



THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

THE SENATE RECORD

Volume 55-----August 13, 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. Appendices

a. [Attendance](#)

Appendix I

FINAL AGENDA FOR AUGUST 13, 2021

A. [ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR](#)

Page 2-3

B. DISCUSSION OF UNIVERSITY PLANS FOR FALL SEMESTER Page 3-35

University Faculty Senate Resolution for Sequential Actions in Response to Penn State's COVID-19 Policies as of August 13, 2021 – Appendix A Page 3-7

University Faculty Senate Response to the University's Fall 2021 Plan (Vote of No Confidence) – Appendix B Page 7-25

President's Response (PDF)

C. ACTION ITEMS – Plan to vote by approximately 11:40 a.m. Page 25-40

Vote on Resolution in Appendix A Page 29-31

Vote on Resolution in Appendix B Page 31-37

D. ADJOURNMENT Page 37

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

The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, August 13, 2021, at 1:30 p.m. via Zoom Webinar with Chair Bonj Szczygiel.

Bonj Szczygiel, College of Arts and Architecture: Good afternoon, everyone. It is 10:00 AM on Friday, August 13, 2021, and the University Faculty Senate is now in session. Welcome. Because this is a special Senate meeting, which I called to discuss issues of urgency, we'll be dispensing with most of the items on the usual Agenda to focus our conversation. I'd like to start by mentioning that I scheduled this meeting for a two-hour block from 10:00 to noon today. I did this out of respect for your time. And at the end of a long summer break, we realized you've got lots of things on your plates. Please keep your comments concise and to the point, it's important that we hear as many senators' voices as possible in this important discussion.

The instructions for this meeting are the same as a regular Zoom meeting. But since some of you are new to the Senate, let me briefly go through the instructions. You'll get tired of hearing me say this. Who can speak at a Senate committee? 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, for this particular special session, please do not try to ask a question if you are not a Senator. You can email the Executive Director of the Senate Office, Dawn Blasko, if you would like to request to speak at any future meetings. But again, this is a special meeting. And so, we have expedited some of our processes.

Our Zoom capacity is 500 people. If we reach that capacity, you may not be able to log on and attend. We do create a complete record of the meeting that will be available within three weeks of this date. Usually much sooner. And this meeting, like all Senate plenary meetings, is being recorded. We have brought you in with your microphones muted but your video on at your discretion.

Chat is turned on for you to communicate with each other, but we are not closely monitoring chat. You can let us know if you're having a technical problem, though. Better yet, if you need technical support, email Kadi Corter. That is kkw2@psu.edu. And maybe someone could put her name, that address, in the chat.

Please do not use chat to ask a question or to be recognized to speak. We can't operate that way. To ask a question you must use the raised hand function at the bottom of your screen. That's the only way we'll be able to identify your interest. Once I've recognized you, you will be unmuted, and you can ask your question. Remember you must begin by stating your last name and academic unit. For example, Szczygiel, Arts and Architecture.

Please speak clearly and slowly as the audio is not always clear on these Zoom calls. In order that we may see each other if desired, as I was explaining earlier, we do not have the option of using the Q&A function today. In other words, today is set up much like any other face to face plenary meeting that we've held in the past, in which you first have to be recognized by the Chair, me, and your mic turned on before you speak on the floor. We will do our best, but as with any Senate meeting, we do have time

constrictions, and we may not be able to answer everyone's questions or hear everyone's comments, recognizing the value of everyone's time at this very busy period.

The meeting, again, I would like it to end at noon, and we are expecting it to end at noon. I anticipate the voting process to begin no later than 11:40, just for your own information. And it may begin earlier than that. In order to get an accurate vote, we are using TallySpace. TallySpace, our new friend. You will need your Penn State nine-digit ID. And I'm looking for mine, I put it away, because I was going to show it to you. It's just your nine-digit Penn State ID that is given to everyone when they become affiliated with the Penn State system. And we'll give further directions for the TallySpace, but it would be a good idea to grab that ID now, so try to rummage around and find it.

And then a final note, as always, please be patient. Running a meeting like this has a lot of moving parts, and we do require a bit of time to pull things up, to prep things, and to get everything rolling. I want to then welcome everyone and thank you for being here for this special meeting. I want to especially thank the Senate Office for their hard work. Without their support, the Senate could simply not get its work done. You're all very much appreciated.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Szczygiel: So, let us move to the Agenda, and Item A, Announcements by the Chair. I'll keep my remarks short in the interest of our time, but a few overriding observations I feel are worth mentioning. First, the faculty Senate is an intelligent, thoughtful, and deliberative body that I've been delighted to be engaged with for quite a few years, a couple of years. OK, a couple of decades.

We come here out of respect for each other, no matter if that represents a difference of opinion. Too often I hear concerns, still, from faculty senators that they should not speak for fear of retribution, or they feel intimidated, or they might upset some ideological standard. I want to emphasize we are not that. This University, this faculty Senate, must value different insights and thoughts and the right to one's expression.

Everyone is gathering here, I know, with an open mind to consider ideas that may be different from your own, and to respect all that speak. Retribution, dismissal, it has no home here. And it's just a reminder. Secondly, there have been decidedly negative connotations made about the notion of this idea of shared governance. The system of shared governance came of age in the 1960s and evolved to include more and more representation in the decision-making process. It was officially affirmed by a document called "The Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities." It's quite a title. And it was issued jointly, I don't know if everyone knows this, by the American Association of University Professors, or the AAUP, and the American College Council on Education, the ACE, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

From its inception it was a collaborative concept. The statement of shared governance was directed to governing board members, that would be our board of trustees, administrators, faculty members, students, quote, "in the belief that the colleges and universities of the United States have reached a stage calling for appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action." In other words, that it's in the best interests for all parties involved to seek this cooperative action.

I remind us of these roots because they are deep and have held through other crises in the past. And these foundational principles have only deepened over time at Penn State. Indeed, ours is an institution that has not only survived, but grown and expanded. Today we are the product of over 100 years of that shared governance. I have seen vast improvements in my time in the effectiveness of shared governance. This is not the time to toss that history out the window as being impossible, useless, non-functioning. We are not at an impasse, I believe. But we do have a massive assignment in front of us, because we do have a significant disagreement.

So, what we are going to do next is voice our concerns about how decisions have been made, and how we should go forward from here. And we will do so, I know, in a manner that befits this organization. Let us be respectful of each other and of this historical context.

Now, to state the obvious, this meeting is a formal plenary in which members of the University faculty Senate will address critical issues attendant with the approaching return of students to our campuses and the beginning of classes, in light of the University's announced plans for a full 2021 return to campuses. I need to share with you just a bit of background of how we got here, so that it's clear to everyone. After the University's fall plan update announcement was made on August 3rd, I called for a special form of the faculty Senate that evening. This was an informal gathering, not a required gathering. But it was well attended. There were at one point over 125 participants.

We divided into breakout groups to discuss concerns, next steps. And then came back with those observations. Not surprising, there was significant consensus. In particular, that further action on our part, the Senate's part, was called for in the form of a plenary meeting. I then convened a special meeting of the Senate council on August 5th to discuss the format for this meeting and content, from which was produced the two documents we have before us today.

So, I want to, again, give you a reminder, as we segue into the discussion part of this meeting. Members of the University community are welcome to attend this meeting, and I see some wonderful familiar faces in the audience. But since this is a specially convened meeting, only current senators can be recognized and given the right to speak on the floor.

DISCUSSION OF UNIVERSITY PLANS FOR FALL SEMESTER

Chair Szczygiel: Let's move on to Item B of our Agenda. Let me first explain this process. I am asking the authors of both reports to present their resolutions in the order that they appear in the Agenda. The floor will only be open for discussion after having heard both resolutions. If there are any amendments to be made from the floor, you are asked to hold them until the discussion is over and we move to action items.

University Faculty Senate Resolution for Sequential Actions in Response to Penn State's COVID-19 Policies as of August 13, 2021 - Appendix A

Chair Szczygiel: First, let us move to discuss a positional report entitled, “University Faculty Senate Resolution for Sequential Actions in Response to Penn State's COVID-19 Policies as of August 13, 2021.” The report can be found in Appendix A, and I believe we are going to share the report on the screen for your convenience.

Presenting the report will be Patricia Birungi, Kimberly Blockett, Wendy A. Coduti, Caroline D. Eckhardt, and Siela N. Maximova. These are members of the Senate council working group who authored the report.

Their elect, Kim Blockett and Carey Eckhardt, will introduce the report and lead the discussion. Kim and Carey, the floor is yours.

Carey Eckhardt, College of the Liberal Arts: Thank you. Eckhardt, Liberal Arts. I would just like to pick up where Bonj had left off. Kim Blockett and I, who will be briefly introducing the report, want to thank our other members of the working group. Patricia Birungi, Wendy Coduti, and Siela Maximova, as well as others who contributed suggestions.

Our resolution states not only what we see as problems, that's the “Whereas” section of our resolution, but also what we see as realistic actions. That is the Be it Resolved section of our resolution, which is in three parts on page two. So, if we could scroll now beyond the “Whereases,” and to pick up the second part. Yes, absolutely wonderful. Thank you very much. And as you can see the "Be it Resolved" section is in three parts and one page two of the resolution.

And I'll turn things over to Kim Blockett now as we take a very quick glance to help you walk through these actions. Kim?

Kim, if you're muted, could you unmute?

Kimberly Blockett, Penn State Brandywine: Of course, I was muted.

Carey Eckhardt: Thank you.

Kimberly Blockett: Thank you. Thanks, Carey. So, our resolution in the “Be it Resolved” items begin with an unequivocal call for a vaccine mandate. Echoing the Senate's May resolution, as many of you recall. We then move on to focus on itemize actions to occur until full vaccination would be in place. Because it would take, obviously, a month or two for the full implementation of a mandate, we're calling for certain actions right now.

Under first “Be it Resolved” heading, the masking mandates, not only if our campuses fall within the substantial category, but we would like to make sure that that is in place fully, because that could vary week by week and day by day. So that needs to be confirmed that we do have a full mask mandate in place, no matter what. Also, on the recommendation of medical colleagues, twice weekly testing for individuals without proof of vaccination, and full adherence to CDC recommendations, such as for gatherings and activities across the University.

The second “Be it Resolved” heading addresses faculty and related issues, such as instructor choice in determining delivery modes. And we purposefully use the term instructor to be as inclusive as possible in terms of who is teaching in our classrooms. And faculty, student, and staff choice for interactions outside of the classroom, like office hours, graduate exams, meetings, and so forth. And a fuller faculty representation, this part is really important, in any COVID decision making.

And then finally, that there will be accountability. An item by item follow up. We state that we'll revisit the option of a no confidence vote on or before the next scheduled Senate meeting on September 14th. So, in this way our resolution differs from what has come before in that it gives a very definitive timetable for moving on to further actions if we do not have an appropriate response to the resolution. Thanks.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you Kim and Carey. And at this point, are there any calls or questions, for clarification only? Raise your hand if you have any points of needed clarification for this resolution. Jennifer Nesbitt. Jennifer, go ahead.

Jennifer Nesbitt, Penn State York: Hi, I was just wondering if the speaker would clarify whether the second section Be it Further Resolved, and I apologize in advance if I just didn't hear this part, regarding instructor choice and faculty student and staff choice, is to be enacted for the entire 2021/2022 year, or whether that is also until the vaccination mandate can be fully implemented?

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you Jennifer. Kim or Carey.

Carey Eckhardt: I don't recall that our working group specifically discussed that, but I think it's a very good question. I think the spirit and-- Kim, since we didn't plan to talk about this in particular, I may have a different take on it-- I think the spirit of these action items is that we need them now. And that if a vaccine mandate were to occur and become fully implemented, that then there might be another look at it. But that these are things that we're emphasizing that we need now.

Item three there, faculty representation in decision making, I think would be continuing, and not just until there would be a full implementation of the vaccine. But there might be less urgent need for individual choice. For example, for things such as how meetings might be held if a vaccine mandate were not only mandated, but then after a month or two or however long it would take, the resolution does not try to work out all those details.

After that point then there might be, with due regard for health and safety, that might then be a fuller return to more in-person activities of that sort. Kim, does that fit your sense of where we would be on that?

Kimberly Blockett: Yeah, in general. I think I would just follow up to say that we are very much focused on the fall semester. And we're not trying to jump ahead of ourselves, because as we all know, things change every day. So, this is about the fall plan very specifically. And there might be ideas and concepts in it that we take up for later. But right now, this focus is very specifically on fall.

Chair Szczygiel: And again, I'd just like to remind us we are only taking questions for clarification purposes only, and only from recognized and elected current senators. So given that, I see a hand raised. Jonté, do you have a question for clarification?

Jonté Taylor, College of Education: I do. This is JT Taylor, College of Education. The last statement was "appropriate response." How are we defining an appropriate response? Are we differentiating between appropriate and desired? What constitutes an appropriate response to this?

Kimberly Blockett: That, honestly, would be up to the Faculty Senate. In other words, "appropriate" meaning a response that doesn't generate enough senators to say we need to revisit a vote of no confidence. So, it's not decided by any one person or a team of people. It really is by Senate voice and vote.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Again, very quickly please, I believe we have James Fairbank.

James Fairbank, Penn State Erie: Thank you. Fairbank, Erie. Question about that first paragraph under resolution, item three, "adherence to CDC recommendations." Clarification here, does that include social distancing? Because that's something that I have heard disappear from the discussion, not only in the town hall that President Barron and others had last week, but a recent town hall at my campus too. So, if social distancing is something that's important, I think perhaps it should be specifically listed in item three. Thank you.

Carey Eckhardt: I think looking at it as stated, the adherence to CDC recommendations-- again the resolution does not try to encompass all contingencies. To some extent it's an aspirational statement. But I would take that to suggest that the CDC recommendations were to include social distancing. But then we would be following that, we would be adhering to that. But at the moment, as far as I'm aware, the CDC recommendations are not for social distancing. But that too, as Kim just said, is very, very much a changing picture.

The spirit of this is that we would follow those recommendations or restrictions and that they would apply to all Penn State students, faculty, and staff, including gatherings. And we tried to specify there, University managed property and University sponsored activities as examples that we would determine that to be a fairly comprehensive application of CDC recommendations.

But items one and two in that section allow us to go beyond what the CDC is recommending. In other words, that we would be calling for getting the input of medical colleagues, the twice weekly testing, et cetera. Even if that's not included in CDC recommendations, which themselves, as we've seen, can change from one day to the next day.

James Fairbank: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Carey. And again, reminding everyone, this is just for questions and for clarification. Jozef?

Jozef Malysz, College of Medicine: Jozef Malysz, College of Medicine, Hershey. I have a question about the rationale behind twice weekly testing for individuals without proof of vaccination.

Chair Szczygiel: I'm sorry, Jozef. I'm going to interrupt you. That should really be saved for the discussion. We will be going into the discussion very soon.

Jozef Malysz: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Melissa?

Melissa Hardy, College of the Liberal Arts: Thank you. I was just wondering, was there discussion of a mask mandate just for University employees as a kind of a fallback position if in fact the universal vaccine mandate wasn't feasible?

Carey Eckhardt: No, I don't think we discussed that a mask mandate would apply only to employees, because we were looking at the University community. That would include employees and students, some of whom are, in fact, also employees.

Melissa Hardy: I'm sorry, if I said mask mandate, I meant vaccine mandate.

Carey Eckhardt: Oh, OK.

Melissa Hardy: A vaccine mandate just for University employees?

Carey Eckhardt: Yes, I may have misunderstood. No, the discussion, at least as far as I recall-- and again, Kim, please correct me-- is that that would be intended to apply to everybody, again, for the safety of the community as a whole.

Melissa Hardy: OK, thank you.

University Faculty Senate Response to the University's Fall 2021 Plan (Vote of No Confidence)

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you everyone. And let's now turn to the second report. It is a positional report found in Appendix B, entitled "University Faculty Senate Response to the University's Fall 2021 Plan (Vote of No Confidence)." This report was authored by former Chair Mohamad Ansari, Renee Bishop-Pierce, Victor Brunsden, Michele Duffey, Frantisek Marko, and James Strauss.

Jim Strauss will be introducing the report and leading the discussion. Jim, the floor is yours. And, Jim, I don't know if we're not hearing you or if your mic is muted? And can we have confirmation that Jim is with us today?

Victor Brunsden, Penn State Altoona: He is.

Jim Strauss, Eberly College of Science: OK, yes. I apologize, I had to get my screen, such that I could unmute my mic. Can folks hear me?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, we can.

Jim Strauss: So, thank you very much for introducing our resolution. And again, I would like to acknowledge the considerable input that all members of our subcommittee had in composing this document.

I'd like to briefly go through the main points and talk about where we go from here. I actually view both resolutions as being very, very similar in their overall content, particularly in terms of the issues that folks have with the fall plan.

When you look at our resolution, we cite the fact that the majority of counties surrounding our Penn State campuses have substantial community transmission of COVID-19 as designated by the CDC. We acknowledge the previous resolution that Faculty Senate had mandating vaccination and point out that the plan did not follow our recommendation for mandating vaccination.

Very importantly, we acknowledge that faculty, staff, and students have household members that often, given their age or other medical circumstances, cannot be vaccinated. So, we want to make sure that we consider everyone's household safety moving forward.

Most importantly, we want to acknowledge that the current fall plan does not allow faculty autonomy over very important issues of curriculum and pedagogy, along with instructional mode. The University's plan does not require universal COVID testing for all incoming arriving students. And we also believe that there are major issues with the contact tracing plan as it currently stands.

We acknowledge the very positive step that the University made following the town hall, following knowledge of our faculty Senate discussions that included serious discussion about a vote of no confidence. And following that, the University did implement a masking policy for indoors. However, this action actually falls short, in that this action does not apply for unionized employees working at Penn State campuses.

Finally, and very most importantly, we do not believe that the University actively engaged faculty Senate in shared governance regarding the fall plan and decisions being made. This process was not transparent, and we would like it to be.

There are two key points to our resolution. We were actually charged to create a resolution that contained a vote of no confidence so that people could see what that would look like. The wisdom of our committee members suggested that we needed to make this vote of no confidence narrow in scope, so the vote of no confidence only applies to the full plan itself.

We purposely did not put in administrative names or groups in this vote of no confidence, and rather chose to focus on a vote of no confidence in only the plan. And I think, quite frankly, if you look at both resolutions and their convergence to very similar statements, I think that we can all collectively look at that and realize that this plan has serious flaws. Therefore, a vote of no confidence in that plan is merited.

And then finally, we are optimistic with this resolution. Keeping in mind that resolutions are only a statement of position, really, for the faculty Senate, and they don't necessarily have teeth. But we hope the administration is listening. And we are basically calling for the administration to reconsider their fall plan, and-- this is very important-- work closely with Senate and make all plans and contingencies

transparent to the University community at large to directly address the outlined issues in the “Whereas” statements of this resolution.

And again, I would point out that these statements are very similar to the statements, independently, that the other subcommittee arrived at in their resolution. So, I think we can really be united with both of these resolutions. We do feel that the vote of no confidence in the plan is exceptionally important for us to gain some leverage and hopefulness that our cries for improving this plan will be heard.

I'm actually calling for all the members of Faculty Senate to make this very easy and vote yes for both of the resolutions. I think that's the simplest way to move forward. Thank you, and I'll take your questions.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Jim. And I want to thank everyone, both groups-- all members of your working groups-- for your good work and for setting forth these two options, which will now be open for discussion. A reminder, if you have a question for the floor or would like to share a comment, please use the Raise Hand function and you will be called upon once we have verified.

Jim Strauss: Point of order, Chair?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, Jim?

Jim Strauss: The previous group had sort of a quick Q&A regarding their resolution. Before we moved to open discussion, can we do the same for this?

Jim Szczygiel: Yes. I felt we would-- regardless of what I tried to do-- we would end up moving toward discussion. But by all means, in the order of fairness. Please, if anyone has a point of clarification, and clarification only. If it is wording, if it is confusing, anything that has anything deeper content wise that you would like to comment on, please just hold off for another minute or two. So, anyone with a point of clarification on this second resolution? This is for Appendix B, a call for a vote of no confidence?

Sam you've had your hand up for a while. Does that describe you well, while your hand is up?

Sam Frederick, College of the Liberal Arts: I think so. You can let me know if my query matches this part of the discussion. It's unclear to me what the COVID-19 plan actually refers to. If I go to the Penn State website, there is only a reference to plans-- in the plural-- there are multiple plans, and those plans keep changing. Can you clarify that?

Jim Strauss: I can, and I somewhat agree with you. But we are referring to the plan as announced by President Barron during the August 3rd town hall meeting, and the subsequent amendment to that plan that he announced the following day, which would have been August 4th, to include masking requirements for faculty and students. Does that answer your question?

Sam Frederick: Yes, but shouldn't that be made clearer somehow? I mean, it's awfully vague. The University could institute a new plan tomorrow and then say that the vote of no confidence refers to an older plan. Hence, it's no longer valid.

Jim Strauss: I acknowledge that they could, but I believe that we all understand which plan we are talking about, and this is the plan. Again, it may be a moving target, and it has not been really given an official overall name. But our committee, and I think most senators, recognize this is the plan that was discussed by Dr. Barron in the town hall meeting on August 3, and then the only modification of that plan I am aware of is the amendment that he announced the following day to include masking for faculty and students. That's the best answer I can give you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Jim. Victor, you are recognized. Could you identify yourself? And let me also say that you are a member of this working group from Senate Council.

Victor Brunsden: That's true. Brunsden, Altoona. Just to further respond to Sam's question. Sam, there's only been one plan that has ever been communicated to the faculty and staff and students of Penn State, and that plan has been that we are going to hold classes in person, and basically, apart from some vague extra testing of students once they have returned, there is no plans, plural.

There's only ever been a singular plan that has been announced. It has been modified apparently, on the spur of the moment. And this singular plan, which basically amounts to-- we're going to pretend like it's 2019, oh, with maybe some contact trace and a little bit of testing and face masks, is the only plan that this University has ever announced for the fall of this year. So that is why we referred to a singular plan.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Victor. I'd like us to move this conversation into a general discussion, reflecting upon both resolutions. Anyone with comments or thoughts, strong or otherwise? I know the chat has been very active.

Chris Zorn. Please identify yourself and your voting unit.

Chris Zorn, College of the Liberal Arts: Sure, I'm Chris Zorn. I am in the College of Liberal Arts at University Park. The thing that I want to express is really an issue with the second resolution. I'm not entirely certain that it's even coherent to have a vote of no confidence in a policy. A vote of no confidence is a statement about the ability or qualifications of someone in a position of authority to manage or run an organization and to obtain or retain a leadership role. And in this case, we're not doing that.

And so, while I'm fully in support of a vote of no confidence, I think the only way that it makes sense, and frankly, the only way that we don't wind up looking bad and it being kind of embarrassing, is if it's a vote of no confidence in the current leadership. And that means President Barron, it means Provost Jones, it means all of the people who are involved in the decision making that brought us, among other things, this plan. I realize this isn't the opportunity to offer this as an Amendment, necessarily. But I want that to be on people's radar, because I think it'll be embarrassing for the Senate if we pass a vote of no confidence that's essentially incoherent. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Chris, if I could respond by just saying that I believe that it is the implication behind the resolution that the plan was created by through the efforts and the ideas of the administration. But you're correct it does not say that explicitly.

Chris Zorn: Yeah, just as a matter of drafting, I guess. It's not clear. I would have it be against the leadership.

Chair Szczygiel: All right, thank you. Point made. Agnes. Your name and your voting unit, please.

Agnes Kim, Penn State Scranton: My full name or just last name?

Chair Szczygiel: Whichever you prefer.

Agnes Kim: OK. Agnes Kim, Scranton. So, I have a quick clarification that I think needs to be raised. And then a comment on the resolution. And this also has to do with the resolution. The CDC guidelines, they've never lifted social requirements for mixed populations. For higher education they lifted social distancing requirements if everybody is vaccinated. If not, everyone is vaccinated, then they are less clear, but they say then measures need to be taken to protect unvaccinated individuals.

I have links for that. So maybe that can be entered into the record at some point? I'm new, so I don't know how this works.

Also, another thing. Someone mentioned that the two resolutions were similar, but I think there is something that is in Resolution A, whereas that is entirely missing from Resolution B. And I'm sure there is more differences than that, but that one I think is really important.

What's missing from resolution B is a "whereas" that refers to vulnerable faculty members. Those who have aggravating conditions listed on the CDC website. Those faculty members, as it stands, do not have an option to opt out of the classroom. There's a measure for immunocompromised individuals. There's a complicated one where, if you have a child that cannot be vaccinated-- there's that. But there's not a simple statement that says, well, if you're at risk you have the option to opt out of the classroom.

So, I think that is included in a broad statement in resolution A. It is not in resolution B.

Jim Strauss: Bonj, can I respond to that?

Chair Szczygiel: Sure, Jim.

Jim Strauss: We actually believe that it does. The third "Whereas" statement states that the fall plan does not account for faculty, staff, students, and their household members who are not eligible for vaccination and must be afforded the option of remote work to protect their, and their household's health and safety. Thank you.

Agnes Kim: Can I respond—

Chair Szczygiel: That was Jim Strauss.

Agnes Kim: Can I respond to that? It specifically says one "not eligible for vaccination." I'm talking about individuals who were able to get vaccinated, but the CDC recommends you should, under the current circumstances, even if vaccinated, if you're at risk for those conditions you really should not be in a public space for any extended amount of time.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Agnes. Clarification to everyone. We will be next considering amendments to the two of these resolutions. It would be very helpful if, in advance-- if you had your amendment written down, specific words that you would like to propose, so that we don't have to work at that. So, Agnes, just hold on, and I guess we might hear from you in a little bit.

Our next hand that is raised, could you please pronounce your name for me? And give us your voting unit.

OK, I think we lost one person. I would like to jump ahead a little bit, if that makes sense. I see Nicholas Rowland, who is a former chair and our current elected Senate representative and academic trustee on the Board of Trustees. If I could recognize Nicholas?

Nicholas Rowland, Board of Trustees: Thanks, Bonj, I appreciate it. I'm not going to speak on whether or not I support or reject either of these resolutions because that's really not my place. But I did want to let everyone know that the board is listening. We're eagerly watching the deliberations that are going on here.

From my personal perspective on all of this, my overwhelming sense is that the faculty are simply not convinced. They have not been convinced that this plan is better than a vaccine mandate, or even at least as good as a vaccine mandate. I don't know how that's possible at this stage, especially after the resolution earlier this summer.

My sense also is that the faculty are not confused about what they're being asked. I think they're reading that very clearly. They're simply not convinced. And I think until we get that clarification, and get that insight, and get a deeper and more transparent understanding of why this plan is better than, or at least as good as, a vaccine mandate, I say fight. Relentlessly, unapologetically, until we gain that clarity. Thanks for the time.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Nicholas. Greg, could you announce your name and voting unit please.

Greg Shearer, College of Health and Human Development: Greg Shearer, College of Health and Human Development. Thanks, Bonj. It's really good to be a part of the Penn State community and to share in this journey. I'd just like to make a few points.

Claiming the right to put something in someone else's body, or to manipulate their bodies, is remarkably bold. It may be legal, but it's also bold. Especially when the claimant can mitigate the danger independently and on their own. Let's at least acknowledge that the evidentiary standard should rise above catastrophizing phrases and clauses. Speaking of which, some of these "Whereases" are pretty darn catastrophic. "The decision jeopardizes the health, welfare, and lives of people, particularly children."

Let's all take a little time to giggle about how overstated that claim is. Children are at virtually no risk, and laughing at ourselves is therapeutic. On the other hand, a letter decrying divisiveness, calling for unity and reconciliation, and then pledging to crack down on the filthy masses who don't wish to share their private medical information, or just wish to avoid the poke pirates because they are already immune, that's a delicious irony too.

So, I'd like to offer a compromise to both groups. To the faculty I offer to support vaccinations provided there are concurrent exemptions for those already immune. You'll have a better opportunity to effectively accomplish your goals and you'll be following the best evidence. You'll have gained a voice that reflects the cares and concerns of a substantially different viewpoint.

And to the administration, I get that you're stuck between a rock and a hard place, bending over backwards to accommodate the triggered, and they're just upping the drama. So also, strong arming the resistance will only generate more of the division you wish to avoid. The reluctant need to hear from a voice that shares those cares and concerns. I offer mine. And the opportunity to tailor policies to meet the broad sets of concerns we're seeing today.

And I don't want to say that I-- I do think some of the concerns being expressed are valid. So, this compromise offers the opportunity to be compassionate across the very ideological divides the University President pointed out last night. It's a polarizing opportunity. To both viewpoints, I just want to point out that this is an example of viewpoint diversity helping you out. It's a love sandwich with meat, cheese, and no pickles.

So, I know my viewpoint can be a bit biting, but also, I'm right. Plus, I got that love sandwich. So, let's make this work.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you Greg. Sibusiwe, we accidentally dropped you, so I'd like to elevate you, again, my apologies, and give you the floor at this point in time. Your name and voting unit please.

Sibusiwe Dube, College of the Liberal Arts: Thank you. Sibusiwe Dube, University Park College of Liberal Arts. I think on the first document, the issue about instructor choice. Given that it's only about 10 days before the semester begins, wouldn't it be unfair for students if an instructor then chose to go remote? When in fact students all chose that class because it was face-to-face? If we take that route, isn't that in itself creating another division between faculty and parents? In other words, that pits faculty against parents, because parents would have purchased a particular product-- their son going to school for a face-to-face class-- but now that class, all of a sudden, 10 days before, it becomes remote.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Next, I'd like to recognize Jozef Malysz.

Jozef Malysz: Thank you, Bonj. This is Jozef Malysz, College of Medicine, Hershey. I wanted to thank Greg for his remarks. I completely agree with him.

Since it's a common knowledge that vaccinations don't prevent transmission or carriage of the virus, and the students, faculty, and staff who are fully vaccinated can carry the virus, I have a question about what is the rationale behind twice-weekly testing for individuals with proof of vaccinations only?

And I also have a brief comment. I believe that that may be viewed as discriminatory practice against the vaccinated and non-vaccinated students. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Jozef. Ira, you have the floor next. Please introduce yourself.

Ira Saltz, Penn State Shenango: Thank you. Saltz, Shenango. I don't know if it's right time, but I did want to propose an Amendment to the first resolution, that those who are unvaccinated must pay the cost of their testing. Of their mandatory testing. And the purpose of this is that it is imposing an external cost on those of us who are vaccinated. The University has to take money that would have otherwise been able to be used for faculty wages or other purposes, and instead has to devote that money now to testing, contact tracing, isolation, and other related costs.

So, to maximize benefits in economics we have to charge those who create an external cost for that external cost.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Ira. I am going to request that any suggested motions be offered at the end of hearing everyone's thoughts and perspectives. So just hold on to that and then see whether you want to bring it ahead again.

Next up I see Andrea.

Andrea McCloskey, College of Education: Thank you. This is Andrea McCloskey from College of Education. I have a question about one of the "Whereas" statements in Amendment B, that says that Faculty Senate was not included in COVID planning. But in comparison to President Barron's letter that said Faculty Senate leadership has been participating in the management teams' regular meetings, and in weekly, biweekly meetings of the academic leadership council. And so, I'm wondering which of these is accurate?

Chair Szczygiel: I will offer my perspective on that since I was one of-- I was attending all of those meetings. There is a difference, when you speak of shared governance, in there being a conversation and a communication regarding the development of ideas. What is often happening at the meetings that you just cited is that decisions are being reported out. They are not in the process of being developed.

And we did approach. We did seek opportunities. Have made it, I think apparent, that we would like to be involved in those conversations, certainly given the lessons everyone learned from last year. Which was an equally painful year.

So that's the clarification I have to offer. Josh?

Josh Wede, College of the Liberal Arts: Yeah, Wede, College of Liberal Arts. And to follow up on that point, when we had the special meeting back in June where Provost Jones came and described the plan, he committed to an open dialogue and communication channels with Faculty Senate. I think before the August 3rd meeting, I don't know of a single faculty member that had any idea what was going to be announced. And so, I think they completely disregarded any open communication channels.

Looking at these two appendices that we have, Appendix A, this is clearly what needs to happen. I mean, this should have happened back in May. Many of the things we've already asked for. One concern I have is, why do we think, if we pass a resolution like this, it's going to change anything? We've asked for a vaccine mandate; we've asked for changes to the plan. And while I fully support Appendix A, I think the real question before us today is whether or not we have confidence in the University's ability to

keep the University and the community safe. And I have no doubt. I have absolutely no confidence in the plan.

As late as last week they didn't have a testing plan developed for unvaccinated people. Particularly those that were living off campus. As late as last Thursday there was no plan. I asked Provost Jones directly in a meeting. And it was clear there was no plan. We are days from the start of a semester. To have no details on what that plan is going to look like, I think is abhorrent.

So, when I read President Barron's email yesterday, when I got it-- as I'm reading through this it instantly brought me back to the first time, I got in trouble with my mom for staying out past curfew. And I was concocting this story to try to-- and she just looks at me and she goes, "Josh, do you think I'm an idiot?" And as I was reading that, I was like, you know, the reference to a poll that shows a split between the vaccinated—

We are an institution of higher education. One of the leading research institutions in the world. Public opinion should not be driving our decisions. We should be basing it on the science, and the science is clear. The reference to the 1,000 students that signed a petition, what about the 1,200 faculty that signed the open letter last year? The 1,200 faculty that signed, or filled out, the survey asking for a vaccine requirement? The 1,200 faculty that signed the current open letter? Are we just completely ignoring them?

I certainly understand that both President Barron and Provost Jones are in a difficult position. But nonetheless, they need to be standing up for the faculty, for the community. And I think the only way that we can go forward, and I hope that this maybe can help give them some leverage, is with a vote of no confidence. I see no other way to get anything done. And that's it.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Josh. Next, I'd like to recognize Julio Palma. Julio, identify your voting unit please for us?

Julio Palma, Penn State Fayette: Julio Palma, Penn State Fayette. I really just want to-- I mean, I think Josh covered a lot of the things that I wanted to say. One of the things that is happening in the chat and even in this conversation, is, we're back again discussing about vaccinations? We passed that resolution. These resolutions are not really just about vaccination. We passed that. And about the science and we-- We are discussing two different resolutions... again as vaccinations. The difference that I hear is, by the way... we will not have.

Chair Szczygiel: Julio, may I interrupt and suggest-- if you turn your video off that might help with your audio.

Julio Palma: Sorry.

Chair Szczygiel: We'll see what happens.

Julio Palma: Yeah, so we're discussing these two resolutions. And I think what is important to remember is, there is no perfect resolution that all of us are going to agree on.

The first resolution, we have tried over the last year proposing, suggesting, recommending ideas and items to have a better plan. I feel most of the ideas we have shared and suggested and proposed have been ignored. So, I support the items in Resolution A. I feel this resolution would have been great in April. But we had all the resolutions. We were ignored, we were not listened too.

We asked back in the plenary in April to Provost Jones if there was a plan B. There was no plan B. And barely there was a plan A. Plan A was, best case scenario, we're back to Fall 2019. Then, they told us maybe by July they were going to inform us about a potential plan B. And that didn't happen. We passed the vaccination resolution, we had a Q&A session, where there was a commitment of communication between faculty and the administration. And that didn't happen.

The Tuesday morning of the town hall nobody knew what he was going to say. So, I, even though I support the items of resolution A, I cannot vote in favor of these because it's too late. What are we doing? The same thing over and over again?

I think there are some items that we can agree on. And I hope most of us can agree. I think we can agree that the process has not been transparent. We don't know what is happening. I appreciate the email from yesterday, when there was an acknowledgment of the pressure from the legislature. I appreciate that. But that has not been communicated well. Faculty has not been involved in the decision-making process. I think we can also, I hope most of us, we can agree that what we saw in the town hall, honestly, was insulting to our intelligence. And that hurts me to say this. I don't want to say this, right? I think we can also agree that the actions that have been taken by the administration the last couple of weeks, the last 10 days, like suddenly mandating masks-- I think, I mean I... Again, it doesn't reflect that it's going in the right direction.

I'm happy that some faculty are being granted to teach remotely because of concerns. I am happy for them. But again, the plan does not reflect a good way of action.

So, I want to invite everyone-- this is about the process. This is about the plan. Just like Josh said, I have, unfortunately, no confidence about the plan. So, I want to invite all my fellow senators to vote in favor to provide a vote of no confidence. The details about the administration, about the plan-- again, there is no perfect resolution. But right now, I think we have to stand together as a Faculty Senate because the process has not been transparent.

Just to finalize. Sorry. Why do I criticize this? Because I care. I didn't want to have a vote of no confidence, because I care. Because I love my institution, because I love my students, I love my faculty, I love the Senate. I care. But today we need to have a vote of no confidence.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Julio. Victor, you're recognized.

Victor Brunsden: Thank you. Victor Brunsden. I would like to remind people that these two resolutions are not mutually exclusive. The first one is forward looking. Yes, we have had a number of resolutions over the past year. And in fact, this time last year the University had included quite a number of faculty in the planning process for the Fall of 2020. We also passed a vaccination resolution in May of this year.

So, the first resolution says we continue to believe in these things going forward. However, we reserve the right to come back and revisit your progress on these things at our first meeting come September. The second resolution, and it is perhaps a little confusing because the forward looking one comes first-- the backward looking one, which says, as faculty we are looking at what the University has done in planning for Fall of 2021. And we give that plan an F.

So, we have actually, as an institution, gone backwards. And the resulting plan is worse than the plan that we came up with for Fall of 2020. As imperfect as that was, this is even worse. There is absolutely no way that we can have any confidence in this plan.

So, I would urge my fellow senators that we can vote for both of these, and we should. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Victor. Megan, please identify yourself and your voting unit.

Megan Neely, College of Arts and Architecture: Hi, Megan Neely, College of Art and Architecture. As many of know, a second Penn State student has passed away from COVID in recent weeks. I don't say this easily. It's hard to talk about. And I know a lot of this conversation has been focused towards faculty, but students need this as much as you guys do, obviously. We need a vaccine mandate.

Sorry, my apologies, it's hard talking about a student that has passed away, even if I didn't know him. But we need this as much as you guys do. And I know many of you probably think that these resolutions probably won't do anything, but at this point, we have to try something. We have to do something, and we will continue to try. Because faculty and students alike need help at this point. And it's been two too many students. It should have been zero. But we can't go back now. So, we've just got to keep trying. So, I implore you to please vote on these. Yes. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you Megan and thank you for sharing. Denise.

Denise Potosky, Penn State Great Valley: Thank you. I just wanted to comment on the second part of the resolution regarding instructor choice. Curriculum and pedagogy are the domain and responsibility of the faculty. And so other than scheduling classroom space and the use of University resources to support teaching, it's disheartening to me to see that we need a resolution to remind the administration and some faculty of this precedent.

I do not believe that instructors are capricious or take lightly the decision to hold classes remotely. There's a difference also between offering a course remotely for the entire semester and offering remote teaching and learning options, in order for a scheduled course to proceed effectively.

As noted in the chat, the technology for hybrid options is available, and now we all have more experience in using it, after doing so last year. If an instructor sees a reason to hold one or more class meetings remotely, or to allow one or more students to attend class meetings remotely, they should do so. And it would be helpful if the administration would recognize these instructors for their flexibility, their compassion, and their commitment to keeping the University's business of education and research going under these extraordinary circumstances.

I would add that not only instructors, but students and staff, could also be encouraged to exercise their own good judgment and not wait for someone else to grant them permission to protect an unvaccinated child, to accommodate an exhausted essential worker, to facilitate attending or conducting class remotely if sick or contagious, and to help alleviate the stress, and despair, and grief, that too many people are struggling with right now. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Denise, for sharing that.

I want to make sure that voices that have not been heard yet will be heard. So, I'm going to skip over to Michele Duffey. Michele.

Michele Duffey, College of Health and Human Development: Thank you, Chair Szczygiel. Michele Duffey, Health and Human Development.

First, I don't think there's anything about the pandemic or the organizational situation that we find ourselves in that's laughable. We are in a serious discussion right here about people, their livelihood, and the health and safety of our communities. Not just our campuses. The transparency of decision making has been lacking, and faculty and staff have been left to develop their own plans within individual units.

It also seems that messaging in the past several weeks in particular has seemed both defensive and reactionary. Students and community groups are making very similar requests that we have proposed here, and I think we all need transparency, and both resolutions are asking for that. Thank you for your time.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Michele. We have Shelly Stine, up next.

Michele Stine: Stine, HHD. Thank you, Michele, I could not agree more with everything that you just said. Being told what is happening is not the same as consultation, it's not the same as participation. We asked for, and were told that we would have, regular updates with the faculty Senate over the summer as plans were being developed. That did not happen. We did not hear about this until the plan was effectively a done deal.

We still don't have solid plans for how are we going to regularly test all of these people, when regular testing last year did not go very well, particularly at the beginning of Fall semester. And in fact, when we asked for large percentages of people to be tested regularly, we were told that was not feasible. So, it's not clear how that's going to happen this year. We still haven't seen solid plans on that, we still don't have solid plans on contact tracing. If we're not social distancing in the classroom, all of those people then become contacts that need to be included in contact tracing. And we still don't have a solid plan on that.

We still don't know what the consequences for not following through on regular testing, on isolation, on quarantine, will be. We've been told that there will be consequences for people who don't follow through on those, but we don't know what those consequences are.

And to Denise's point, teaching remotely is hard. It's much more work than teaching in the classroom, for those of us who are used to teaching in person, face to face. And yes, we're much better at it now.

But my point is that this is not a request that we're making lightly. This is not something that faculty would turn to because they want to stay home in their pajamas. This is hard work, and we want to keep our students learning. We want to keep them moving forward in their education. We want them to be able to complete their degrees in a timely manner. And this is the best and safest way for all of us to have that autonomy to run our classrooms in the safest way possible, and still move our students forward, which is our primary goal and mission.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Michele. Again, in the interest of making sure everyone's voice is heard, if you are a repeat customer just hold on, OK? We'll get back to you if there's time.

Lewis, you are being recognized. State your name and your voting unit please. And Lewis if you're having—

Lewis Richardson, University Park Undergraduate Association: Can you hear me?

Chair Szczygiel: Can hear you now, yes.

Lewis Richardson: Lewis Richardson, UPUA, Chair of Academic Affairs and Liberal Arts. So, I just want to preface this statement by saying that I was elected by my peers in the Student Government to speak on behalf of the UPUA, which is as I'm sure most people here know, University Park Student Government, as well as the student body, to more broadly represent the issues and areas of concern of the undergraduate student body. I speak in accordance and in line with Megan Neely. Another one of the student body members here in attendance today. When I say that the University action has been almost thoroughly rebuked by members of the undergraduate student body across all sides of campus, I stand in agreement with many of the members who have spoken here today, when they say that the action has been treated on behalf of the administration as almost a universal joke by students. The University action has been viewed as flip flopping back and forth. Really no solid statement. And the statement that we received yesterday from President Barron was, I'd say a breath of fresh air, that is 18 months too late, in some way.

To echo a lot of the points that Megan made, University action thus far has been very devoid of teeth. And we've heard this time and time again. With that in mind, I stand in absolute support of this resolution, as well as the former piece of legislation. And I think with that said, we need to make it very clear that not only are the faculty members in support of something like this, but also students. We saw the results of the survey from President Barron's email yesterday. Many of those numbers, while they may be inflated in some way, definitely are indicative of the vast majority of students. And so, with that being said, again, I stand in support of this resolution. And I hope that on behalf of the students, that our perspective is considered in this voting process.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Lewis. Before you leave, which resolution are you strongly in support of?

Lewis Richardson: Both of them. Both the first and second.

Chair Szczygiel: Both of them. Thank you. Thank you for sharing those thoughts. I'd like to recognize Tim next.

Tim Robicheaux, College of the Liberal Arts: Hi, everyone. I'm stuck in a hotel room, randomly. So--

Chair Szczygiel: If you could identify yourself and your voting unit?

Tim Robicheaux: Robicheaux, Liberal Arts. Sorry, I'm supposed to know that. So Bonj, when you started today, you mentioned some concerns about Senate and Senate silencing voices, and things like that. Something to that effect. It should be noted that we have a Senator who said that dying children is a giggling matter. I think that we probably allow a lot of voices to be heard. And there are people with lots of opinions, including that.

So, I think that's kind of off base a lot. I bring up a couple of points as someone who's a Hodgkin's disease survivor, I am at high risk. I would be immunocompromised, and I also have had a lot of radiation to my chest, and my lungs are just really beat up. So, I'm at high risk of contracting, and higher risk of danger. I plan to teach in person, at least to start. That is something that I've put a lot of thought in. I have a little girl, who I take care of full time. It's a decision that I've not taken lightly. And I'm not in any way suggesting other people should do it. I'm going to monitor the situation.

I miss the classroom. That said, I feel like I don't have a huge choice beyond either asking for all or nothing. That's a problem. Because if I could be flexible, then if rates increase, I could quickly shift online, and then come back as needed. That would be great.

I could look at my classroom situation. I plan to stream everything. There's lots I can do. And so, I'm making those decisions on that, but I'm going to submit my request today, but I feel like we're put in a position of all or nothing. Like, oh, sure, you have all these health issues, you can teach at home. But I want to teach in person. I just want to do so safely, when I can trust the system.

So, Melissa Hardy and I, another senator, received several comments yesterday from our colleagues in our department, and a lot of diversity of thought there as well. So, I want to make sure I put those on the record. I had one professor who said that he had no real concerns and that he felt like the system is-- that the current plan is fine. I had one who had problems with masking, suggesting that it's going to be very tough to teach masked. But strongly supports the vaccine mandate for that reason.

Several things that are brought up in the proposals here, so I won't really add to that. But fear of getting sick, a lot of concern about how we as faculty handle large classes when someone decides to remove a mask. They have someone who is a police officer by training who says, this is a lot for me, I don't want to do this. You know it's going to cause a disruption. We don't have any sort of push back on that, or any kind of guidance on that. There's a lot of lack of guidance.

But my broader thing that I want to bring up quickly is that I attended LSU 2019, National Champions in Football. But it's LSU. We're not top of the line University by any stretch. Penn State was this place that I never thought I would work at. I'm here by pure coincidence. When I tell people at home that I work at Penn State, they're in awe. Penn State is viewed very positively by people around the world. I take students to Europe each year for study abroad, and they have heard of Penn State in positive ways, just the state, and are in awe of our students and love our students. And request that we come back.

If Penn State as an institution is not strong enough to go up against the state legislature of Pennsylvania, is not strong enough to go against PASSHE, if that's a factor, and in middle states when it comes to things like teaching online, then what are we? Because we should be able to do that. We have some of the top research funding in the United States, competing with private universities.

If the concern ultimately-- which it sounds like it is, from the letter-- is that some legislators, because they want more votes, are willing to kill people-- and I believe our local ones certainly are, because they'll get more votes that way. If we can't stand up to that as a University? Then that's problematic. And I don't even mean about this issue, because this has come up multiple times since I've been here, that while the legislature might get upset if we do this, teach critical race theory, whatever it is. If we can't stand up to those people, then we have a problem.

We should be stronger than that. And there were talks several years ago about going full private. It's unfortunate, but if we're going to just be pushed around by legislature for a very small bit of money, then that scares me. And that's not the Penn State that I, as an undergrad, looked up to. So, I think it's problematic overall. And I think that it's the wrong reason to make decisions. And I say that as someone who has a lot of sympathy for the administration. Because this has got to be really tough for them. So, we have the power. And other, smaller universities in this state need us to step in. So, we're the ones who can do it.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Tim. I'd like to recognize Kevin.

Kevin Bowley, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Thanks, Bonj. Bowley, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences. I'd like to thank everyone who is here today, senators, students, and the students in particular, for voicing their thoughts in the matter. As well as leadership that are in there as well.

It's a difficult spot we put our trust and leadership in for the health and well-being of the University. It's been a phrase that's been used a lot over the past month in statements. I've had many faculty members vocalize to me that they feel like the University has lost sight of what health and well-being is. And I'm very conscious of the fact that that's a multilayered question we're directly trying to address. The question of the physical health and well-being of the University. But of course, there's other questions that those well above my pay grade have to deal with in regards to the financial health and well-being of the University as well. Which gets to the question of what's going on, who's putting the pressure on it.

Education has always prized itself on being independent from a lot of outside forces. And it's a little bit disheartening and sad to see that we're in a spot with it. And that does come with the road of being a public University, but it still is disheartening none the less on that front.

I would just like to share a couple of things that I've heard from our faculty, particularly I've heard statements from a lot of our faculty that voiced that a vote of no confidence in some form of leadership is a necessary first step here. And that maybe it needs to go beyond that. We're not really sure.

Certainly, there's a lot of pressure towards trying to point a finger towards the board of trustees or others. And it's a little challenging because there's a lot of indirect talk about where the blame is actually falling here. And it's challenging to figure out just where exactly we place the blame.

Can we have a vote of no confidence in a plan, versus a person or persons? It gets a little bit tricky to parse out on that front, but I do think some sort of first step is necessary there.

I would say to our first Amendment, or our first point we're going to vote on, is I think we do need some sort of line in the sand that exists in that. We saw this summer that in our meeting with Provost Jones, we were told July 1st we'd have information. Six weeks later we got that information, maybe four weeks later for the town hall, which still didn't have some of the information that we were told by the provost that we would have. So, I think we need some sort of firm line in the sand added at some point in time.

I'm not going to suggest an Amendment there, because I think there are those who are more well-informed to propose that. But I do think that is necessary, because the question is, if we don't have a line in the sand, when do those actions get met? If we have a vote of no confidence, and it does nothing, what do those actions get us? What do we do next? Questions on that front.

The last thing I'll say, and this is just my own personal concern, I'm terrified about how effective we're going to be as educators, this Fall. I'm terrified about how effective our students are going to be as learners this Fall if we're operating in this extremely high-stress, highly politicized or highly polarized environment. So, I'm just worried. That's all I'll share. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Kevin.

I'm getting a request from the Senate Office that, if you have been sitting in TallySpace, waiting for the vote to occur, that you need to refresh your page. If not once, then a few more times, before we get to the actual voting segment of this meeting. I guess it becomes stale.

All right moving along and, I am keeping an eye on the clock. I'd like to hear from Amit.

Amit Sharma, College of Health and Human Development: Thank you, Bonj. I'll keep it brief. I respectfully disagree that the resolutions don't have teeth. At least they indicate several of you have said, a mistrust in the process. Michele Stine reminded us, and I just want to remind everyone, that we did speak about this earlier in May. There was a promise that we're going to be kept in touch and in fact, we had requested that the risk is that early August, we're going to be dropped with our guidelines, and that's exactly what happened.

I do also agree with Bonj there's a very clear difference between being on a committee and being part of the decision-making process. And I think at the least we can agree that there's got to be a positive move towards more shared governance.

The second thing I would just want to point out is that guidelines are great, but once you start to dig into the guidelines, oftentimes these statements are open ended. They can be interpreted in several ways. And once we read those statements we are running back and forth between senior administration trying to figure out what those implications are for these guidelines.

So, moving forward I hope we can get more specific guidelines and consequences that people have already spoken about. So, thank you, Bonj.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Amit. Moving along Ali, you've got the floor. Please identify yourself.

Ali Watts, Graduate and Professional Student Association: Thank you. My name is Ali Watts, I am a graduate and Professional Student representative. And I want to both speak broadly about graduate instructors and what this means for us and not having kind of protections, but also the power dynamics and feeling even less empowered to be making decisions about our teaching, about our research, about what it means to be on campus. And then I also want to speak, kind of similar to Tim, about what this means as an immunocompromised graduate student instructor.

I was trying to go on the job market this year. So, there's also that challenge, and what does it mean to want to be in my classrooms, and to want to be teaching, and to be building up, honestly, my ability to be an instructor and to be competitive in the faculty job market next year, when I'm terrified to go to campus. I don't feel secure about who's going to be in the classrooms. I don't feel secure about how I'm going to get to campus. Am I going to walk every day because I don't trust the buses? What am I supposed to do and how am I supposed to navigate that space, when I don't have confidence that there will be support and that those around me are looking out for my health and my service as well?

And I also I want to think about the ways that, while this is a decision for faculty Senate and decision about shared governance between faculty and the administration and the board of trustees, I'm also thinking about the graduate instructors and graduate research assistants who have many of the same questions and the same concerns, but even less power. And so, I'm in full support of both of these pieces of legislation. And I think also we need to be keeping in mind that it's not just the folks in the room, it's not just the folks who are eligible to be part of Faculty Senate who are going to be directly implicated and directly affected but what we do today. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Ali, thank you. And I must say that we all, I know in the room, and in Senator Plenary really appreciate hearing the student voices, so thank you for speaking out.

Greg, I see your hand, but I'm going to skip over to Julie Gallagher, she has not spoken yet.

Julie Gallagher, Penn State Brandywine: Thank you very much, Bonj. And thank you for calling this meeting today. I would like to address two points that were in President Barron's letter yesterday. I recognize that we're in a very challenging time, but I was distressed to see the representation of the respondents versus the returns of the surveys from students.

The survey numbers were much lower than the respondents that were quoted in yesterday's letter. So, one would believe, if you weren't reading carefully, that 88% of University Park respondents were partially or fully vaccinated, but in fact the respondent's rate was lower than that. And so, we're talking about closer to 62% of the students being partially or fully vaccinated, and that's much lower on the Commonwealth campuses. So, I think that, while I'm heartened to see so many who have responded are vaccinated, I think that clarity and transparency that we're seeking was not fully apparent in the ways the numbers were reported.

The second issue I wanted to address was in the second paragraph of his letter. He said, unfortunately, across the nation every action in response to the pandemic is being met with division and controversy.

That's true. We've seen division and controversy rife in our country in the last number of years, and the pandemic has not made it any easier. In fact, it's made it a lot harder.

But this is the challenge of leadership. And leadership has to act in the face of that controversy and take the hard stance, which are not necessarily going to be popular with an awful lot of people, but they're lifesaving. And even yesterday the Supreme Court of the United States gave a green light to Indiana University's vaccine mandate. We're not flying alone here in having this conversation. In fact, we're at the back of the pack of the Big Ten and major universities across this country.

And so, while the division is unfortunate and we have a lot of work to do as a community at the University and as a society, that can't drive the decision to save or allow people to die. I certainly don't want to be the person bringing COVID home to my 9-year-old son who cannot get vaccinated. I wish I could get him in a Pfizer study, but that doesn't protect every other child. And so, I think there's so many reasons why these decisions to go for a vaccine mandate have to go forward. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Julie. And, Greg, I'm happy to return to you if you have something that you want to add that is not a repetition of what we've heard before. If so, then please you have the floor.

Greg Shearer: Hey, Bonj, Greg Shearer, HHD. I'll let you be the judge I just want to-- Tim mischaracterized my comments and I just want to take the opportunity to point out that's where we're at. We're saying I'm laughing at children's death, which is not the case-- in order to make points about-- that's really just an ad hominem attack. I say that because that's where we're at, guys. That's how worked up we are about this. And I'm sorry that we're in the state we're at. But I want to try and work on pragmatic solutions to the problem. And I'll just end there.

Chair Szczygiel: All right, thank you, Greg. And I think we have one last time for one last comment. Nathan, the floor is yours.

Nathan Tallman, University Libraries and Scholarly Communications: University Libraries, Tallman. Thank you Bonj. Some things that have come up in the chat that bear repeating and being read into the record, is the lack of representation for staff employees at the University and how they have some of the least amount of power to affect these changes, yet the decisions we make today and talk about can have huge implications for many employees who don't have a direct voice in Senate here today. Or have a minimized voice elsewhere in the University that others have found to be ineffective. And so, I hope when people are voting today, they're thinking about the implications of these resolutions on our colleagues. As the "We Are" says, we are all employees of Penn State. We are all in this together, and we have to deal with the consequences of our choices and actions as a community. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Nathan. Harry, would you be following up on Nathan's comment?

Carey Eckhardt: Yes.

Chair Szczygiel: Please go ahead. I was going to ask you to do that.

Carey Eckhardt: Just very, very briefly to point out that Resolution A does include staff. It refers to faculty, students, and staff choice. Doesn't mention staff in every item there, but they are included. And similarly, the item in that resolution that says instructor choice in determining course and/or class delivery mode was intended specifically-- rather than saying faculty, instructor was intended specifically to include the many, many graduate students who teach either in a TA role or as instructor of record, and therefore, should have choices and the ability to make decisions based on their own health needs and their perceptions also. Thank you.

ACTION ITEMS – Plan to vote by approximately 11:40 a.m.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Thank you everyone. This has been some great commentary; good thoughts heard all around. Your participation, simply your being here and your participating in these conversations is very important, and it is valued. I think we are ready to move on to the next portion, which is our Agenda Item C, which are our Action Items.

At this point in time if anyone had any specific amendments, they want to be placed to the floor on either of these resolutions, this would be the time to do that. Please raise your hand and I will recognize you. And it would be helpful if we could recognize which resolution is being described. So, we could pull it up on the screen. Agnes, we'll start with you. Please identify yourself and your voting unit again.

Agnes Kim: Agnes Kim, Scranton. And this would be to put an amendment on the Appendix B Resolution. And essentially, it was suggested that I should write while this was going, but I really didn't have to write anything new because I think in Appendix A there's the statement that was just mentioned actually, "whereas current policies do not fully accommodate faculty, staff, and student circumstances during a pandemic which require more alternatives and flexibility." I think that statement could simply be copied into Resolution B as is.

Chair Szczygiel: So, I believe we have a motion on the floor to opt in a statement from Appendix A. Could you restate which statement that was?

Agnes Kim: It's the one that says, "whereas current policies do not fully accommodate faculty, staff, and student circumstances during a pandemic which require more alternatives and flexibility."

Chair Szczygiel: My understanding is you're suggesting that is the fourth clause under the resolution on Appendix A. And you are suggesting that it be simply incorporated into the second resolution, which is the vote of no confidence, is that correct?

Agnes Kim: Yes. Yes, it is the fourth one.

Chair Szczygiel: The motion is on the floor. Do we all understand what's being suggested here? Thank you, Beth.

Keith Shapiro, Parliamentarian: Bonj, we'll need a second.

Chair Szczygiel: Yeah, we're getting there. I just wanted to make sure everyone understood what was going on. And then do we have a second for that? Thank you, Keith.

Eli Byrne, Eberly College of Science: I second. Byrne from College of Science.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Beth, if you could incorporate that change? It's basically a cut and paste. Is there any discussion before we take a vote on this special motion to amend Appendix B, which is the Vote of No Confidence Resolution?

Ira or Megan, are you wanting to make-- your hands have been up for a while, are you wanting to make a comment on this particular motion?

Ira Saltz: No.

Chair Szczygiel: OK. Then seeing none, we will go directly to a vote. I hope you all have been refreshing your TallySpace screens.

Megan Neely: I just want to ask a question about clarification a vote of no confidence. What does it mean in this regard?

Chair Szczygiel: If you will scroll down, if you have Appendix B available to you, a vote of no confidence regarding-- the wording says, "Be it resolved that the University Faculty Senate provides a vote of no confidence regarding the University's COVID-19 plan for Fall of '21." So as was explained before this is a vote of no confidence in the plan.

Megan Neely: I'm sorry, I had a suggested Amendment. I thought you were referring to the Amendment that--

Chair Szczygiel: We actually have-- it's been seconded. We've got a motion on the floor that's been seconded, so we need to proceed with a vote.

Megan Neely: My apologies.

Chair Szczygiel: That's all right, Megan. Hang in there. We'll get back to you. There we go. We've got some TallySpace instructions being posted on the chat.

Anna Butler, Senate Office Staff: Excuse me, Bonj. Can you clarify what we're going to be voting on, please?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes. We're voting on an amendment as seen on the screen right now, the shared screen, which incorporates a specific text which is highlighted, again being shown on the screen, into Appendix B. So it is the addition of a clause into Appendix B that we would be voting on, whether people want that or not.

Anna Butler: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: I know you're trying to write that as a question, and I probably didn't help. Sorry. And I'm assuming soon that Anna will be able to-- is the poll running now, Anna?

Anna Butler: The poll is up and there are people voting.

Chair Szczygiel: And you'll let us know when we have a good compliment?

Anna Butler: Yes, I will let you know.

Chair Szczygiel: I don't know if we have a count of Senator attendees. Of course, only senators would be allowed to vote on this. Keith, do we have any other suggestions?

Keith Shapiro: No, I think we're on good track here. Just for the record, our attendance is up to 467 people.

Chair Szczygiel: The amendments do take a little bit of time. I hope the voting mechanism is going OK. If you are having trouble entering your vote, you should mention that in the chat. I believe Chair-Elect Blockett is keeping her eye on that situation, and she'll let me know if we need to do a test pull. I hesitate to take a more time with a test poll if we don't absolutely need one.

Anna Butler: So far, the vote is 129 Accept and 27 Reject.

Chair Szczygiel: I think we have a motion that has been approved. Thank you, Anna.

Anna Butler: You're welcome.

Chair Szczygiel: Moving forward, are there any other motions to be brought to either of these resolutions. Ira?

Ira Saltz: Yes. Saltz, Shenango. I would like to propose an Amendment to the first resolution, Resolution A. There's a paragraph, "Be it resolved-- one, universal mask mandate. Two, twice weekly COVID-19 testing for individuals without proof of vaccination." I'd like to add "and the cost of the testing to be borne by the individual without proof of vaccination."

Chair Szczygiel: Beth is going to just temporarily type that in so people can see what it is. Can you repeat that phrase? You're saying, "Be it Resolved, number 3?"

Ira Saltz: No, number two. It says, "twice weekly COVID-19 testing for individuals without proof of vaccination." Add "and the cost borne by the individual without proof of vaccination."

And again, because this would be a cost that the University is picking up that takes away from what it could spend on other things.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. So, we have a motion on the floor by Ira to make this addition to Appendix A, which is the Sequential Actions Proposal as we're referring to it. Do we have a second on the floor?

And I see hands up. I cannot tell. If you could put your hands down, please, unless you are making a second motion in support? Hands down please. Richard, are you supporting this motion?

Kofi Adu, Penn State Altoona: Bonj, this is Kofi. I don't know if we can do this, but I wanted to add something to what Ira just indicated. I had the same thing about the cost. His hand was up-- that is why I did not because it was going to be the same. But if we can distinguish for those who have medical conditions, I think the -- should -- that. So, we should clarify that for those who have medical conditions.

Chair Szczygiel: Keith, where are we on the rules?

Keith Shapiro: We haven't had a second, so it hasn't been accepted by the body yet, it's not really a part of the body. So, if Ira's willing to make a change to his original Amendment, then a second can be made on that. Otherwise, we would have to have a second on Ira's and then amend the Amendment.

Ira Saltz: I accept the amendment to my Amendment.

Chair Szczygiel: Kofi, could you repeat what you would like added? "Borne by the individual --"

Keith Shapiro: "The cost is borne by the individuals without the proof of vaccine, except those who have medical conditions."

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Thank you. And again, I'm looking for a second. If you have your hand up to do anything else, please lower it. You can always put it back up again. And again, Richard, I'm asking, do you have a second on the floor? Richard you're muted. We can't hear you.

Richard Shurgalla, College of Health and Human Development: Yeah, I'm sorry. I was dropping my hand. It's not for amendment.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. So, lower your hand if you--

Richard Shurgalla: I'm trying to do that.

Chair Szczygiel: We'll try to help you, Richard. Chris, are you here to second the motion? We can only hear someone who is ready to second this motion before anyone else speaks. Chris is that you?

Chris Zorn: Yes, that's not what I'm here for, but I am happy to second the motion. Chris from University Park.

Chair Szczygiel: Chris Zorn, University Park, seconds that motion. Any further discussion before we vote on this motion to amend? Josh.

Josh Wede: Oh, I'm actually just having a discussion on this.

Chair Szczygiel: OK. Please, if we could all just lower our hands. Julio, do you have anything to comment on this particular Amendment? This is where Zoom gets a little weird.

Julio Palma: We're discussing the Amendment right, now it has been seconded?

Chair Szczygiel: It has been seconded. Now it is just, does anyone have any comments about it?

Julio Palma: Yeah, I mean I am against the Amendment. Can I say why?

Chair Szczygiel: Please.

Julio Palma: OK. Yeah, I'm totally against the Amendment. First of all, somebody already mentioned that there was a lot of-- one of the challenges in our current times is the misinformation and disinformation. We're a University, we're here to provide education, we're here to-- We are a Senate, a Faculty Senate, we're not in the business to recommend charges to students.

Let's also be aware that there are some communities in our country that historically mistrust the vaccines and the medical procedures. This is also an equity issue. We are faculty here to educate. Now we're going to accept-- I mean by the way, the financial situation of the University, I don't think is too bad. I think this should have been part of the plan, to provide education, like a good public health campaign, so people can vaccinate. We are not in the business to impose or to recommend costs on individuals. I'm totally against this Amendment.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Julio. Any other comments? Brief comments, please, we're running against the clock here?

Tai-Yin Huang, Penn State Lehigh Valley: Yes, can I speak?

Chair Szczygiel: Please.

Tai-Yin Huang: This is Tai-Yin Huang from Lehigh Valley. I disagree. I don't think this is a business from a business point of view. Basically, this will provide an additional incentive for people to get vaccinated. Vaccination is free. They don't have to pay a dime. But getting tested, for people that will pressure them to get vaccinated, because first of all, they don't want to get tested twice a week. And so, I think this will be a better incentive than the raffle drawing or something, because vaccine is free. But testing, if you have to get tested and you have to pay, then that will force them, those who don't want to get vaccinated, now will have to reconsider whether they want to do it or not. Thank you.

Vote on Resolution in Appendix A

Chair Szczygiel: All right, thank you very much. Your point is well made. And I think that pretty well covers this discussion about this fairly straightforward Amendment. We do have a second, it is going to go up for a vote now whenever Anna gives us the say so.

We are voting to determine whether the highlighted text should be added to Appendix A, which is the Sequential Actions Resolution. You vote "Yes"--

Anna Butler: I do have a poll out, Bonj, and people are voting.

Chair Szczygiel: The options are "Yes" to accept and "No" to reject. Is that correct, Anna, could you clarify that?

Anna Butler: That's correct.

Chair Szczygiel: So, you would vote "Yes" to accept this and "No" if you do not want this wording included.

All right, and how are we looking in TallySpace? We're doing well into TallySpace this time. It's impressive.

Anna Butler: In TallySpace currently I have 118 Reject and 44 Accept.

Chair Szczygiel: What are the standards, Keith? What do we need to see?

Keith Shapiro: For these we need a majority.

Chair Szczygiel: Majority. All right, so the majority has spoken. Thank you, the resolution-- you said 118 "Yes" to accept the resolution, Anna?

Anna Butler: There are 121 Reject and 46 Accept.

Chair Szczygiel: 46 Accept. The motion to include this new language has been rejected. We can move along. Again, quickly, in the interest of time, if anyone has another critical Amendment to make-- Eli, what say you? Eli, are you there?

Eli Byrne: I'm sorry, I should have lowered my hand when you called the question. But I hope that everyone can just stay out of the weeds. Our colleagues have done very good work preparing both of these. They're not perfect, they'll never be perfect, they're very good. Unless there's a really earthshaking Amendment, I would love to see us just vote on both of these.

Chair Szczygiel: I'd like to recognize Mary Beth, she's someone we've not heard from before.

Mary Beth Williams, Eberly College of Science: Thank you, Bonj, and thank you, Eli, for saying that. Mary Beth Williams, College of Science. I'd like to move Appendix B for vote please. Call the question?

Josh Wede: I second.

Carey Eckhardt: Bonj, could you clarify what calling the question would do? In other words, if there would be further proposals for amendments, if we approved calling the question, that those amendments would not be heard.

Chair Szczygiel: I think you just clarified that. Yes, thank you, Carey. So, there's a motion to close further discussion on any resolutions.

Josh Wede: Point of order, Bonj. I think the first motion was to vote on Appendix B first. I think we probably either need a vote on that, and then we can vote on calling the question? I don't know, Keith?

Keith Shapiro: There hasn't been a second on any of those things. So, the question is--

Josh Wede: I seconded.

Keith Shapiro: Like, what Mary Beth wants to do. Does she want a closed debate? Or does she want to-- because closing debate essentially means that we're going to move to voting on both of these things.

Chair Szczygiel: On both.

Keith Shapiro: Yeah, absolutely. Because we joined them together, the discussion has been-- the amendments have really been about both of them.

Chair Szczygiel: There will be separate votes, but we can't prioritize one or the other.

Keith Shapiro: At this point the question right now is, is Mary Beth calling the question?

Mary Beth Williams: Yes, I am.

Keith Shapiro: OK, then we need to have a vote--

Josh Wede: I second.

Keith Shapiro: OK, now we have a second. Now we need to have a vote to close debate, and that has to be a 2/3 agreement.

Vote on Resolution in Appendix B

Chair Szczygiel: And off to TallySpace we go.

Geoffrey R. Scott, Penn State Law: Are we going to have discussion on closing the debate?

Keith Shapiro: There is no debate on closing debate.

Geoffrey R. Scott: OK.

Anna Butler: Can you verify what we're going to be voting on, Bonj, please?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes. Mary Beth Williams has called the question, which in effect closes further discussion or debate on either of these resolutions.

Anna Butler: OK.

Chair Szczygiel: And jump in if I ever speak incorrectly, but I do believe calling the question would be an impact on both amendments, any potential future amendments to other resolutions.

Keith Shapiro: What we do is, right now we're closing debate on both of these motions that are all currently on the floor, and we move to voting on both of them.

Chair Szczygiel: So, we are in the process of voting.

Anna Butler: Yes, I have the call of the question poll up, and people are voting.

Chair Szczygiel: So, if you want to move straight to a vote, you should vote "Yes," is that correct, Anna?

Anna Butler: Yes, the way I have it worded is select A to accept stop discussion, or B to reject to continue discussion.

Carey Eckhardt: Is everybody seeing that, because I don't see it on TallySpace. But maybe it's just my problem.

Lawrence Kass, College of Medicine: No, I don't see it either.

Geoffrey R. Scott: I don't see it either. There is no vote on TallySpace.

Eli Byrne: Click home first. Click home and then refresh.

Geoffrey R. Scott: I have clicked home myriad times.

Raymond Gabriel Najjar, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: I had to hit the Back button. If you hit the Back button, that worked for me. The backwards arrow.

Richard Shurgalla: I'm not able to vote at all. I have done before, but now it's telling me I have no contact information found.

Anna Butler: So, it could be that after two hours TallySpace may kick you out, and you have to go ahead and log in again. Sometimes it does that. That may be what's happening with you, so if you could go ahead and log in again, that may help you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Anna. Are you seeing any votes come in?

Anna Butler: Yes, right now we have 129 Accept the stop discussion, and 27 Reject to continue discussion.

Chair Szczygiel: All right, so that in effect moves us straight to the vote. And we are going to take them in the order that they were presented. So up on the screen, Beth, if you wouldn't mind pulling it up, is going to be Appendix A.

Richard Shurgalla: Don't know if anybody else is experiencing it but I still can't get in it says no contact with that information found.

Anna Butler: When it says no contact information found-- first of all, we need to verify that you're a senator and you are in our system. And Aaron will do that. If you could bump a message out, or Aaron if you could check that for the people who are having problem with that "no contact" information?

Chair Szczygiel: And I want to give this call the question a little bit more time for people's votes to be registered.

Anna Butler: Oh, OK.

Chair Szczygiel: Is the poll still open?

Anna Butler: It isn't. I closed it, but I can reopen it.

Chair Szczygiel: I'm just looking at some comments in the chat. Would it have an accumulative nature if you reopened it?

Anna Butler: Yes, it has accumulative effect. I did reopen it.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Anna. This vote would terminate further amendments or discussions as was placed on the floor. That is what we are voting on for both resolutions. And it would take us straight to a vote. The logic having been presented is that we can sit and edit these things all day long and we will never arrive at a perfect document. That is just the nature of Senate work.

All right there is a concern now. People understand what is at stake, I believe. Mary Beth, since this is your motion, did you want to clarify anything? Your hand is still up.

Mary Beth Williams: Oh, I'm so sorry. I didn't mean to put my hand up.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. I'm actually getting some requests that we conduct the vote again. Keith, any problems with us doing that?

Keith Shapiro: I think that if there's any question about whether or not people understood or didn't understand what they were voting for, and you've got enough indication of that in the chat and you're comfortable with it, then rerunning the vote seems prudent to me.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Let us open the vote. We will re-run it from the get-go.

Anna Butler: This is the call the question vote, right?

Chair Szczygiel: It's the call the question vote. And again, it would terminate discussion about either of the resolutions. It would take us straight to a voting position.

Anna Butler: OK, I have reset the results on that, and votes will be coming in clean now for this.

Chair Szczygiel: All right.

Nathan Tallman: Bonj, just to-- Tallman, University Libraries. Just a reminder, folks, the chat is not formal. It's not part of the Senate Record. You need to raise your hand and be recognized in the proper time and in the order of the meeting. So just remember that as you're putting comments in there about not being able to do things.

Chair Szczygiel: If you want to close discussion on both appendices on both resolutions, you would vote "Yes" to accept. If you want the conversation to continue, you would vote to reject.

Anna Butler: I currently have 119 Accept and 33 Reject. Looks like there are still a couple coming in though.

Chair Szczygiel: OK. Do we know what would take us to the 2/3 level?

Keith Shapiro: This is 2/3 of the total vote.

Chair Szczygiel: 2/3 of the total vote. So, we are well there at this point in time. We'll leave the poll open for another few seconds.

Anna Butler: OK, I currently have 124 Accept and 35 Reject.

Chair Szczygiel: By my calculations that would put us at accepting the call the question. Can anyone confirm that math?

Keith Shapiro: I think you got it, Bonj. I think that we have 2/3.

Chair Szczygiel: We do have 2/3. All right. OK, so the call the question motion was voted to be accepted. We now are going to move directly to a vote on both amendments. Beth, again, if I could just have you pull up Appendix A. We are voting on Appendix A. This is the "Faculty Senate Resolution for Sequential Actions in Response to Penn State's COVID-19 Policies as of August 13, 2021."

Anna Butler: And I have the poll open now.

Chair Szczygiel: I don't know who GRS6 is. Are you an elected Senator? But the vote is open?

Geoffrey R. Scott, Penn State Law: Yes, I am an elected Senator.

Chair Szczygiel: I'm afraid the vote is ongoing. So, we can't really recognize you now. And Keith could you remind us of the parameters for this vote? What is needed?

Keith Shapiro: It's a majority vote of the total votes cast.

Chair Szczygiel: Anna, can you remind us, we would be voting for "Yes"--

Anna Butler: So, the way I have it worded in the poll is "to support the resolution in Appendix A, press A. To reject the resolution in Appendix A, press B." So, the choices are "A" support, or "B" reject. And I currently have 122 support and 32 reject.

Chair Szczygiel: Let's leave it up for a little bit more time.

Anna Butler: OK.

Chair Szczygiel: And how are we looking now?

Anna Butler: I have 128 Accept, and 32 Reject.

Vote on Appendix B

Chair Szczygiel: Then we have a passed resolution. Faculty Senate has voted to accept Appendix A, which is the "Faculty Senate Resolution for Sequential Actions." Beth, could I ask you to pull up Appendix B, which was the second resolution up for discussion today, as has been amended? And Anna, I'm assuming that the wording would be the same. That if you wish to support the adoption of Appendix B-- this is the vote of no confidence in the plan. If you want to support this you would enter "A," to reject, "B." Un

Anna Butler: That's correct.

Susan Marie Fredricks, Penn State Brandywine: Bonj, can you repeat that one more time, please?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes. So, to approve the amended Appendix B, which is the call for a vote of no confidence, right now it would be to-- if you want to vote to approve it, you would hit accept. If you want to reject this amendment from further consideration, from Senate support, you would hit "B," reject.

Anna Butler: OK, to clarify, it's "A" support, or "B" reject.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you.

Anna Butler: And I currently have 104 Accept, and 50 Reject. But there are still some votes coming in.

Chair Szczygiel: We will do this all the time that it needs.

Just a reminder, this is a simple majority vote of all votes cast today. That is what it would take to pass this amendment.

And Anna, whenever you think we've got everyone, feel free to just let us know.

Anna Butler: I haven't seen any new ones coming in for a little bit now, so I think this is going to be the final. And it's 109 Accept, and 57 Reject.

Chair Szczygiel: By my calculations it is not-- it does not go forward. Is that correct?
Keith Shapiro: No, it's a majority.

Chair Szczygiel: 57?

Keith Shapiro: We have 109 accepted it, correct?

Chair Szczygiel: Correct.

Anna Butler: 109 Accept, and 57 Reject.

Keith Shapiro: You have a majority.

Victor Brunsden: A simple majority.

Keith Shapiro: Yeah, you have a majority. One more than half is a majority.

Chair Szczygiel: One more than half. All right, I believe that is it for Senate business today. I see some hands raised. If there's anyone who would like to make some final comments, I think it's appropriate. Jim. Jim Strauss.

Keith Shapiro: I have no further comments, I just was trying to move things along with a motion to adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Szczygiel: Michelle, do you have any comments, or was this your intent as well? Motion to it adjourn?

Michele Duffey: It was my intent, so I will second the motion. Michele Duffey, HHD.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Duffey. And we've got a motion to adjourn and it's seconded. All those in favor of adjourning the meeting, please raise your virtual hands. Use the reactions button on the screen. Yes, I am seeing everyone is ready to adjourn. The Senate meeting on this day is now adjourned. Thank you all.

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

ATTENDANCE

Due to the format of this special meeting attendance was not recorded.

