chair Seymour: Item K—Informational Reports. And we have three informational reports today. The first is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment. It is titled Important Changes to Title IX and can be found in Appendix G. Suzanne Adair, Associate Vice President for Affirmative Action, and Chris Harris, Title IX Coordinator, will present the report.

And I think we're getting them elevated to the panelists right now. So hi, Suzanne. I think you should be able to unmute yourself.

Important Changes to Title IX

Suzanne Adair, Associate Vice President Affirmative Action: Hello, all. Thanks for having us today. My video doesn't show, but that's OK. Thanks for having us today. And we know that folks have heard about the new regulations by the Department of Ed around Title IX that have been put in place in August. And so, we really wanted to just spend some time with you today to have Chris Harris, who is our Title IX coordinator for Penn State, walk you through some of the specifics-- the content and some of the details of the new Title IX policy on the regs, and specifically of the Title IX policy here at Penn State. So, Chris, I'll turn things over to you.

Chris Harris, Title IX Coordinator: Thanks, Suzanne. So as Suzanne mentioned, there were new federal regulations that went into effect in August of this year. Title IX is a federal civil rights law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in federally funded education programs or activities. Those colleges and universities that receive federal funding are expected to adhere to the Title IX regulations.

So, for much of the past over 40 years, Title IX was governed by what I call quasi-regulatory guidance. There are Title IX regulations-- the last time prior to the current regulations, the last time that the regulations were updated I think was in 1975. So, it's been quite a while.

But roughly between 1975 and August of this year, much of what we encountered were quasi-regulatory guidance in the form of your colleague letters and other forms of written guidance from the Department of Education. Probably the seminal document in that area and the colleague letter area-- 2011, Dear Colleague letter that really set the stage for the work that I do as Title IX coordinator, and really impacted the way colleges and universities address issues related to sexual harassment and essentially broadened-- it didn't broaden the definition of sexual harassment as much as it defined it in a way that I think a lot of folks had not really considered prior to 2011.

So we went from that venue where we had a very broad interpretation of sexual harassment under Title IX, and that included things that many of us are familiar with, particularly that were reflected in University policy-- mandatory reporting for what we call responsible employees, which would be the vast majority of faculty and staff at Penn State.

We had requirements to provide provisions for resources and support for complainants, requirements for training for Title IX coordinators and investigators. All of those things really were born out of that 2011 Dear Colleague letter and then subsequent guidance from the Department of Education in 2014 and 2015.

What we've seen and what we've encountered not just at Penn State but at other colleges and universities over the past several years are an increase in the number of federal lawsuits-- due process, lawsuits that have been lodged against colleges and universities typically by respondents. This did not go unnoticed by the Department of Education.

It was one of the reasons that they offered for their decision to move toward a more regulatory model. They started off with retracting several years of guidance, 2011 guidance, in addition to 2014 and 2015 guidance, was retracted in 2017. So, we were in sort of a limbo area for a little while during nearly a two-year period where the Department of Education crafted Title IX regulations which were made public in May in the Federal Register as of May 19 of this year.

Any other school, college, University, K through 12, were required to implement new policies to reflect these new regulations. We didn't have a large window to work with. The Department of Education mandated that we implement new policies by August 14. The caveat to that was that Penn State had previously signed an agreement with OCR, a resolution agreement based on a multi-year review. OCR is the enforcement wing of the Department of Education.

That meant that the turnaround time for us to implement, or to at least provide, a copy of our new policies to the Department of Education was much tighter. Schools were not required to provide their new policies to the Department of Education. However, since we signed the resolution agreement, we were required to provide that information, and we needed to do that by the end of July. So, we had slightly less time to do so.

We were able to implement these new provisions and create new policy by the end of July deadline, and then the new policies went into effect August 14 of this year. So, there were 13 major provisions in the new federal-- I call them federal regulations. They're not new anymore, but the federal Title IX regulations that came public can in May.

I'm not going to give you all 13 major provisions. There are a few that I want to highlight-- I guess what I call the major, major provisions. And these are the areas that we spend a significant amount of time over the summer considering and weighing the impact on current process and procedures and ultimately working with a lot of folks within Student Affairs, of course, the affirmative action office, general counsel's office as part of an implementation team to really ascertain what the response should be from the University to ensure that we are compliant with these new regulations.

So, I'll give an example-- actual knowledge, we're all familiar with, as I mentioned a moment ago, the responsible employee standard that appear in all University policy-- Policy 5. What the regulations have done, the impact is felt in several areas. One is broadly what the Department of Ed has done is really shrunk the scope of Title IX.

We talked about a moment ago sexual harassment had a very broad definition, if you will. There were a lot of activities that weren't even connected to the campus, for example, that could be considered under Title IX. The best example-- I'll use a student example-- would be a student accusing another scene of sexual assault in an apartment off-campus.

Prior to the regulations, the 2020 regulations, that activity, that behavior would be considered a potential violation under Title IX. The new regulations have essentially kind of narrowed that

scope to the point where, from a jurisdiction perspective, we can only consider harassment that occurs within an education program or activity in the United States.

So I tried desperately not to get into the minutia with this stuff, but I think the point here is that we can't consider that example I just gave you-- a sexual assault that occurs in an apartment off-campus-- that can't be considered under Title IX. However, the Department of Education did not intend, and made it quite clear, they didn't intend for us to not be in a position to address that behavior. Basically, the Department of Education said you can absolutely address that behavior under your policies and rules, you just can't do it under Title IX.

So, there are a number of areas where the Department of Education, in crafting the regulations, provided institutional choice, and that is one of those key areas when we talk about jurisdiction. The definition of sexual harassment-- the definition is something that Penn State actually incorporated into University policy two or three years ago.

So, the definition that we're now required under regulations to use is one that we've been using for a few years. We'll talk about actual knowledge that speaks to the responsible employee piece of our previous policy that I mentioned. And again, we're moving away from that broad perspective that virtually everyone is a responsible employee. Everyone has a responsibility to report any suspected behavior, sexual harassment behavior, that they may learn of.

That's changed under these Title IX regulations. It's narrowed the focus to saying that the University really only has actual knowledge when someone who has the ability to implement what we call corrective measures on the University's behalf becomes aware. So that becomes a very small circle of folks, including myself, for example, University police, student conduct, folks in residence life, for example-- those folks that have the ability to take those corrective measures is a small group-- smaller group than what we encountered in the past. HR supervisors would also fall in that category.

So, what that means is that we needed to take a look at the University's responsible employee language that we previously used in AD85 and determine whether we wanted to retain that. And, again, this is another area of institutional choice that the Department of Education provided to us. They said, you can keep your responsible employee mandatory reporting policy, or you can, for Title IX purposes, adopt the sexual knowledge standard.

So, what we as an implementation team-- and I should mention that there was a larger implementation committee that helped inform many of these decisions-- we decided that it was prudent to adopt the actual knowledge standard that was set forth in the regulations. You'll see that if you have a chance to read AD85, you'll see that the previous responsible employee language that was in the AD85 prior to working is no longer there. It's been removed.

The other issue that I felt I wanted to mention is a major, major provision would be what we call the grievance process or process for resolving issues related to sexual harassment. So, the big

takeaway, the major takeaway from this portion of the regulations is that the Department of Education has made it clear that the regulations and all of their due process requirements, and there are many-- I'm not going to get into them today, but there are several-- all of those apply equally to students, faculty, and staff.

I think where we see that come into play most prominently is that issues related to hearings-- and I'll talk about that now in terms of hearings-- not a major shift for us institutionally as it relates to students. The Student Conduct Office always had an opportunity to participate or request a hearing based on an allegation of misconduct. That has not been the case in this particular venue for sexual harassment allegations when it comes to issues related to faculty and staff.

What it essentially means is that we are in a position now where we investigate an issue related to sexual harassment involving a faculty or staff member, and that investigative process may culminate in a hearing process before a hearing panel most likely of three individuals. Then they get a finding of fact.

So that's a very different space than we have been in historically. And again, this applies only to those situations that would fall under Title IX jurisdiction. So, make sure to make clear. But that's essentially the space that we're in right now. The definition I mentioned earlier, this is the definition of sexual harassment that appears in our policy that is mandated by the regulations.

It is essentially the definition that we've used institutionally for the past few years. We see that it talks about behavior-- it is a very rigid, high standard in terms of severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive behavior. It effectively denies a person equal access to the school's education program or activity. And then there are other what we know, we see in the employment sector, quid pro quo, and then sexual assault, dating, domestic violence, and stalking.

That severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive is a high standard. So, I recognize that. I think since we've had that in place over the past three years, again, not a substantial change for us institutionally. By when you factor this definition into everything else that comes with these regulations and the due process pieces of the regulations, it is essentially narrowing the reach of Title IX in comparison to previous years.

So the actual knowledge standard I mentioned earlier in terms of our adoption of that process, the actual University is considered to have knowledge when someone who has the ability or authority to take corrective measures on behalf of the University becomes aware of suspected pre behavior.

Jurisdiction, we talked about in terms of the education program or activity. The catch here is the harassment must occur against someone in the United States. So, the question that's come up probably most often, particularly from a student perspective and from a faculty perspective as well, is what does that mean for study abroad, for example?

It means that we would potentially need to address that behavior using separate policies and procedures which we've developed. We have for students, for example, we have the Student Code of Conduct as a companion to the revised AD85. We also revised the University's General Discrimination and Harassment Policy, 8091, to reflect that we also can address behavior that falls outside of Title IX using that policy.

So, again, that was an area where there was institutional choice. And essentially our response to that was to head down two different worlds, both of which address this behavior-- the behavior sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, but under slightly different lenses, meaning that we're doing what we need to do in order to be federally compliant as it relates to Title IX, but at the same time, we're not seeking to disenfranchise folks who might experience behavior that happens outside of that jurisdiction.

So, any fear that and if you have an opportunity, if you've not already had a chance to read through AD85, the revised 80, I would encourage folks to do that. AD85 is the University's Title IX policy as of August 14 this year. It is different than what you'll find in most University policies because it incorporates not only the policy language, but also the procedures that are applied to students, faculty, and staff.

So, it is fairly lengthy. It does provide a complete overview of what our response is to incidents of sexual harassment that occur. AD91, as I mentioned, is a companion policy that is applied to non-Title IX sexual harassment, including gender-based harassment. So that is, I don't want to call it a catch all, but it is, essentially, the policy that we use to address issues that would fall outside of that Title IX jurisdiction.

So, they mentioned, we went down with kind of these dual roads. And that, by virtue of having AD85 to address issues related to Title IX and AD91 to address issues outside of that jurisdiction, we also needed to craft procedures that were reflective of these changes in policy. And that was done in advance of August 14th implementation date Student Affairs implemented or developed separate procedures to address behavior that occurs outside of the Title IX jurisdiction.

Those were not substantial changes insofar as, essentially, what the folks in Student Affairs, student conduct, the Office of Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response-- what they were able to do is take existing procedures and fine tune them a little bit, and essentially apply them to those non-Title IX issues.

Affirmative action office, same thing-- needed to develop a set of procedures to address behaviors that fall outside of Title IX. For employee matters, faculty and staff matters, the majority of behaviors that we see from employment perspective are viewed through the lens of AD85 through our Title IX policy. It doesn't necessarily mean that they are violations of that policy, but typically we would look at them through that lens. But we also have the ability to address them otherwise if needed.

So, I mentioned hearings in their application to all cases, whether they are faculty, whether they are students or staff-- this includes a bevy of due process provisions that I won't get into today. I'll spare you that minutia, but there are a number of due process provisions that really fall on my shoulders and the shoulders of investigators to ensure that we're following those as we work through that process and investigation.

Must provide for a live hearing-- another component that will, again, not a massive shift for the student process, but one that will be unique and it will be new, I should say, for the employee. The faculty and staff side is, both the hearing itself and then the cross-examination piece, that is a change for the student process as well. And by that, I mean we've allowed cross-examination in the past for student cases, for example. But there will be a more pronounced role for a person that we call an advisor.

An advisor is someone that can provide advice, guidance to a party, whether it's a complete or respondent. Under Title IX and under the Title IX regulations, the advisor is the sole person that can conduct cross-examination during a live hearing. So that cross-examination would be of another party or could be cross-examination of a witness.

So that also carries with it a requirement under the regulations that if a party does not have an advisor at the time of a hearing, the University must provide them with an advisor. So, part of our focus over the summer was to ensure that we had provisions for that. One of the areas that, again, another area of institutional choice-- the Department of Education said if you have party A who has an advisor and their advisor happens to be an attorney, you do not have to provide the other party, party B, the party that doesn't have an advisor-- you don't have to provide that party with an attorney.

University, we decided that it made more sense from an equity perspective to ensure that we are providing advisors of equal or equivalent educational background, professional background, and knowledge. So, in that circumstance, if a private individual does not have an advisory hearing-- and again, this applies equally to students, faculty, and staff-- if that person does not have an advisor, we will provide them with an advisor if the other party has an advisor, and that advisor is an attorney. We will provide the attorney to that party.

Again, that's solely for the purposes of cross-examination during the hearing. We're not required to provide advisors beginning the process. We are required to provide the advisor at the hearing stage. So, this discusses that requirement that I mentioned a second ago-- essentially exactly that, that we'll provide that advisor at that point.

We have gone through an initial round of recruiting folks for this role as an advisor. We have a number of folks that have agreed to serve in this capacity on an as needed basis, or have allowed us to provide their names to parties if the party chooses to try to get an advisor they can select from that list. And they can actually select by the regulations, they can choose anyone they want.

We wanted to ensure that folks are aware that they have that right and that we have individuals who have already expressed an interest in fulfilling that role. One critical area where we're lacking is in faculty participation in this advisor role. That's an area that we still have roughly, I think at this point, about 25 folks from across the Commonwealth who have agreed to serve in this capacity. The majority of those folks are staff.

And we'd like to see, if possible, greater representation from faculty. And I think part of what we've done, what we've committed to is providing training to folks. One thing I would stress to anyone, to everyone, is that we would not put folks in the position where they are in a hearing with a seasoned attorney, for example. Again, we are looking at that equity in terms of, we will ask an attorney to serve as an advisor if the other party already has an attorney.

But in most cases, that's not the case in most but not all cases. So that's one of the areas that we're currently focusing on trying to gather additional folks to serve in that capacity to fulfill that requirement.

The other area of institutional choice we had that we pondered over the summer was what standard of evidence we wanted to use in the process. Regulations actually permit us to either use an intermediary standard, clear and convincing, or we could use a preponderance of the evidence standard.

Preponderance of the evidence is the standard that we've been using across the board for seven, eight years, if not slightly longer. The University took a significant amount of time to do its homework and research that particular area and ultimately chose that standard. So, we've retained that standard.

It's applied equally to all cases, whether it's a matter involving a student, faculty, or staff. So that was one of the areas where we had some freedom and choice, but ultimately determined that it was best to retain what we were already using. So, I'm happy to answer questions for folks.

There's a lot of minutiae and a lot of stuff related to due process requirements that I didn't get into. I did at the very least want to talk about the hearing process and the requirements that we're under for that. That does have an impact, very pronounced impact, on the entire University community.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Chris. And yes, I encourage all of my senators to read up on this quite a bit, because it is dense-- and so to try to get as familiar as you can with these changes. Bonj, is there a question in Q&A? No. OK.

Suzanne Adair: Can I jump in, Beth? There was one question that I just answered in writing.

Chair Seymour: OK.

Suzanne Adair: So, I just want to make sure that folks saw it or hear the answer. There was a question asking about the AD85, so our new Title IX policy. If the Department of Ed has not approved it yet, why we ended up having to implement it. And the answer is DOE said that we were required to implement the changed policy by August 14, just as every other school across the country was, regardless of whether they had approved our policy per our resolution agreement.

And so, we had no choice but to implement it on August 14. What that essentially means is as we continue to wait for the Office of Civil Rights-- so the enforcement arm of the DOE, as Chris said, we are waiting for them to provide feedback and approval of the revisions that we've submitted.

Until that time, it is our policy. It is the policy that we are working under now. When they get back to us with, presumably, approval, and maybe some revisions that they'd like us to actually implement, it will become approved policy by the Department of Ed. So, we anticipate that we will have to make some revisions.

We did follow the law and the new regulation when we crafted the new policy. So, we don't anticipate major revisions. There may be a few minor things they want us to tweak, but that's why it's a policy now even though it has not been approved by the DOE yet.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Suzanne. I was wondering where that question disappeared to. So, thank you for answering that for me. Rose Jolly, I think you have a question.

Rosemary Jolly: Jolly, Liberal Arts. Yes, I do have a question. In my experience here at Penn State, I have come into contact, because of my area of specialty-- one of them-- with a number of students who are victim survivors of sexual assault from other students. And I have had difficulty because they won't go and seek services because some of them have had experiences where if they seek post-assault services, be they psychiatric or physical from the hospital or somewhere else, it's my understanding that the folks report.

Now, I've had a number of students in my office very distressed because they were the victim survivors, and they did not want to report their situations. But their situations were followed up with campus police. And in one case, I had a woman develop anorexia because she was trying to continue to attend a class in which her aggressor was sitting. So, it actually turned out that the victim survivor ended up not being able to avail themselves of the education for which they had paid, because there was no move by the University to remove the aggressor from the classroom.

So, I'm trying to-- this is not a hostile question at all. I'm trying to figure out how we appropriately advise students when they absolutely need process closure prophylaxis and other forms of counseling, and at the same time assure them that they are in control if they are, indeed, in control of their outing of their own incident. Because it seems every now and again, according to the students that I have sat with, that that is taken out of their hands and automatically

reported, and they had no intention of reporting because they didn't feel they could go through the legal services, but the person offering them services reported.

So, I'm just very confused as how to manage the situation under the constraints of Title IX. And while I understand the preponderance of evidence standard, it makes it even more possible that more victim survivors will not want to report the incidents because they don't want to come up to that standard. And at the same time, there seems to be, under Title IX, a habit of third-party reporting by service providers.

So, I would really like to practically understand what this means for faculty supporting students who have been affected by sexual assault, including rape. Thank you.

Chris Harris: Thank you for the question. And it always troubles me to hear of any experience of anyone in the University community, particularly those who've been traumatized, are not able to get or gain access to the resources that they need. And when I mentioned reporting, when we talk about reporting, that is the sole focus of my work.

When I receive a report, at that point, my focus is on providing resource information to that complainant and allowing them the freedom and the flexibility to use those resources or to ask if they need our assistance with gaining access to those resources, and ultimately to ensure that they have the flexibility and freedom to determine what next steps might look like for them. What are they prepared to go through? Do they want to go through a formal University process?

I would say at my time at Penn State-- and definitely since 2011-2012-- we have folks who are designated as confidential employees. So those are folks that do not have to report anything to the Title IX coordinators. And those are typically folks that are in the counseling center, folks that have maybe have a pastoral background or function in their role at the University.

Those folks are aware that they fall within that confidential employee designation. There are no confidential employees at the University who are not already made aware of that designation. So, they're aware. One of the issues that we wrestled with, and ultimately why we chose to move in the direction of removing that responsible employee language from policy AD85 is exactly the reason that you mentioned, which is it puts folks in a position where you're now aware of this person's trauma and their experience.

They're asking for help, and then you're also obligated to share that information—information they may not want shared with the Title IX coordinator. So, when we remove that responsible portion from AD85, that was part of the reason for us removing it, was because we recognize that not every victim or complainant wants their experience shared with the Title IX coordinator. Many, I would dare say most, want access to counseling.

So, I think that they want access to counseling. They may be looking for academic accommodations, workplace accommodations. And that's really the direction that we want-- we

want to focus folks in that direction and in terms of that mindset. So, the goal, I think, for us-- and we're still kind of figuring out the nuances of the policy and the procedures. But I would say the message moving forward is less of an onus on reporting, except for those who fall within that category I mentioned-- those who have the ability to take corrective measures-- and more of a focus on providing faculty and staff with the tools to provide resources to that person that's been impacted.

So, I think that's another way of saying the responsible employee language was removed for a reason-- I would say in large part because the experience that you discussed. And that was part of our thought process.

Rosemary Jolly: And just a follow-up question-- does that mean that I can comfortably refer to the Mount Nittany hospital and/or CAPS for post-exposure prophylaxis, and the person involved will not automatically find the incident being reported? Or is the hospital still required to report to an outside authority?

Chris Harris: Yeah, my experience has been that folks who choose to go to Mount Nittany, for example, the police are notified. That doesn't mean that that person has to speak with the police, but the police will most likely be notified. CAPS-- that is a confidential resource.

CAPS will not notify me. They're not going to notify the police except in some very limited circumstances. UHS, I don't believe, has that same type of responsibility that the folks at Mount Nittany may have.

Rosemary Jolly: I think this is very, very important for faculty to understand, because often students go to Mount Nittany because they feel like it will be more distant, and then they end up being followed up by the police when they didn't want to report it in the first place. So, I think it needs to be very clear that--

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Rose. I hate to shut it down, but we're already 10 minutes over, and I do want to give Maureen an opportunity to ask the final question, and then we do have to move on. This is such an important topic. I hate to shut it down, but I need to be mindful of people's time. Maureen, you should be able to unmute.

Maureen Jones, College of Health and Human Development: Not as much a question, but, Beth, if I could indulge for just a second-- we may need to bring in someone else. It's not completely accurate what was shared about the police and the hospital. I am the co-founder of the Center Abuse Response Team that was responsible for sexual assault response team development in the county.

And yes, the police are notified. Victims are not required to talk to them. They're not required to prosecute. So, there's a lot of elements there that I want to make sure the senators are aware of the actual process that's in place. So maybe at another time or place where we can provide

someone to come in-- the Center for Gender Equity at the University is highly involved in that and could provide some accurate information about what victims are required to do and what reporting is definitely happening.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Maureen. I was wondering if there's any way-- so, Maureen, you and I can take this offline. I think what might be best is that we find some way to provide some guidelines for faculty in a coherent way with the new--

Maureen Jones: Yeah, I'm happy to do that with you.

Chair Seymour: OK, thank you. So, thank you, Chris and Suzanne, for the presentation and the work that you're doing. I'm sorry we've got to move on, unfortunately.

Chris Harris: Thank you. Appreciate it.

Suzanne Adair: Thanks, Beth.

Chair Seymour: All right, let's move on. Our second report is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Libraries, Information, Systems, and Technology. It is titled Faculty Response to the Shift to Remote Teaching-- Enabling Technologies for Remote Learning and can be found in Appendix H of your Agenda.

Committee Chair Ann Clements and Crystal Ramsay, Assistant Director of Innovation and TLT, will present the report. Chair Clements, the floor is yours. You have five minutes. This is kind of a brief one.

Faculty Response to the Shift to Remote Teaching: Enabling Technologies for Remote Learning

Ann Clements, College of Arts and Architecture: It is. Thank you very much, Beth. I hand the mic and floor to Crystal Ramsay.

Crystal Ramsay, Assistant Director of Innovation and TLT: Thank you both. Good afternoon, everyone. I am here today to report briefly on the faculty response to the shift in remote teaching. Back in the spring, shortly after the University's shift to remote, our research and evaluation group at TLT developed a survey to better understand the implications of the switch. And I want to acknowledge my colleagues who worked on this effort-- Jenay Robert, who was the principal investigator, and Alex Serpi.

We received IRB approval to administer surveys to both faculty and students in late April and early May. And my report today focuses on results of the 576 usable faculty responses that we received. The respondent pool was diverse. We received responses from faculty at every campus across the Commonwealth.

I'll note too that we defined faculty broadly. Our data included graduate student instructors, staff who may teach. Anyone who was teaching was invited to respond. Remote assessment and open educational resources top the list of current challenges-- current back in the spring-- and areas of future interest. So more than 50% of faculty respondents reported remote assessment of learning to be a major challenge, and more than 40% reported students' responsiveness to faculty and finding replacements for face to face tools to be challenges.

Faculty also reported that if they had more time, more than 40% would like to more deeply explore open educational resources, and more than 30% identified topics like online assessment, Kaltura, blended learning, and Canvas. There are resources to help faculty meet pedagogical challenges. And of course, since we are teaching and learning with technology, we were interested especially in ways that our resources and services could meet these needs.

The IT Learning and Development Group assisted with training, course delivery software, the Media Commons with creative assignments to support remote instruction, and the Learning Design Group with, among other things, a new series on engaging students. The Tech TA program is something new at TLT, where we match faculty with an online Tech TA to support faculty during synchronous Zoom meetings. As of today, there are 46 active Tech TAs supporting 273 classes. And Tech TAs also support non-course events, such as this faculty Senate meeting. So, thank you, Akash and Parth for that today.

And of course, additional resources-- we now have the Keep Teaching website, which has many, many resources available, the open educational resources website, and a very robust Commonwealth Campus Faculty Development website as well, organized by instructional mode. There are many, many resources out there.

Troubleshooting technology emerged as the top technological challenge for faculty as well as others you can see here-- things like familiarity with apps, access to the internet to name a few. I mentioned Tech TAs just a minute ago. Tomorrow, December 2, the request form for spring opens up on the TechTutors.psu.edu website. So, if anyone on this call is interested in trying to line up a Tech TA for spring, that request form will open up tomorrow. But just a reminder that there are many, many resources out there to help faculty meet technological challenges.

Faculty also reported challenges related to health and wellness, their own and their students'. And this is something that was certainly of interest to us, because our survey was largely about technology and teaching. And when given an open-ended kind of what are the other challenges you're experiencing question, a solid number of faculty reported challenges related to having enough personal time and energy to deal with all the things that you all were dealing with back in the spring.

And the faculty quote here on this slide is not unlike many others we received. So, my students, said this person, are so stressed and their poor mental health affects my own, my ability to teach,

and their ability to learn. I feel like I could be the perfect remote teacher and it wouldn't matter right now. So, health and wellness emerged even on our technology survey.

We also ask faculty about preferences for communication. And one on one interactions and local communication emerged as preferred mechanisms for faculty. So, the best methods that emerged from our survey for communication were 75% said through department, college, or program channels, Canvas alerts, campus communications.

And in terms of one-on-one resources, people like learning designers, folks at the IT help desk, and colleagues emerged also as just important mechanisms for people getting the information and the resources that they need. So, we generated some text-based reports based on the survey. We created some infographics to summarize findings of both the faculty and student results University-wide.

We've shared focus breakdowns with more than 30 departments, programs, and individuals who've reached out for more specific information about their local contexts. And recently, we presented to the Commonwealth chancellor some strategies that they could share with campus faculty to help address some of the many challenges that students identified on the student survey as well. So that's just sort of a summary. Of course, appendix H has a lot more information and links to many of the things identified here. And we certainly appreciate the opportunity to share with you today.

Chair Seymour: Thank you so much, Crystal. And thank you so much for your work as well. Do we have any questions for Crystal Ramsay in this report?

I don't see any. It can sometimes take a little second or so for a delay, but I don't think we do. So anyway, thank you so much, Crystal, and always, Ann. Our final Informational Report is also sponsored by the Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology. It is titled Relationships with a Box Application and can be found in the Appendix I. Chair Clements and Shuchi Nalepa, Director of Enterprise Application and Solutions, will present this report.

Penn State Relationship with BOX Application

Ann Clements: Thank you very much, Chair Seymour. I hand the microphone over to Shuchi.

Shuchi Nalepa, Director of Enterprise Application and Solutions: Thank you. Thank you for inviting us and providing us the opportunity to talk about the box migration project at the University. I'm going to go ahead and share my PowerPoint presentation here. So, one of the first questions that often comes up is why retire Box at Penn State? And there's a number of reasons why that decision was reached.

So early to mid-2019, we started hearing from other higher education institutions that the Box contract negotiations weren't going in the direction they were hoping, and that the costs were

coming in three to four times higher than their current contracts. We started talking. And in our February of 2020 negotiation with Box, we were presented with a contract that had reflected an almost 600% increase in the price-- so going up to a \$2.2 million price tag, or we would have had to have a reduction of usage by 87%, which would have been untenable given our average annual growth.

So that made it fairly easy to make the decision on if we should be pursuing the Box contract or not. So that was one reason. The elimination of unlimited storage has also been a troublesome trend that we've seen with Box. We are currently using about 3.2 petabytes of data in Box at Penn State, which is an incredibly large amount of data that we do have stored in the system.

So, the price increases would have continued given our rate of growth that we have seen. Last year, we had a 24% growth in the usage of Box, the year before that, 79%, the year before that, 111%. So, although the trajectory is headed downward, there's still a definite amount of growth happening at the University around Box usage.

At the same time, we also have similar services that we now have at the University. When Box was introduced in 2014, it was very timely, as there was a need for this cloud-based data storage. And we had no other option. And Box served that need well, as is apparent from the fact that we have 3.2 petabytes of data in the system at this point. But since then, the technology in cloud services offered at the University have evolved.

We have additional cloud-based storage, including Google Drive and Microsoft One Drive or SharePoint. And then additionally for researchers, there are file storage options that have been available for quite some time, but not everyone is maybe aware of them through the Institute for Computational and Data Sciences. So again, knowing that we are spending quite a lot of money and resources around supporting the Office 365 solution, and to simplify the ease of use of sharing documents, collaborating with folks, we often hear commentary and feedback from faculty, staff, or students sometimes that it's difficult knowing which suite to go into based on who you're working with.

So, in some cases, you might have to work in Box. In other cases, folks are working from the Office 365 side, et cetera. So, this is an attempt to help reduce some of the duplicative and confusing services at the University. Also, at one point, Box was the only cloud storage solution where people could store level 3 or level 4 secure data. Now, we are able to do that in Office 365.

So, our OIS team has set up a secure enclave SharePoint service where if you do need to store any type of level 3 or level 4 data, that can be done in Box. So that also helps us make that decision. Now, after a lot of negotiation in August, we were able to negotiate Box down to keeping our current pricing for an additional year.

So, we've maintained our current contract at about \$400,000 through September of 2021. But after that time, the likelihood that it will increase dramatically is pretty much written on the wall. So, these are some of the decisions that kind of helped spur the reasoning behind the change. So, this, again, very briefly, I mentioned a couple of these dates-- but in February is when we were told the official pricing changes.

And that's the \$2.2 million that I had alluded to earlier. We decided in May that we would extend the contract through September of 2021, and we started planning. We put together a project team that is made up of folks from across the University to start planning around the migration and retirement of Box at Penn State. In August, there was a retirement decision announced to the public-- to folks in newswire and via emails. And then we did begin with some early adopter migrations to Office 365 in September of this year.

And we have been scheduling migrations with units. Our goal is to be able to complete our migrations by June of 2021. That gives us a little bit of time to address any process or data clean up issues that may occur with Box. You may have your own Box account. You might also be using a non-person account, which is generally used by departments where there are multiple areas or folks working on maybe some shared data and things like that.

So if we can meet the June 2021 goal, that'll give us some time before the contract ends in September and the service is retired to kind of catch any missed data or any information that may come forward as we complete our migrations. So, this is our migration approach in general.

One of the things I will point out-- we just recently launched a storage.PSU.edu website that has some Box retirement types of data on it. Our hope is to have that serve as an ongoing space where we can talk a little bit about what are the best solutions for your storage needs-- so having some information on what ICBS provides, what Google Drive provides, what SharePoint provides, when to use OneDrive, and things like that.

But there's a lot of information about the Box retirement on that website that you can check out. Another new endeavor is that we will be implementing a Box retirement project advisory committee. So, we are planning a kickoff meeting in the next couple of weeks. And this advisory committee is made up of a number of faculty across the University and across different disciplines, and also some IT folks, and then a number of staff as well.

So, it's a good representation. We're also going to have undergraduate and graduate student representation, but it's a good representation of folks across the University.

And these are people whose input is very valuable to us. And they can help us make sure that the direction that we are going in and the decisions that we're making are what are in the best interest of our faculty, students, and staff. So hopefully some of the folks who are on the faculty Senate might be part of this as well. So hopefully you'll get more information through those folks as well.

But in essence, this is just showing some of the approaches that we're suggesting for steps users can take, the roles the unit migration team plays, and then what the Box Migration Project team can bring to the table. We are migrating user data with an enterprise tool. So, Mover is a tool that was purchased by Microsoft in fall of 2019.

It is available at no cost to us since we do have a contract with Microsoft. There is a free version of it. We recommend folks not use the free version of Mover to try and move their own data. We would recommend that faculty are waiting until the date is arrived, if the college has chosen whatever the date, because the enterprise tool offers the ability for us to make sure that if you have shared your links with your colleague in your department or things like that, those shares are carried over.

Additionally, Box Notes, which a number of folks also use, the enterprise tool will allow for conversion of that. So, a number of reasons why we're asking you to hold off on migrating on your own. Additionally, when we use the enterprise tool, it's happening from cloud to cloud. So there is no need to download your data locally to your computer and then put it in Office 365 or on Google Drive or whatever the case might be-- so a number of reasons that we're asking folks to just kind of wait until we are able to meet with your areas and start the migration process.

And speaking of the migration process, this is just some information around what you will see on our website and what we'll communicate as we work with your campuses, your colleges, your units around the migration. These are some things that we ask that folks look at pre-migration.

If you were here for the Office 365 migration, this is very similar in many ways, right-- so cleaning up any unused Box files, et cetera. So obviously, the amount of data that you have in Box, the number of files you have, et cetera, all determine how long the migration process will take. So, if there are options where you can rid yourself of any old data or things like that, we recommend going ahead and doing that.

I'd mentioned Box Notes-- if you have a lot of formatting in your Box Notes, you may want to copy and paste those into a Word doc. When the conversion happens, because Box Notes is so proprietary, when the conversion happens, it converts it into a simple Word doc, but it doesn't always bring over any kind of in-depth formatting that you may have. So that's something to keep in mind.

And again, because you are moving into the Windows, the Microsoft world, there are some limitations on the number of characters that you can have in your file name path. So that's another thing just to be aware of that if you have a very long file naming-- sometimes folks have just hit Save and it saves the file name as the first line of your sentence or something like that, it can end up being very long. So, another thing to be aware of is that the character limitation.

And I went through all of them, but these are all available, as I mentioned, on the stories.psu.edu website. We are working-- we have found a script that can help identify Box links that are in

Canvas courses and things like that. So we are actually working with folks in TLT to see if we can help with doing a scraping of Canvas courses for friends and letting them know that there is a Box link here that you may need to update.

We understand that there is some manual work associated with this migration. And we're going to do all that we can to help maybe ease the moving pains. There are some training and resources also available that you can check out. If you're not already familiar with using OneDrive or SharePoint or things like that, there's a lot of training available on the Office365.psu.edu website that you can take advantage of.

And then communications-- we're working very closely with your local IT, the colleges, the campuses, and the units. So, our expectation is that they will be sharing information with you and sending out emails that are timely, let you know where you are in the migration process or when you will be migrating and things like that.

If you have any special use cases-- so any special workflows that you have that involve Box, please do let you look like IT know, as we are working with them to identify those processes so that we can make any changes that we need to. And then while the migration is happening, we're going to ask that you do not access or work from the files.

Again, our hope is that it's a one-day process. It'll be dependent on how much data you have, but that's what we've been seeing with the majority of the early adopters that we have migrated. And then you will receive an email at the conclusion of your migration that confirms that the migration has completed.

And then you can always go in post-migration, locate your files. If you have external collaborators, you will need to re-establish the permissions of your external collaborators. And we've provided templates to your local IT that you can use to share some of that information out.

Next steps-- again, along with the advisory committee, the faculty Senate feedback input is invaluable as we're moving forward with these migrations. So, if you do have questions or concerns at any time, please email the project team at boxmigration@psu.edu or you can email me directly as well at shuchi@psu.edu. And I know I'm probably running out of time. I ran over my time, so.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Shuchi. Bonj, I believe we have a question.

Bonj Szczygiel: This is from Tallman in Libraries. How long is our contract with Microsoft for Office 365 and OneDrive's SharePoint? I'm worried we'll be going through this again if the contract is three years and MS hikes the price. We invest a lot into using enterprise services, and it can be painful when they change because of that entrenchment.

Shuchi Nalepa: So yes, I definitely understand that perspective. So, our contract is actually being renewed this coming June. We will be renewing our contract for another three years. And Office 365 is so enmeshed in so many different ways beyond the storage piece of it, our University is a very heavy user of Teams-- so we're number three in the country in Teams usage, for example. So, I don't see Office 365 going away or going-- never say never, but I don't see any changes happening or any concerns around that contract being dropped.

Chair Seymour: I believe we have another question, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: Yes. Rogerio Neves from Medicine, Penn State Health-- still does not allow us to use OneDrive SharePoint. It is impacting our research and collaboration efforts. When will this finally be resolved?

Shuchi Nalepa: So, the Penn State Health IT-- we actually just had a meeting with Penn State Health IT team a few days ago. But the Penn State Health, because of the HIPAA concerns, et cetera, they have their own Office 365 tenant. So that is managed by your Penn State Health. You have a CIO for Penn State Health and College of Med.

But if you are affiliated with Penn State University by being in the College of Medicine, you have full access to all of these same tools. The only issue is that you have to log in using your Penn State credentials, which are your abc123, and not your Penn State Health credentials, which are usually your first letter, last name, et cetera. So, we have seen some issues around that.

We have asked and are looking into federating so that there is a more seamless ability to share between the two tenants. But at this time, the cybersecurity team at Penn State Health College of Medicine has locked out some of the accesses for external sharing because of the sensitivity of the data that is often stored there.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Shuchi. I think those are all our questions related to your presentation. So, thank you very much, and thank you, Ann, as well. There is one other comment if you don't mind reading it into the record, Bonj, from Carey Eckhardt. I think you're muted, Bonj.

Bonj Szczygiel: Eckhardt, Liberal Arts-- this is not a question, just a note to say I agreed with the problems that have been mentioned regarding WorkDay in Victor's report. So, thanks to Victor and others for bringing this concern forward.

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Seymour: So, thank you. Yeah, I just wanted to make sure that was in the record. Item L-
- New Legislative Business. Is there any new business?

Seeing none. I'll ask for your patience just a little bit longer. What we'd like to do now is to try out the new voting system so that you get a practice run with it right now, so that when you come in January, you've at least tried it once. So, Erin is putting the instructions up. So, if you would please go to TallySpace.com, vote 10774, and then just follow these instructions.

We will do a test vote as you go through it. I don't think you need me to read all these for you. While we're waiting on this, if I could ask Anna to give me the results of the vote for the minutes. And Dawn Blasko put the link in the chat feature for you as well. So did Erin.

Anna Butler: OK, so the tallies on the voting-- the attendance vote was 173. There were some people who came on after and marked themselves as being in attendance. So, it was 173. The vote for accepting the October 20 Minutes was 164 Accept and 0 Reject. So, it passed.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, Anna. Greg, one of the reasons we did this experiment today is so that people do realize they're going to need their Penn State ID number, because you're going to need to use that for Tally Space. So, it's OK that you don't have it today, but just have it prepared, have it ready for the next meeting. And if you could let me know when people are able to start accessing the vote.

Anna Butler: People are in, and the votes are starting to tally.

Chair Seymour: Thank you. Let me know when you think we've got our results.

Anna Butler: OK.

Chair Seymour: So, I have a question in chat if someone wants to answer it-- where people can find their ID. Their ID number, not the ID. If you've lost the ID, I believe it's in WorkDay. I'm not sure what it's in as far as the processes.

Anna Butler: You can go in the system-- that's DIMC.psu.edu. That's Digital Identity Management Center, DIMC-- Digital Identity Management Center-- DIMC.psu.edu. And when you go in there and log in, you can put your information in, and it'll show you what your ID number is. If that helps.

Chair Seymour: Yeah, and we may need to give those instructions to people as we move into January's meeting.

Judith Ozment, Penn State Abington: I mean, anybody that has their Penn State ID card will have it.

Chair Seymour: Yep, and thank you, Judy. I know it was the last thing on the email, but that's why we're doing this practice. We all know from instruction the best way to learn is to have a little bit of failure.

Anna Butler: So, I'm not sure how many people are actually voting, but I have 78 votes so far.

Chair Seymour: All right, well thank you. I don't need to take people's time more. We just wanted to give you some experience with this before we have to do it.

Anna Butler: Thank you.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Seymour: Your comment, Star, may maybe for the next one. Item M-- Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the University. Are there any additional comments for the good of the University?

And I know I'm not supposed to do this, but I'm going to take her comment. I believe she's with the Graduate and Professional Students Association. And it's new business. Thanks for the good of the University for the good fall Senate session. Everyone have a safe and healthy close to the semester. Best wishes for the new year. Any other? Josh Kirby. OK, Josh, you should be able to unmute yourself.

Josh, you've raised your hand, so I've elevated you. You should be able to unmute yourself. Yeah, you're unmuted.

Joshua Kirby, College of Education: Yeah, just happy holidays to everyone. That was a total mistake on my part, sorry.

Chair Seymour: Well, that's OK. It's good to say that.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Seymour: While you're here, may I have a Motion to Adjourn?

Joshua Kirby: So, moved.

Keith Shapiro: Second.

Chair Seymour: All in favor, give a thumbs up and thank you.

Keith Shapiro: Thumbs up.

Chair Seymour: Thank you, everybody. Have a wonderful break when we get to it. I know we're still a little early. The motion carries. The Senate is adjourned until January 26, 2021. And as always, if you need anything, please don't hesitate to reach out to me. Take care.

Keith Shapiro: Thank you.

Chair Seymour: Make sure you take time for yourselves.

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, January 26, 2020, 1:00 p.m., via ZOOM.

The following Senators were noted as having participated in the December 1, 2020 Senate Meeting via Zoom.

- Abendroth, Catherine
- Acharya, Vinita
- Alexander, Chandran
- Amador Medina, Melba
- Anand, Harsh
- Anderson, Bryan
- Aurand, Harold
- Baka, Jennifer
- Bansal, Saurabh
- Barron, Eric
- Bartolacci, Michael
- Belhassen, Imene
- Bieschke, Kathleen
- Bird, Douglas
- Birungi, Patricia
- Bishop-Pierce, Renee
- Blakney, Terry
- Blockett, Kimberly
- Blood, Ingrid
- Boas, Erin
- Borromeo, Renee
- Breakey, Laurie
- Brown, Rachael
- Browne, Stephen

- Brunsden, Victor
- Byrd, Amanda
- Byrne, Christopher
- Calore, Gary
- Cardenas, Artemio
- Chen, Wei-Fan
- Chetlen, Alison
- Clements, Ann
- Coduti, Wendy
- Costanzo, Denise
- Czymoniewicz-Klippel, Melina
- Dare, Tyler
- D'Artenay, Tamrya
- Davis, Dwight
- Demirci, Ali
- Eckhardt, Caroline
- Egolf, Roger
- Engel, Renata
- Evans, Edward
- Fairbank, James
- Farnan, Kaitlin
- Fausnight, Tracy
- Fliegel, Cara
- Foley-DeFiore, Rainier
- Folkers, Deirdre
- Ford, Karly
- Fredricks, Susan
- Freiberg, Andrew
- Frisch, Paul
- Gallagher, Julie
- Garry, Amy
- Gayah, Vikash
- Gibbard, Sydney
- Glantz, Edward
- Goffe, Lorraine
- Grimes, Galen
- Gross, Charlene
- Guadagnino, Frank
- Han, David
- Handley, Meredith
- Hanes, Madlyn

- Hardy, Melissa
- Hardyk, Andrew
- Harte, Federico
- Hayford, Harold
- Hoffman, Robert
- Holden, Lisa
- Hoxha, Indrit
- Huang, Tai-Yin
- Hufnagel, Pamela
- Iliev, Peter
- Iyer, Anush
- Jett, Dennis
- Jolly, Rosemary
- Jones, Maureen
- Jones, Nicholas
- Jordan, Matthew
- Kadetsky, Elizabeth
- Kahl, David
- Karpa, Kelly
- Kass, Lawrence
- Kass, Rena
- Keiler, Kenneth
- Kennedy-Phillips, Lance
- Kenyon, William
- King, Brian
- King, Elizabeth
- Kirby, Joshua
- Kitko, Lisa
- Kramer, Lauren
- Kranc, Stan
- Laman, Jeffrey
- Lang, Dena
- Larson, Allen
- Libby, C
- Linch, Amy
- Linn, Suzanna
- Liu, Dajiang
- Liu, Xin
- Mahoney, Joseph
- Mangel, Lisa
- Marko, Frantisek

- Marshall, Megan
- Masters, Katherine
- Mathews, Jonathan
- Maximova, Siela
- McBride, M.Scott
- McKinney Marvasti, Karyn
- Meeder, Lakyn
- Melton, Robert
- Michels, Margaret
- Mocioiu, Irina
- Mookerjee, Rajen
- Moore, Jacob
- Mulder, Kathleen
- Najjar, Raymond
- Nesbitt, Jennifer
- Neves, Rogerio
- Noce, Kathleen
- Nousek, John
- Novotny, Eric
- Ozment, Judith
- Page, B.Richard
- Palma, Julio
- Palmer, Timothy
- Pangborn, Robert
- Pauley, Laura
- Perkins, Daniel
- Petrilla, Rosemarie
- Phillips, Kathleen
- Pierce, Mari Beth
- Posey, Lisa
- Precht, Jay
- Pyeatt, Nicholas
- Quinnan, Kaleigh
- Reichard, Karl
- Reid-Walsh, Jacqueline
- Rhen, Linda
- Riccomini, Paul
- Robicheaux, Timothy
- Robinett, Richard
- Robinson, Brandi
- Rodriguez, Najee

- Ropson, Ira
- Rowland, Nicholas
- Ruggiero, Francesca
- Rutherford Siegel, Susan
- Saltz, Ira
- Sangwan, Raghu
- Saunders, Brian
- Schiro, Noah
- Scott, Geoffrey
- Seymour, Elizabeth
- Shannon, Robert
- Shapiro, Keith
- Sharma, Amit
- Sharpe, Starlette
- Shea, Maura
- Shearer, Gregory
- Shen, Wen
- Sigurdsson, Steinn
- Sillner, Andrea
- Simmons, Cynthia
- Sims, Damon
- Sinha, Alok
- Skladany, Martin
- Smith, Cori
- Smith, David
- Snyder, Stephen
- Sprow Forté, Karin
- Stephens, Mark
- Stine, Michele
- Strauss, James
- Strickland, Martha
- Strohacker, Emily
- Subramanian, Rajarajan
- Swinarski, Matthew
- Szczygiel, Bonj
- Tallman, Nathan
- Tavangarian, Fariborz
- Taylor, Ann
- Taylor, Jonté
- Thomas, Gary
- Tyworth, Michael

- Van Hook, Stephen
- Vasilatos-Younken, Regina
- Volk Chewning, Lisa
- Vollero, Mary
- Vrana, Kent
- Wagner Lawlor, Jennifer
- Wall, Wayne
- Wang, Ming
- Warner, Alfred
- Wede, Joshua
- Weld, Jennifer
- Whitcomb, Tiffany
- Whitehurst, Marcus
- Williams, Mary Beth
- Williams, Nicole
- Williams, Tealine
- Wolfe, Douglas
- Wong, Jeffrey
- Yagnik, Arpan
- Yen, John
- Zambanini, Robert
- Zilleruelo, Arturo
- Zorn, Christopher

Elected 181

Students 15

Ex Officio 4

Appointed 10

Total 211