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

Chair Bonj Szczygiel, College of Arts and Architecture: Good afternoon, everyone. It is 1:30 on Tuesday, November 30, 2021. And the Senate is now in session. Today-- this is being read for posterity-- we are meeting in a Zoom format. So let me go through the instructions please. I'll try to make it quick.

Who can speak at a Senate meeting? Only those who are elected or appointed faculty, student, or administrative, or retired senators, or past chairs have the privilege of the floor.

The meetings are public, and others can join and listen, but please do not try to ask a question if you're not a senator. You will be arrested. You can email Erin Eckley at the Senate Office if you would like to request to speak at a future meeting. You need to do those five days in advance. This meeting, like all Senate Plenary meetings, is being recorded. Thanks to Zoom, it is being video recorded. We have brought you in with your mics muted. Please stay muted unless you're recognized to speak. If you are presenting a report, we'll call on you. Please wait to speak until you're introduced by the chair.

It's my understanding that some of you have already addressed this next issue in your committee meetings this morning, but I'd like to just spend a little bit of time regarding the use of the chat function at our meetings. It is, of course, provided as a means to communicate with each other, as is appropriate during a professional meeting-- in other words, to post relevant comments, such as links to outside content, or report a technical problem, or even better, to ask for clarity for something missed or to add insight that you might have into a particular issue.

In other words, all of these things add quality to the discussions, and that is the beauty of chat. And when it's used well, it's all about inclusivity and accessibility. But it has been brought to my attention that sometimes-charged emotional nature of some of the chat has become a distraction, a serious distraction. And I have, in fact, had many requests to disable or curtail its function.

And yet, I hesitate. So, here's the bottom line. We're all here to conduct the business of the Senate. I know you are passionate, and have many reasons to be, but we all must be respectful of one another. By the way, this is true for senators as well as for visitors to our meetings, because we always have a handful of visitors attending these meetings.

These are just simply the rules for conducting an efficient and effective Senate meeting. Anyone who wants to engage in the chat, please do so, but I ask that you do so with restraint and consideration for the entire audience of senators, students, guest speakers, and the public. Many of you do that already now, but I just need everyone to get on board with this to respect these, frankly, very modest standards of professional conduct in this public setting. And you know what, today will be the test, so I'm hoping we can continue with it.

Continuing on, how do you ask a question? You raise the-- use the “Raise Hand” function, wait until the chair recognizes you, and then 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 Zoom calls.

How do you vote? In order to get an accurate vote, we are using TallySpace. We'll be posting that link in chat, if we haven't already done so. We will be posting that link in chat.
It's strongly suggested that you retrieve your-- there it is-- thank you, Destiny-- that you retrieve your nine-digit ID now. Have it handy. You may want to hold off-- in fact, it's encouraged you hold off on logging in until we're ready to vote, as it has a two-hour session limit.

You'll need your Penn State ID to be able to log into the system. The Senate staff simply don't have the time to look it up for you during the meeting, so get your ID now. Have it handy, sitting by your side. If you don't know what it is, you can log into Penn State's Workday and be able to retrieve it.

A final note-- please be patient. Running a large Zoom meeting is a bit like riding an angry mule. We do our best to keep it going forward. Sometimes it balks, but we are all doing our best.

So, let's begin. I want to welcome everyone and thank you for being here. Your commitment to the Senate is more important than ever. We're nearing the end of a very busy semester, and while I hope this past week offered some respite-- yay-- we're also facing the grand effort known as the end of the semester wrap-up-- lots of papers to read, projects to grade, exams to write, adult beverages probably consumed.

I want you to know that, despite these demands, your energies within Senate are, as always, very much appreciated. This, us, the Senate, would not exist without your commitment. And so I wish you all the best luck over the next few weeks and offer up my eternal gratitude for all of your time and energy spent.

I also want to thank our resource people and guests for attending and engaging in the work of the Senate. And of course, I want to thank the ever-hardworking Senate Office. Without their support we could not get our work done.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Szczygiel: Moving on to the formal Agenda, Item A changed slightly from what is listed in the agenda. It's listed as minutes of the preceding meeting. In fact, the more accurate representation would be records of the preceding meeting. The record of Senate meetings are currently provided in two forms. The first is a recording-- in this case, a video recording-- of the proceedings themselves. This is posted within just a few days after each meeting on the Senate website.

The other is the formal traditional Senate record that provides a full verbatim transcription of the meeting, as required by our rules of procedure. I don't know if you knew that. The transcription process typically takes a longer time, because it's handed to a consulting firm to deal with and produce. So, if it is not ready, quote, "the approving"-- "the record" may mean simply the recording that is posted on the website. So, I hope that's clear to everyone.

Today, for example, we have good news, because both of these things have been posted and have been available for review. We should note that, since the Senate record is required to be verbatim, corrections to the transcription can be made at any given time by notifying the Senate Office. If mistakes are found a year from now, and it's an audio glitch of some sort in the transcription, it needs to be brought to the attention of the Senate Office, and we'll do our best to correct it.

So having said that, setting the stage, are there any additions or corrections to the October 19, 2021, meeting record at this time? Please raise your hand. I see one. No? I see no questions or additions to the
record. Seeing none, the record is approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Szczygiel: Next, Item B, Communications to the Senate-- for your information, the Senate curriculum report of November 9 is posted on the University Faculty Senate website and listed on the agenda as Appendix A, as well as the 2022-2023 Senate calendar, posted on the Agenda as Appendix B. You might want to take a look at that calendar. We'll be talking more about that later on.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Meeting of November 9, 2021

Chair Szczygiel: Agenda Item C, Report of the Senate Council-- minutes from the November 9 Senate meeting can be found in the link on your Agenda. Included in the minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President at their November 9 meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Szczygiel: Agenda Item D, Announcements by the Chair-- first, I would like to make a public service announcement, and-- asking you to please check to make sure your vaccination card documentation, et cetera has been uploaded to the University's website. I've posted the link with-- it's a very easy way to just go on, log in. It'll tell you immediately whether you have indeed uploaded your documentation or not.

I have been informed by a reliable source that the names of some senators are on the identified noncompliance list. So, I just want to post this address and encourage you just to make sure-- do a double check to make sure that the information that you think is up there the correct information. Following that, I have some sad news. A past chair of the Senate, Barton Browning, recently passed away at the age of 81.

Barton was a senator starting in 1975, and his term ended in 2005. I'll save you the math. That, my friends, is 30 years of Senate service. He served as the Senate Chair in 1995 to 1996, and the Immediate Past Chair, of course, the following year. Barton's Senate record was a diverse one. He sat on Faculty Benefits, Curricular Affairs, CC&R, and as well as the Academic and Athletic Standards Committee, which he vice chaired.

He was appointed to a number of important task force, such as the President's Planning and Budget Advisory Committee, Travel Policy Task Force, and he chaired the General Education Humanities Review. And then he continued to provide service outside of Senate, and as a result, was awarded the McKay Donkin Award for service to the University. It's a prestigious award to receive.
He increased the number of Fulbright scholarships for faculty, he led the German Department's Graduate Studies program, and oversaw the Liberal Arts Business minor. And the list of his contributions to this University goes on. Retirement seemed not to slow him down. He was active in restarting what is now the Pennsylvania State University Retirees Association and served as its president.

I am informed that he and his wife Alice were married for 57 years. Barton will certainly be remembered in the Senate records, but also in the hearts of those at Penn State who knew him as a valued colleague. Thank you, Erin.

Onto other news, today marks the last Plenary meeting to be attended by our current Executive Director. As you may have read or heard in a recent Penn State communication, Dawn Blasko will be stepping down from her role as Executive Director of the Faculty Senate, effective December 31-- having served in that role since 2017. This was preceded by no less than two decades of involvement with the Senate as a Penn State Behrend faculty member, and of course, included her own stint as Senate Chair.

Dawn will remain with the University and return to her position as associate professor of psychology at Penn State Behrend. The work and intellectual activity, of which I believe she has missed-- because I hear about it in glowing terms when she and I talk-- in particular, I want to thank Dawn for the enhanced support of faculty governance at all campus locations, including regular meetings with the leadership of college and campus faculty organizations.

These have been really important and meaningful interactions that I know the next Executive director will want to continue. It's a way of reaching out to the campuses in a very meaningful way. Dawn, you'll be missed, and we wish you the very best in the next adventurous phase of your life. I personally want to thank you for the support and advice you've offered during my time as chair. So, Dawn, we bid you a fond farewell.

**Dawn Blasko, Executive Director, Faculty Senate Office:** Thank you.

**Chair Szczygiel:** I want to end my comments on a note regarding an important role that we all play at this institution, a right, if you will, that was created by actions within Senate's Faculty Affairs Committee, and passed on the floor in April 2019, with President Barron providing his full support-- dare I say, enthusiastic support-- in August of that same year. This was a revision to AC14, the policy on academic administrative evaluation.

In that one Senate vote, and with the stroke of the president's quill pen, faculty were granted the right to engage in formal annual evaluations of their academic administrative officers-- that is, those folks who report directly or indirectly to the provost, basically, and includes people like deans, and chancellors, assistant and associate deans, department heads, directors, chief academic officers, and so on-- school directors.

It was given the catchy title of Faculty Reviews of Administrative Effectiveness, or FRAE, and designed to complement the extant five-year assessment process. So, FRAE was intended to offer formative feedback and allow really much more timely, significant input on issues within a given unit, if any were present. The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Dr. Bieschke, was gearing up to implement FRAE that following spring.

Yes, that would have been the spring of 2020, when all of a sudden, there were other pressing matters to attend to, such as surviving a pandemic being at the top of that heap. And it was decided to put FRAE
implementation off for a year. It brings us to spring of 2021. And I'm hoping some memories are beginning to kick in for you. But understandably, by then, folks had sort of forgotten the significance of this Amendment to AC14 made 1 and 1/2 years previous.

We all received a polite request in the mail to—asking us to engage in these reviews. The results of this trial period-- or inaugural period, I should say—were less than spectacular. There was between 36% and 38% participation rates respectively by faculty and staff, meaning that the staff had 38% responded to the faculty. And given a problematic suppression threshold of five or fewer responses needed for each individual, the overall impact was even less heartening. Any individual receiving less than five did not get the feedback.

So, it was very clear something needed to be done, and a plan for more positive future results was kicked into action. A small working group, including two senators and a committee chair, is working feverishly on the survey instruments improvement. Once that group has completed their work, I'll ask that this information be brought back to the Senate floor, if only as a brief update an informational report.

Why am I talking about this silly AC14? Because, folks, this is important. This is the protected anonymous voice faculty and staff have long sought. There must be a mechanism in which to express concerns without fear of reprisal. Now, Penn State did not invent the wheel here, but we are in the process of catching up to other Big Ten institutions. If we want the information to be fair and representative, we need to get those response rates up. And we'll tell you the steps being taken to encourage greater and less hesitant engagement with the new survey instruments-- so more on that later.

OK, finally, to end literally on a pleasant note, there was, last time, in October, an impromptu mingling-- if we can call it that-- on Zoom after our last Plenary. The recording stopped. Most of you flood the Zoom room as quickly as you could until, at the very end, a handful lingered just for a few more minutes. And we had casual conversations, just chatting. I thought that to be a very pleasant way to end these things, and so plan to do it again. And therefore, I invite anyone who wants to hang after the meeting to continue discussions or to express your thoughts or whatever, feel free to linger.

Tracy Peterson, Director, Student Transitions and Pre-College Programs, will provide Introductory Comments

Chair Szczygiel: Now, I would like to introduce Tracy Peterson, Director of Student Transitions and Pre-College Programs, who will make introductory comments about the report sponsored by the Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment, titled, “Aboriginal Acknowledgment,” which can be found in Appendix C. Fifteen minutes have been allotted for presentation and questions.

In just a few words, prior to-- because I can't stop talking-- prior to Tracy's joining us, I first became aware of his work at the university through his involvement in Penn State's diversity roundtable series entitled, “Toward Racial Equity.” He presented at the September 2020 session. Tracy spoke at the company with James Franklin and Brandon Short-- Short being a former football figure and current member of our Board of Trustees.

It was a remarkable, honest conversation on so many levels. And if you can look it up-- or contact me-- I've got the link-- I encourage you to spend the time to watch it. It's very worthwhile to do so. It was Tracy's empathy for first-year students transitioning into the university setting as well as his compassion for the struggles of first-year students and marginalized students that made such an
impression on me. And right then I knew he needed to spend time with us somehow. So, on this very last
day of Native American Heritage Month, I am delighted to introduce Mr. Tracy Peterson.

Aboriginal Acknowledgement – Appendix C

Tracy Peterson, Director, Student Transitions and Pre-College Programs: Thank you. Thank you.
Can everyone see my screen OK?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, we can.

Tracy Peterson: OK, great, great.

[Tracy speaking in Diné Bizaad, the Navajo language] Greetings, my esteemed colleagues. My name is
Tracy Peterson, and I’m a citizen of the Diné (Navajo) Nation. I come from the Zuni Clan of the
Edgewater People Clan, born for the Bitter Water People Clan. My paternal grandfather’s clan is the
Towering House People, and my maternal grandfather’s clan is the Big Water People. In this way I share
my kinship with you so that you will know who I am. Lastly, I’m originally from the Steamboat Canyon
community in Northern Arizona.

[Tracy speaking in English] Welcome, everyone. My name is Tracy Peterson. I serve as Director of
Student Transitions and Pre-College Programs in the College of Engineering. And I'm happy to be here
today in my conversations with Dr. Bird and others around this process and the support from
administration. I just wanted to share a few slides here with all of you. And hopefully this works.

OK, great-- so this is just going to be a brief overview. We're not going to go too far in depth. We've had
several presentations around this, and we will continue to educate the Penn State community, students,
faculty, and staff throughout the coming months. But this is kind of an overview-- land
acknowledgments, land grand institutions, the acknowledgment of land at Penn State, its purpose, when
is a land acknowledgment given, and time for some questions.

What is a land acknowledgment? It's a formal statement that recognizes and respects indigenous peoples
as traditional stewards of land. That's the first and foremost. It also recognizes the enduring relationships
that exist between indigenous peoples and their traditional territories. And why does it matter? Land
acknowledgments aren't about placing blame. The point of making a land acknowledgment is to
recognize the systemic and institutional systems of power and how they have oppressed indigenous
peoples.

And that oppression-- in thinking about this aspect, it's directly related to land grant institutions and other
institutions of higher education. When we think about land grant institutions, I did-- in my earlier career I
started out at Cornell University, and everything land grant I learned at Cornell. I had a great supervisor. I
had a great mentor there.

And basically, in 1862, the legislation was known as the Morrill Act. And again, this law gave public
lands provided to be sold-- or used for profits and to establish at least one college in every state. At least
here at Penn State, this is in our mission-- land grant colleges would teach agricultural sciences and the
mechanical arts. And that's just an overview of land grants. And the act was in 1862, but the actual
legislation goes in at '67.
And just realizing you guys already have all the documentation on the land acknowledgment-- and what we're doing here and what we're saying is that we're recognizing the original homelands of Pennsylvania. I just made my 19-campus tour around this-- around the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in my position representing the College of Engineering and meeting with our different campus colleagues around the 19 campuses to learn what's happening in the state of engineering at their campuses and learning best practices and making those connections.

We completed that earlier last week, and we visited all 19 campuses. And a part of that, I realized-- come to realize that a lot of the campuses aren't aware of One Penn State. And that's one of the biggest findings, that we're all Penn State University. And so that was the driving force behind the acknowledgment of land, because I've talked to various individuals who said, can you create a land acknowledgment for X campus or this campus?

And the way it was presented, I said, the whole Commonwealth is Penn State, so we're recognizing all the tribal nations. And these tribal nations are the Erie, the Haudenosaunee, that Lenape, the Shawnee, the Susquehannock, and Osage nations. And we acknowledge these institutions as traditional caretakers of those lands, and we're striving to understand and model their responsible stewardship. And so, when we think about this and we look at Pennsylvania or the Commonwealth of what-- tribal nations used to thrive in this Commonwealth, here's a map.

I love this map, because it's so detailed, and it gives you a breakdown of where these tribal nations are. As you know, the Susquehannock and Erie people are no longer in existence in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or in the United States as well. They've been decimated. So, the Iroquois, the Haudenosaunee peoples-- this was their territory at one time same people-- they were just partitioned in that way.

The Shawnee and Ohio Valley tribes consist of the Shawnee people in the Osage peoples. The Osage and most of these tribal nations were removed to Oklahoma. And so if you look at Oklahoma, or if you look at territory maps in the state of Oklahoma, you'll see how those lands were partitioned there, and-- Pennsylvania being that homeland.

But also, there are X amount of tribal nations that have passed through, hunted, called Pennsylvania their homelands-- and that idea of moving around. And so, we tend to forget the Meskwaki Nation, and-- whose home base is in Iowa, who were moved to Oklahoma. They hid out in Iowa, and Kansas, and parts of Illinois. And so, this was their territory as well, coming down from Montreal area. And this was their migration paths.

And so, thinking about all these different instances-- and so just a quick overview-- we examine in one of our classes with a graduate student, who was facilitated as an independent study through Dr. Hollie Kulago, who is from the College of Education-- and she had a graduate student, with his class, examine the treaties that were used to dispossess the tribal nations of land within Pennsylvania.

And so, these are the treaties. And so, I'm going to put a link in the chat for all of you. This is a great resource. Eric Novotny from the Library, in response to developing this whole land acknowledgment, created this-- with a team of individuals from the Library created this actual resource that's available for all of you. And you've probably seen this disseminated widely.
And so, to think about the Morrill Grant-- Land Grant Acts of 1867, there were 114 tribal nations affected by this when 780 acres of land was taken by the United States in order to create Penn State specifically. We're not talking about Cornell or the other institutions, but specifically Penn State. The US back then paid $38,000 for those lands. The value today, according to the High Country News article, is around $4 billion-- the value today. It's just something to think about in terms of why land acknowledgments are important.

Let's see here. And so, the last thing here-- a couple of things here-- the purpose-- like I said, it's an expression of gratitude and appreciation to tribal nations. It's a way to honor indigenous peoples who've been living and working on the land. In the state of New York, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy continues to thrive on those lands. And our nearest neighbors are in Salamanca, which-- we've already reached out and started developing relationships.

And even north of there, we're talking about the Seneca Nation, specifically in the Allegheny region and the Cattaraugus region-- and as far up north just past Ithaca to the Cayuga Nation, where we've had individuals go to the SHARE Farm and do some outreach work, and just helping those tribal nations to think about the different aspects. And we've had faculty go there as well.

So, this is really important. And so, it's also important to understand the history of the land and to seek that understanding of the land and our positionality. And land acknowledgments don't exist in the past. They're considered living documents, and that's the key thing here. When we talk about truth and reconciliation, we're talking about amending the past and bringing those individuals into the future with the current state of that government and/or policy relegated to those indigenous peoples.

As we all know, colonialism is an ongoing process, so remembering that-- acknowledging the land is an indigenous protocol, and it's very important. And so, when we're going to give a land acknowledgment, understanding the difference between situational and relational-- meaning that meetings versus events is referring to situational. And relational are things like tours. We need to get our tour guides up to speed to understand how to give this land acknowledgment when we're welcoming prospective students to campus.

Events, graduation, commencement-- these are big things where individual leadership can do these things. And it's just a way to bring forth the indigenous past of Penn State. Penn State is known for its education program. There are literally hundreds of famous alumni that have always-- refer back to Penn State as their home, as where they got their degrees. And they're out there.

When you look at Native America, in terms of leadership, I would say at least eight out of ten individuals in leadership are Penn State graduates. And that is huge, because of the American Indian teaching program that once existed in the College of Education. And so also understanding that this is a colonial practice of-- decolonial practice of understanding of place and relation to self and making indigenous peoples and land relevant in the work that we do-- there's always ways that we can integrate this-- the land acknowledgment as well as its teachings into the pedagogy of our scholarship.

And that's really important. It's an important aspect-- and also that this is a reflection process in which you practice mindfulness and intention, and recognizing and honoring indigenous nations, whose lands you are on. And I'm sure most of you been to conferences where that has been done or international settings where they are recognizing this type of work in that being done. So, this is just a brief overview.
And again, please reach out to us. I'm a part of the Indigenous Faculty Staff Alliance, which has somewhat formalized to bring indigenous faculty, staff, and allies to this work. And so, we meet on a biweekly basis, and we can share that out with Douglas Bird, and he can share it here. He's attended a meeting, and we welcome anyone to join that working group. And that's how we were able to get with the libraries, and now there's a lot of little projects that are popping up that are great. Are there any questions?

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you very much, Tracy. I think we're just going to make a segue way over into Doug's presentation next.

Douglas Bird, College of the Liberal Arts: Hi, everyone. Can I just share my screen?

Chair Szczygiel: Hopefully you can.

Douglas Bird: OK. Just one sec-- let me pull up my-- so hi, everyone. I'm Doug Bird. I am a Senator from the College of Liberal Arts, and I currently serve as chair for the EECE, the Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment.

First, I would like to acknowledge that Penn State is a land grant university with campuses located on the original homelands of the Erie, Haudenosaunee, Lenape, Shawnee, Susquehannock, and the Wahzhazhe nations. And most importantly, thank you so much, Tracy, for your moving address-- so important. In support of the efforts of Penn State's Indigenous Faculty and Staff Alliance and the Indigenous Peoples Student Association, EECE has submitted an informational report to invigorate Penn State's acknowledgment of land that was adopted in May of this year.

And the goal of this report is to simply identify the needs for developing a process of truth and reconciliation related to indigenous representation and equity on Pennsylvania State University lands and campuses. As a land grant university, Penn State's original federal endowment was provided, as Tracy detailed by the Morrill Act of 1862. And under that Morrill Act, the United States set aside indigenous lands to be used either directly for space to build universities, or alternatively, if a state didn't have any lands available, the proceeds of lands that were expropriated from indigenous nations and tribes elsewhere were then awarded to the states to buy land for purposes of higher education.

And in 1867, the Morrill Act gave 79,461 parcels of indigenous lands totaling 10.7 million acres to 52 land grant universities to fund their initial endowments. One hundred percent of Penn State's initial federal endowment came from the lands expropriated under the act. This total as Tracy said-- $439,000 from the sale of 776 acres of indigenous lands, mostly in the West and northern Midwest. The U.S. government paid $38,000 for those lands. Today estimates of the endowment principle that's been raised from Penn State's original grant range upwards in the billions.

Among many other reasons, this is partly why a living and continuing acknowledgment of land is necessary at Penn State. In light of those kinds of inequities, the goal of the EECE report is to identify gaps in current operations and representation inclusion regarding indigenous nations, the historic tribes, University organizations, faculty, staff, and students with a target of working toward processes that recognize sovereign relationships between the University and the historic tribes and federally recognized tribes whose land the University now occupies.

Collaboration with a range of Penn State indigenous organizations, and colleagues, and students at all campuses is going to be necessary, as their considerations are really diverse. The goal is to not further
burden indigenous colleagues and students, but to engage in a process of identifying how the University Faculty Senate can support ongoing efforts related to truth and reconciliation.

A vision of what that process needs to be needs to come from lasting collaboration with various indigenous individuals, and organizations, historic tribes, and regional nations, current researchers, and groups that have been working on these issues now-- in fact, in some cases, for generations. So, thank you all so much. Again, thank you to Tracy. Thank you all for your consideration of these important matters and for the work that you all do representing our diverse Penn State community.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you very much, both Tracy and Doug. We could spare a minute or two for a question, but then I'm afraid we have to move on. Anyone has any comments-- you've been getting a lot of feedback, Tracy-- all positive, saying, thank you so much for coming. We're going to catch up with this topic again soon, so Doug, keep on coming back and keeping us abreast of what's happening. And again, thank you, Tracy, for spending your time with us.

All right, before we turn to Agenda Item E, I'd like to explain the slightly different process we'll be following. I've asked the president to make his remarks, followed immediately by the provost's remarks, holding all questions and comments to the very end of both of their announcements. Then we've-- I've allotted 20 minutes for questions. All right? So, we're going to hear both presentations, and then have time for questions.

---

**COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY**

**Chair Szczygiel:** So, it is now time to move on to Item-- Agenda Item E, Comments by the President of the University. It's my pleasure to recognize President Barron for his comments.

**Eric Barron: President, Penn State University:** Well, thank you very much. I appreciate it. So, a few things that just take a minute, and then one perhaps a little bit longer-- so as you know, we have been working hard on entrepreneurship and economic development activities in the University, a lot of it through Invent Penn State, now with a launchbox or some other innovation hub at every campus-- although a couple of them have not cut the ribbons yet.

We are working hard because of the opportunity that economic development has a lot of support, in terms of our efforts and our outreach to get permanent funding coming from the State of Pennsylvania-- a relatively rare opportunity to increase dollars coming into the University from the state.

I have, with a group of others had a hearing with the Senate on-- a committee on this topic with the Governor's Budget Officer and with the Secretary of DCED, as well as others, and seeing significant support for what Penn State is doing. We are hopeful that we will see it, as we move into 2022, in the Governor's budget, and that we will have significant support in the state. And hopefully they will match Penn State's investment.

Perhaps you know that more than 5,000 entrepreneurs have gone through our launchboxes-- significant number of companies developed, and-- really a remarkable amount of support coming in from community members and others, and some true success stories of our students taking their ideas into the marketplace and being successful on an international stage. So that's one to watch. Hopefully we will get the support that we need.
A second issue is that I think, as you know, I have been following through on select commission recommendations, and announced a short while ago the Center for Racial Justice. That is now in the search process with Lora Weiss, working with lots of advice on creating the Search Committee. So, we're hoping that mid-spring, we will identify a director. She's also been collecting all of the different types of programs that might benefit, and support, and be coupled with the new Center for Racial Justice. So, it's good to see now another one of the topics from the select commission reaching a level of fruition.

A third Item is the capital plan. This University, over the last 5 to 10 years, has been working hard at capital renewal and construction of a number of different buildings across the entire spectrum. We're just in the process of developing the next capital plan that the board, in short order, will be discussing. The amount of money involved is substantially less than prior years.

The combination of maintaining flat in-state tuition and dipping into our reserves to help support capital renewal and the pandemic, which had a substantial impact on the budget of the University-- both from the viewpoint of enrollment, which will take a couple of years for it to flow through the system as that freshman class moves on onto graduation, as that first-year class moves on to graduation-- and so it will be substantially reduced.

Unfortunately, our backlog for maintenance is growing, and the resources are not there to alter that. But we're going to do our very best to take the very highest priority buildings and issues and-- to move forward. And then hopefully, as we recover financially from the pandemic and hopefully get additional resources, we will find a way to push back on some of that deferred maintenance.

The other thing that I thought I would just talk about briefly is what the presidents and chancellors in the AAU have been discussing. So recently we had a meeting, and I'm just going to point out some of what were the hottest topics. So, one of the topics that had a great deal of discussion was entitled the role of the University in preserving our democracy-- an interesting topic based partly on the high level of polarity that exists within the country, coupled with a media that is equally polarized and very quick to issue comment; and from the president's viewpoint, a lack of an understanding of civics within the country, and even within universities.

And so much of the discussion of this went to the degree to which universities are having pressure on our classrooms, and what we're teaching, and what we're saying. And we feel that here at Penn State, the number of times where people from across the spectrum are objecting to what is taught in the classroom, claiming that it's indoctrination, rather than an education.

I think you could pick a lot of topics, but critical race theory is certainly one that you hear a lot about in the news. Quite frankly, I suspect that maybe 1% or 2% of the country even understands what critical race theory is, but yet the words have been weaponized as a suggestion of an indoctrination of students.

There is clearly-- and you see it in surveys, and we see it in those comments on that side of the issue-- a lack of trust from the outside in our faculty, and a belief that our faculty has tilted far, far to the left, and that are no longer representative of what so many people in the country are believing. I can flip to the opposite side that presidents were discussing, which was the number of times where faculty, students, and others-- wish to silence those areas for which we disagree with, where I hear students saying, perhaps we should have a litmus test on who can be admitted to Penn State-- if they profoundly disagree.
And we know that, across the spectrum, there are significant protests when speakers at commencements are announced. I somehow think that we're going to get to the point where every speaker is controversial, and we will have to only invite athletes who don't have opinions on topics or haven't been present in the world in some respects to be the speakers.

But we see this increasingly, that notion of not letting ideas being tested in the marketplace. So, this is occurring from both sides of the spectrum. And it was a very fulsome discussion on the part of the presidents and chancellors on how it can be that universities can, in this sense, preserve our democracy.

I actually think-- and I know it's a sore topic in a lot of ways-- that Milo is the perfect example of this. Milo is clearly a flawed individual. I personally find his thoughts and presentations to be abhorrent. The view was-- and I think the vast majority of us share it-- that the greatest concern was the degree to which this was going to hurt our students, faculty, and staff-- particularly the LGBTQ population-- of our University.

I look back at what happened. I don't believe Milo thought he was going to be allowed to speak. His speech was terrible, and discombobulated, and unprepared, and got very little attention for what he said or how he said it. It's basically hard to find anything about what he said and how he said it. He didn't sell all his tickets until the last-minute people entered. OK, some demonstrations outside-- a lot of people worried, including our police services about, whether or not this would turn out to be problematic. It wasn't.

But then there was the counter-element, which was “Love is Louder Than Hate,” that was in the hub. More than 1,900 people showed up. The lines were incredibly long to get into the room. Molly and I were in the line, and just amazed at the outpouring of support.

And my reflection on what went on in that room was that it was a celebration in support of individual identity, exactly the opposite of what Milo wanted to have happen on this campus. He wanted to be kicked off, and so he wasn't prepared, because we didn't kick him off. He wanted to foment this discomfort among a population, and instead, Penn State celebrated individual identity in all its many forms.

I have to say, for all of you who were there and who supported our students, thank you, because I believe this is the case where Penn State spoke out loudly on what's important to us. And the outcome was the exact opposite of what Milo wanted. And I think, in testing the ideas in the marketplace, he failed, and Penn State won.

I don't know that it will always happen that way, but I'll tell you, I'm incredibly proud of the Penn State community and how they reacted to that, especially given the fact that all the legal advice that we got was there was little choice in the decisions that the administration has made in this case. We talked a great deal in AAU about public opinion. The polarity associated with higher education is extreme.

When the opinions were asked about whether or not universities are worth it, and worthy of support, and questions of that ilk, the majority in both parties said no. It was interesting to see that this came out in ideas like taxing endowments, which were just indications of the wealth accumulated by universities. Despite the fact that a very small percentage of it is not legally bound with the donors that have provided for particular purposes, the notion of an endowment tax is gaining steam.
But here is this notion that both sides of the aisle are viewing higher education as not worthy of support--very different opinions in terms of each side about whether one side feels that it's a cost factor and the other side feels that it's not-- that we're not teaching the right things. It is interesting. In the surveys, as soon as you insert the word research, the support for the universities goes up, but it's still not something to be proud of.

And the surveys suggest that we counter those arguments and actually get a favorable response to those questions when three things are introduced into the equation. One is the level of research supporting COVID is a positive, in terms of the viewpoints. I think that's interesting. It's, of course, telling us what is on everyone's mind.

Economic development-- if you talk about the role of research universities in economic development, it swings to positive again. This probably reflects my earlier comments about the state seemingly being positive about support of Penn State. And the third is that we are in the path of upward mobility for low-income students. Those three things switch the public opinions-- so these are public opinions-- switch the public opinions to a more positive, but yet not overwhelmingly positive perspective.

We had a discussion, including federal partners, on the number of topics that fit within the scope of what I've just described, in terms of both the polarity and public opinion. And the list is remarkable, and in my opinion, much longer than the list that we might have seen in the past. Student debt's a big topic. Endowments and what you do with it is a big topic. Build Back Better, in terms of its role in supporting universities, free community college, issues associated with foreign students and faculty members, national defense authority and its role in the University environment, DACA, college transparency, expansion of EPScRoR research support in different areas-- particularly targeted areas of research support-- DE&I-- it is an incredible list with a high level of polarity associated with almost every single topic.

So, in many ways, we're in a very interesting place. And we do this and talk about these issues in the middle of what I would call considerable anxiety among faculty, staff, students, and administrators, and the public. The level of isolation which COVID has brought, the sense of loss of agency and determining what it is we want to do with our lives, how we want to teach-- these are universal issues, according to the AAU presidents, regardless of mandate, regardless of other characteristics.

Every single one of those presidents is sensing this feeling of helplessness associated with a pandemic. And I think, with a lot of negative consequence for everything from shared governance to personal satisfaction to a sense of the value of the jobs that each one of us is doing-- one of the final elements of this is how long it will take us to recover from something that has been so challenging and so difficult.

So Bonj, I will stop there and have you pass the baton. But I thought it might be useful to realize really what a stressful world higher education is. And I wouldn't say we've had a lot of people making suggestions for what to do about it-- more the expression from a large number of presidents and chancellors on the challenges, particularly the polarity around each one of these challenges that is weighing heavily on everybody's mind. So, I'll stop there. Thank you.
COMMENDS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, President Barron. Indeed, stressful times-- it's now my pleasure to recognize Provost Jones for his comments.

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: Thank you, Bonj. Three topics I want to cover today-- COVID, of course, enrollment, and budget briefly-- and I'll be doing a more full budget presentation at the next Senate Plenary, so this will just be hitting some highlights. First, under COVID-- three topics to cover really here-- a recap on how the semester has gone and where we are, the federal mandate, and of course, some new Greek letter that emerged primarily over the Thanksgiving break.

So first, in terms of status for the fall semester, first and foremost-- big shout out to Kelly Wolgast, director of the COCC for her tremendous work in really leading the University through the many, many, many things that we have had to navigate. Now Kelly's been-- I didn't think she quite anticipated she was signing up for a job with such a long, tenure but-- done an awesome job.

Overall, through the fall-- and the fall is not over-- I realize this. The testing positivity-- and I'll talk about University Park and the campuses separately-- we stayed mainly in the 0.5% to 0.7% range for positivity, which was a good low number. Recently-- for those of you who've been looking at the dashboard, all these data are available in detail on dashboard-- we bumped up to around 2%.

That was pre-Thanksgiving testing and post-Thanksgiving return. So, we're seeing a little bit of a tick up driven in some part by larger numbers of positives, but also larger numbers of positive just being generated from lower numbers of tests, as people have returned and as people are departed.

Vaccination rates at University Park-- we're sitting right around 90% for students overall-- 92% residential, 88% non-residential; for faculty, 98%; administrators, 99%; staff, 90%; and union staff-- again, all University Park-- now at 52%. The numbers that we've seen of hospitalized folks at Mount Nittany has remained reasonably stable-- troublingly high through the fall-- usually hovering around the mid-30s-- bumped up a little bit over the break, but back down into the 30s again-- but just stubborn.

And I know the leadership at Mount Nittany has been frustrated with the continuous churn of folks there. Fortunately for us, I think we don't need one hand to count the number of students who were admitted to Mount Nittany, so that's a very good outcome for us. And generally, our numbers for quarantine and isolation remained low.

The campuses-- obviously, the vaccination rates remain lower. Some of the campuses in particular have made really extraordinary progress from where they were when we last spoke about the numbers. They've done really an awesome job. People have been working very hard to drive the compliance and encourage vaccination. There are still some campus locations where the numbers remain stubbornly low, and we just keep pushing.

Second issue is the federal mandate. There are several components to the mandate. And also want to do a shout-out to Lindsey Droz-- many of you probably have not interacted with Lindsey. We brought her on to help us manage through the implementation of the Executive Order at Penn State. There's just a lot of moving parts here, and Lindsey's done an awesome job in leading us through this.
There are many components to the Executive Order. The two that are of most general relevance-- there's a third, but the two that are of most general relevance to Penn State are the federal contractor requirements, which apply at University Park and the following campuses-- Altoona, Behrend, Berks, Brandywine, DuBois, Fayette, Harrisburg, Schuylkill, plus the College of Medicine, plus anybody who's working in agricultural extension.

For all of those locations, by January 4, employees need to be vaccinated or have an exception-- religious or medical-- and then be tested on a regular basis-- weekly basis after that period. There's no test out. All other campuses are subjected to the OSHA requirement, which is basically you're either vaccinated or you test weekly.

That one is being challenged in the courts, so we don't know the outcome of that process yet. But we are planning around it, prevailing-- and so implementing that mandate. That's actually not a whole lot different from what we are requiring now of our employees, but it does extend to include union employees at all locations. But we've got to prepare, because there's not a lot of runway between now and January the 4th, of course.

Information about compliance went out today. It's in Penn State Today. Bottom line is you get your cards in. Get vaccinated. Get your boosters. And encourage anybody and everybody around you to do the same. We've only got a month until January 4th, and there's a lot to be done, particularly with the holidays.

And then finally, Omicron-- you've probably all had about enough of that Greek letter as I have just in less than a week-- not much to say here. So much is not yet known about this. It has emerged rapidly relatively rapidly, just-- probably more rapidly than Delta did. Much more will emerge over the next two to three weeks, so we're still in a listening and learning phase.

We are prepared. We are prepared with the infrastructure and the people that we need to make a change, should we need to make a change and we will pivot as needed. But we just need to wait for the data and the understanding to come in. And probably the best thing I can say here is that we are going to continue with our layered approach to resisting and managing the presence of the virus at our campus locations, and so masking will continue with us for the foreseeable future, and all of the other protocols we have in effect.

OK, so that's it for COVID. Enrollment-- it's been obviously a bit of a challenging year with enrollment because of COVID, which has caused a lot of churn. And the churn has been different at different locations. There's all the data that you would care to see on OPAIR's website in the Penn State Data Digest and the weekly enrollment dashboard as of fall census date. And I encourage any of you who are interested to take a look there.

I'm just going to hit some of the high points, but there's much information there for you to chew into. Overall enrollment remains steady for Penn State. We saw a 1% decrease in student numbers for fall '21 and a 2.7% decrease from pre-COVID in fall of 2019. So those are small numbers, but they have big budgetary implications. I'll talk about that in a moment.

University-wide, fall 2021 enrollment is just shy of, as of census date, 89,000 students. University Park on-campus enrollment increased by 2.2% compared to 2020, and 0.4% compared to 2019-- very good
news there. At the campuses, the story is a little different. On-campus enrollment decreased by 8.1%, but students receiving instruction at campuses through the World Campus increased by 1.4%.

Degree level-- we know that around the country colleges and universities are feeling the impact of COVID on enrollment. A recent report from the National Student Clearinghouse indicates that the U.S. experienced a 3.2% year-over-year undergraduate enrollment decline. Penn State's undergraduate enrollment for fall '21 includes a little over-- about 73,500 students which represents a decrease of 1.3%.

Graduate programs enrolled 13,900 students for fall '21, which is a decline of about 1% from last year. And then undergraduate students-- University's undergraduate enrollment was just over 16,000 first-time students, a 2.8% increase from fall 2020 and very slight decrease compared to 2019. So, that is a good indication of a bounce-back.

The number of first-time undergraduate resident instruction students at University Park increased by 1.8% to a little over 8,600 students. The number of first-time undergraduate resident instruction students at the campuses increased by 2.6%-- very good news there. And the outlook for 2022 is promising. We are seeing strong interest through undergraduate first-year baccalaureate applications, which are significantly higher than even the 2019 numbers-- so all good news there.

International enrollment was impacted-- slight increase from '20 to '21, just under a percent. But that follows an 11.4% decrease from 2019 to 2020. I think most of you have dealt firsthand with the impact of the pandemic on our international student populations.

So, we saw that pretty steep dip-- 10.2%, thereabouts-- in-- enrollment-- of new international undergraduates. New international graduate student enrollment saw a 64.2% increase-- pretty remarkable. And this rise contributed to this year's slight increase in total international student enrollment-- so generally, some positive news there on the enrollment front, certainly, looking forward. But you can see the impacts of the COVID bubble-- negative bubble is that continues to propagate through the system, and will for a couple of years yet.

Finally, budget-- just some bulleted highlights, again, in advance of the full budget presentation at the next Plenary-- total operating budget for the University-- $7.7 billion. That includes Penn State health, education and general, and other components. The education and general funds budget, which is the one that we are generally most focused on, was a total of $2.6 billion.

For the 2021-22 year, we assumed a 0% increase in the state appropriation, a 2.5% tuition rate increase for in-state undergraduates, a 2.75% increase out of state. And the budget assumed that student enrollment would remain at about the same levels as 2020-21, and as you've heard, it didn't quite.

Approved uses for this year's budget included a 2% salary pool, $10 million in incremental student aid, $12 million for strategic investments, and a 2% across the board rescission for all E&G units. E&G sources-- less uses resulted in a projected manageable deficit of $11 million, with the expectation that an additional 1% rescission would be implemented, if needed, to make the gap.

And unfortunately, since, as you heard, full-term enrollments are about 1,000 students lower than the previous year, the additional 1% rescission was implemented in order to offset the revenue shortfall plus the $11 million in unidentified cost savings that had originally been approved by the board. And Mary Lou and I, and Mary Lou's team are working through budget review meetings with every one of the E&G units through this-- the end of this semester.
And we've got several more ahead of us, and-- having good robust discussion with all of the budget executives about how they're incorporating that additional 1% rescission and just how they're doing in the midst of these challenging times. So, Bonj, let me stop there and-- happy to go to questions.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Provost Jones. Open the floor up now to up to 20 minutes-- we might not need all of that time, but we have it-- for questions, comments to either of our speakers. Please raise your hand-- virtual hand-- and when called upon, identify yourself and your unit. I see we have Ray Najjar.

Raymond Najjar, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Hi. Eric, Nick, thanks for your comments. A neighbor of mine attended the Trans-Siberian Orchestra concert at the Bryce Jordan Center on November 19 and shared with me, and on Facebook, pictures of the event which revealed that very few in attendance were wearing masks. While masking was enforced upon entry, it wasn't afterwards, even though my neighbor was assured that it would be. When my neighbor complained to staff, they either shrugged, stared blankly, or said sorry. My neighbor left after the second song.

My neighbor emailed the Bryce Jordan Center, CCing me, and I followed up with an email to the BJC and also to the Office of the President on November 21. But I never got a reply. My neighbor's getting a refund from the BJC, but there was no apology about not enforcing masking, and no promise that this would not happen again. And that's basically what I'm asking you to do in a public statement.

I don't think it's an overstatement to classify this as a super spreader event, so an apology to the communities of State College and Centre County is needed. We cannot have any more of these events. Cases, as Nick pointed out, are very high in the county now, and events like this must be contributing to the spread of the virus, especially now, with the highly transmissible Delta variant and relatively low vaccination rate in Centre County, which is only 52%.

I know I am often critical about Penn State COVID policy. And I want to be clear that I think Penn State is doing a number of things right with regard to COVID, at least at University Park, where, as you pointed out, Nick, the student vaccination rates are high. And I've also taken advantage of, frequently, the access to rapid and effective testing at White Building. It's really a great system there.

I'm also pleased with being able to hold office hours and other meetings via Zoom. Masking in buildings-- I think, even at most entertainment events, such as volleyball games, and as far as I've heard, School of Music concerts, appears to be adhered to. Hopefully the BJC Trans-Siberian Orchestra concert was an outlier.

Would you please apologize, one of you, to the communities of State College and Centre County for endangering their health, and promise that all future Penn State indoor entertainment events will enforce masking while the pandemic is still a threat? Thank you.

Provost Jones: Ray, let me take a crack at responding first. And I will say that, when I heard about the concern that you shared, I was actually surprised and somewhat disappointed, because the week before I had actually been to a theater event on the campus and was-- came back to the office the following week and was talking up how well everybody was complying.

Raymond Najjar: Yeah.

Provost Jones: The messaging was clear. Event was clear. There were masks available for anybody who didn't--
Raymond Najjar: Exactly.

Provost Jones: There was-- I would say, Ray, there was no enforcement necessary--

Raymond Najjar: Right.

Provost Jones: --because everybody was compliant. So that was a good thing. We were certainly disappointed to hear that there was a large degree of noncompliance. That's not what we expected. I would say all folks involved in the process had done everything they could in advance of-- when people were purchasing tickets, when people arrived, when they were walking in, there were masks available, being handed out, and just constant, constant, constant reinforcement that mask wearing was a requirement.

Of course, then, evidently, what happened when people went in? They started taking their masks off, as your pictures demonstrated. We certainly regret that this happened. And to the extent that made people like your neighbor uncomfortable we do really feel bad about that and apologize that she found herself in that uncomfortable position.

We have followed up with the BJC about redoubling our efforts, both in the prior marketing of these events, the distribution of tickets and on arrival to really strongly, strongly, strongly encourage mask wearing. And unfortunately, once the doors closed and the lights go down it, it becomes difficult, as it always is, to enforce without being seriously disruptive. And we recognize that. And we're going to continue to do our very best to encourage anybody participating in these events to follow the University requirement that masks be worn at all indoor locations.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Nick. Greg--

Gregory Shearer, College of Health and Human Development: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Greg, could you identify yourself and your unit?

Gregory Shearer: Yeah. Greg Shearer, HHD-- President Barron, Provost Jones, thanks for making yourself available. And thanks to President Barron for your comments on the perception of universities. I'm commenting on behalf of faculty across the University from within HHD to ARL, Engineering, Liberal Arts, and more, and I'm asking for your feedback.

I've been asked to express concern over the University's decision-making policies and communication around COVID management, which are creating an intolerant climate that affects the unvaccinated and the exempt. A strong one-sided narrative is fostering a hostile environment, and open dialogue has been shut down.

In response, faculty and students are reaching out to me to bring this to your attention-- among the concerns, the University avoiding informing graduate students of their entitlements to exemptions, which have the effect of coercing them into violating their conscience or facing censure by their advisors; increasing acceptance of personal attack and pressure as faculty and student who are self-censoring, being labeled, and losing professional contacts; and an opaque policymaking process that appears devoted to a single viewpoint, irrespective of evidence to the contrary. And I'm happy to share more details of this these claims at another time.
In the past, the University has been quick to resist government policies that undermine the security and liberty of community members. The administration and the Faculty Senate have worked together to promote open dialogue and representation of multiple viewpoints, but this advocacy appears to be available only to select elites who are at risk.

I ask, does this commitment change when viewpoints are perceived to be predominantly held by poor rural Pennsylvanians not privileged with elite education, or to academics who, by employing their expertise, draw conclusions that align with those groups? We see something, so we are saying something. And we are asking, does the administration acknowledge that this one-sided narrative is hostile?

Does the administration acknowledge that there are subject matter experts whose evidence-based conclusions disagree with the University and the predominant narrative? Why aren't they invited to the discussion? And finally, would the administration be open to convening a COVID Climate and Diversity Committee that allows-- that commits to allowing the voice for the counter-narrative?

If we get these issues wrong because of our biases, we're getting it wrong when it matters most, but also, we are losing out on unconsidered solutions. And you mentioned the lack of trust in universities. This is it. This is why we have problems in this. And we encourage you to be a bridge and make Penn State an example. Thanks.

**President Barron:** Well, thank you for your comment. I will say that the health data is overwhelmingly that your risk of hospitalization goes way up without vaccination, and that masking, and social distancing, and vaccination are basically our protection. And since our first obligation, despite the fact that the way we're doing it can be controversial, is to the health and safety of our community, at the same time, obviously, we recognize that there are counter viewpoints, strongly held beliefs that are opposed to vaccination and opposed to masking.

I think we had a good example in the prior discussion about the challenge of a few staff members trying to tell people what to do within the BJC. So, I think the University's narrative is always going to be leaning towards that notion that the more vaccinated and the more masking, the safer that we will be. Obviously, we have exceptions, and we've worked hard to develop those exceptions. But I take your point.

We already sense that there is conflict arising between those vaccinated and not vaccinated, those who want masks to be worn and those do not. So, I acknowledge that. And I will tell you that, from an administrative viewpoint, we believe this is likely to get worse, because especially with all of the different federal levels of mandates, we will see multiple people in an open office. Four may be vaccinated, one person with an exception.

We're seeing it in local businesses that there are arguments that are occurring between those that are vaccinated and those that are not, where those that are vaccinated believe that the unvaccinated are putting them at risk. So, I do think that this is an issue that's going to grow. And so, the administration is already having conversations about, what can we do, following all the rules and regulations, and realize that people take this very, very seriously, and they have very different viewpoints? So, I think we're not done yet here with this space.

**Provost Jones:** And Greg, could I just add too please that, if there are-- I'm not quite sure what the issue is with graduate students, but perhaps you can email me the details. I'm happy to follow up on that. We
tried to be very careful in this process to ensure that no units within-- or cohorts within our community were excluded.

And we've got big, complicated tables with all kinds of columns representing the different groups, so if we missed something on graduate students, then we need to address-- and certainly, we have very little tolerance for any kind of attacks, verbal and certainly physical, on any individuals as a result of this, or the creation of hostile environment. So, if there are situations where that is perceived to be occurring, please let us know so we are able to act and hopefully act quickly.

President Barron: There is a message already just in the chat that someone feels like they need to be anonymous to talk about this. And so, this, I think, signals that the fact that it’s going to be an issue. But I do think any level of harassment is intolerable, and echo Nick's comment that it needs to be reported-- specifically reported.

Provost Jones: And as far as a committee goes, I would just respond quickly that, frankly, over the course of the next six weeks, everybody has their sleeves rolled up to well above their elbow just trying to get us through the expectations associated with the implementation of the federal mandate by January 4. So that that's going to be hard. I certainly always welcome emails from anybody who has thoughts that they want to share. And certainly, as we roll into the new year, we can consider putting a group together to discuss this.

Gregory Shearer: Really appreciate that, both of you-- and yeah, I think, for-- from our viewpoint, the concern is primarily that there don't seem to be any countervailing viewpoints expertise-- by people with expertise. But I certainly appreciate that you-- to the extent you give it serious concern, we very much appreciate it.

Provost Jones: Yeah.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you very much. We need to move on. I am going to hold us to that 20-minute time limit, and, we're getting pretty close to it, as-- so Megan, brevity would be really appreciated. Please introduce yourself and where you're from.

Megan Neely, College of Arts and Architecture: Hi. Megan Neely, College of Arts and Architecture-- so as you know now, it's Hanukkah right now, and according to the Hillel College Guide Magazine fall of 2020 edition, Penn State has over 4,000 Jewish students that comprises 10% of our student population, and we have the 10th largest Jewish population of any public US university.

But the two most important Jewish holidays-- some of the most important ones are Yom Kippur and Rosh Hashanah. I understand now that students are allowed to-- they're excused from their classes, but Penn State does not have non-instructional days for Jewish holidays, like they do for a lot of other holidays. Has Penn State administration ever considered non-instructional days for Jewish holidays for Jewish students as well as Jewish faculty, staff, and administration?

Provost Jones: Megan, don't know for a fact, I would be very surprised if, at some point during Penn State's history, this has not come up. I can certainly reach out to Yvonne Gaudelius and ask her if she can review that for me. If she's on, she might be able to drop something in the chat, but it's certainly something we can take a look at and work with the Senate, of course, given the nature of the topic.

Megan Neely: Thank you.
Chair Szczygiel: Thank you both. Nathan, you're up.

Nathan Tallman, University Libraries and Scholarly Communications: Thank you-- Tallman, University Libraries-- the University of Florida recently tried to prevent three faculty members from serving as expert witnesses in a voting rights case in that state. The University used language in the conflict of interest policy to deny this request, as they thought it would have, quote, "adversely affect the University's interest or mission," end quote.

The same language is currently in AD77, and in the new draft of AC80. In a hypothetical situation where Penn State faculty member-- a Penn State faculty member is asked to serve as an expert witness in legal proceedings against the Commonwealth of PA-- either administrators or legislators-- would they be permitted to proceed, or could this language in AD77, AC80 be invoked to prohibit this request? Thank you.

President Barron: They would absolutely be permitted to do so-- very different in Florida in a lot of ways. Given that I spent four years as a president at a neighboring university, university employees are considered to be state employees, and as a consequence, there's often considerable pressure to act like a state employee so that you don't stand as a witness against the State of Florida.

Obviously, enough noise was out there that that has changed, but personally, I would find that to be unacceptable. It's not our policy, nor is it our attitude, nor is it our history, nor are you an employee of the State of Pennsylvania. So, I think that can count on the fact that, if that were to occur, you would get a very different response here.

Nathan Tallman: Thank you very much for that full-throated response, and thumbs up, Provost Jones.

Chair Szczygiel: Donald?

Donald Impavido, College of Information Sciences and Technology: Hi. College of IST, Donald Impavido—I had question about the mask mandates. And I don't want to argue for, or against, or bring them up or anything, but I'd like to know if we could talk about or bring up the goalposts of what we'd like to see so we can drop the mask mandates. We've had them for over a year now. We have a vaccination rate pretty much across the board around 90% in almost every category.

And I'm noticing students are wearing the mask less and less as time goes on. So, I was just wondering, what can we do or what do we need to see in order for the mask mandates to go away?

President Barron: So, I will tell you-- Nick can probably add in here-- I will tell you my own opinion. Vaccines, masking, social distancing-- those are the three keys to fighting this disease. And in particular, as you have new variants come on, as we have now, or if you go back a week or two and the caseloads were going up, literally, you can watch the infection rates across the United States to appear as a wave, where it-- month or so ago, it was largely in the South, and you literally watched it march up the east coast to Pennsylvania and New York.

As long as we're in a world like that, I would be supporting a mask mandate. I have many people that are suggesting that our numbers are so low that we could stop having a mask mandate. I think we have to wait a little bit longer. And so right now we're following all of the guidance that we have, and we will continue to do so.
I think it's going to take a little bit more time. I'm truly hoping that we start to see things settle down, and that we can start to relax back, but I don't expect it to be soon. Nick, I don't know whether you want to add more to that.

Provost Jones: Yeah. I would just add, Eric, that, at this point, we're taking things-- I wouldn't necessarily say one day at a time, but certainly one week at a time. A week ago today, we were barely talking about omicron, and now it's all we're talking about, so things are changing very quickly. And the importance of maintaining the different layers of protection, as the president noted, are critically important.

So, I can't see us not returning in the spring without the mask mandate in force. Maybe sometime through the spring semester, conditions will be that it can be lifted. It's just too early to predict. But the sooner we get to a place where we're comfortable that there are no more surges coming, the sooner we'll be able to get there.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, thank you very much. And I apologize to Joseph and Michael, but I am going to hold us to that 20-minute time period. I think, if you posted your comments or questions in the chat, there's a chance that you would get a response, but if not from our speakers, then at least from some of the faculty. So let us move on. Thank you, Provost Jones and President Barron, for your time.

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Szczygiel: Moving on to Item G, Forensic Business-- today we have a forensic report from the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs, titled, “Microcredentials and the Senate's Role.” It can be found in Appendix E. Here to present the report are Mary Beth Williams, Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee; Liz Wright, Director of Academic Affairs, Penn State Hazleton; Gary Chinn, Assistant Dean of digital learning in College of Arts and Architecture; and Kelly Griffith, Director of summer sessions undergraduate programs. Please take the mic.

Microcredentials and the Senate’s Role – Appendix E

Mary Beth Williams, Eberly College of Science: Thanks, Bonj. Thanks very much. Good afternoon, senators. In October, the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs had the opportunity to meet with the three co-chairs of the One Penn State 2025 Guiding Principle Three Committee-- Liz Wright, Kelly Griffith, and Gary Chinn, who Bonj just introduced for you. We met with them to talk about the work of their committee, and in particular, how it intersects with curriculum and Senate policy work.

I'm pleased to be joined by all three of them this afternoon for this discussion with all of you. As you saw and read in our brief forensic report, the One Penn State 2025 GP3 Committee is considering a report that was generated by the Online Coordinating Council-- this was linked in our report-- I hope you had a chance to take a look at it-- which makes recommendations on micro credentialing and badging of educational programs at Penn State.

To orient our conversation today, microcredentials, or badges, are broadly defined as the formal recognition of learning by students, but at a level smaller than a degree or a credit unit. Microcredentials can be credit-bearing or non-credit-bearing. Currently microcredentials and badges do not appear on the official University student record or transcript.
As many of you know, Senate curricular policies and procedures encompass majors, minors, certificates, general education, and other University requirements. Recently, in 2016, certificates were formalized as a curricular subprogram, which some of you may remember. So similarly, here, because of Senate's role in oversight and policy making on educational programs, your input here is essential.

The four of us are here today to talk about the two important questions in this report that we'll read in just a moment. And for the work going forward on microcredentials as an institution, we're also here to invite your further engagement in this topic. So, this is a forensic session, and we'd like to, if we can possibly, Erin, show the two questions to invite senators to engage in the conversation this afternoon.

Our first question is about, what kinds of microcredentials does your unit offer or plan to offer? And how do these differ from certificate programs? Related to this question, what benefits and challenges do you see with microcredentials? Our second question is what the role of Faculty Senate should be in microcredentials and badging, and how the answer for that question might differ for credit-bearing and non-credit-bearing microcredentials and badges. So, before I open up the floor, I just want to ask Liz, and Gary, and Kelly if they have anything they'd like to add there, or if we'd like to hear from our Senate colleagues.

Elizabeth Wright, Director of Academic Affairs: Thanks, Mary Beth. And thanks for inviting us to be here today. I think we'd love to hear from the members of the Senate. But I'll defer to Kelly and Gary.

Chair Szczygiel: We seem to be having a little bit of difficulty in getting your questions on the screen. So, if you could just repeat the first one, let's just take them--

Mary Beth Williams: Sure.

Chair Szczygiel: --one at a time.

Mary Beth Williams: OK. So, let's take the first one then. The first one is, what kinds of microcredentials does your unit offer or plan to offer, and how are these different from certificates or other curriculum in your department, college, campus? What are your benefits and challenges for microcredentials?

Chair Szczygiel: Kat, I see your hand is raised.

Kathleen Phillips, University Libraries and Scholarly Communications: Hi. Kat Phillips, University Libraries-- to answer question 1, Mary Beth, et al-- thank you very much for putting this forensic together-- I can speak on behalf of the libraries to say that the types of microcredentials we offer are used as learning units. So, we offer them as supplementary material, much like you would offer a quiz or other test of learning. Thank you.

Nathan Tallman, one of my colleague senators has posted information about our information literacy badges. So, we offer badges for graduate students that cover APA citations, other badges that cover things like academic integrity. So, we use them most specifically as a non-credit-bearing type material. So, I think that this benefits a lot of students, as we are able to reach out to many students across the globe. We use these with World Campus a lot.
And some of the challenges could be maybe the upkeep or maybe the maintenance, maintaining them and making sure that they are up to date always. But we do have a team that works on that, so we do face that head on. So, from the libraries, that's our perspective on how we do use micro-badging. Thank you.

Mary Beth Williams: Thanks, Kat.

Chair Szczygiel: Annie?

Ann Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Hi. Taylor, Earth and Mineral Sciences-- so we love the Library's microcredentials, their badges. We use them in our courses pretty routinely-- our online courses. But I also wanted to point out, as this group knows, microcredentials aren't new at all. They've been used kind of below the radar at Penn State for a long time. And another use that I've seen come up that I can imagine a college like mine wanting to continue is using them within a course.

I took a course, for example, about 10 years ago as a graduate student then. I did finally finish my degree as my PhD. Thank you. But I took a course where we had to earn badges that used Penn State's badging system at that time to-- throughout the course to show that we were mastering certain things, that we were doing certain projects, and so forth. And our instructor then used those badges as a way to give us feedback, and ultimately they contributed to our final grade in the course. So, while they were somewhat standalone, they were part of a credit-bearing course.

The other use that I know I've heard interest in my own college our faculty and departments interested in using these as professional development tools. For alumni, for those in business and industry, they can be credit-bearing, or more often not credit-bearing-- and are very interested in that opportunity as well. I think our biggest challenge that we've seen over many years with microcredentials is not having a central University platform that we can use.

The Penn State badging tool was great. It obviously needed more refinement, they would admit, to be able to do things like put your badge on LinkedIn and so forth. But now, with the rise of other commercial platforms out there, it's not clear, I think, even to ITS that they're going to be able to continue to support refining and updating that kind of a tool. So, we are very hungry for a University-supported micro credential platform that we could use to not only produce the badges and make them available, but that people could register through and so forth.

Mary Beth Williams: Thanks, Annie.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Annie. I'm going to recognize myself. Szczygiel, Arts and Architecture. I'm really fascinated by this topic, and I'm wondering if there are any-- because really, to my mind the question is, to what degree does Penn State assign its reputation to these microcredentialing or badging experiences? So yeah. And so, if anyone has any insight of that would be helpful. I don't think they show up on transcripts, for example, but I'm not sure. But I also would be really happy to hear from students. If we have any students around, that would be great.

Mary Beth Williams: Yeah, and I will add to that, that chat is a really nice opportunity to record your thoughts that we will capture, even if it's not read on the record. If you'd like to put some thoughts there, we will use that to collect your input.

Chair Szczygiel: John?
John Champagne, Penn State Erie: John Champagne, Penn State Erie. My concern about minors and certificates and certificates, et cetera. Is that a lot of extra labor falls to faculty to construct these, and administer these, and recruit students for these, minus very little evidence that they actually accomplish anything. And I would hope that, at some point, someone would present us some research. I mean, yeah, students may want them, but students want lots of things that are not necessarily helpful to their education and place even more burden on already overworked faculty.

Mary Beth Williams: John, thank you. I think that leads kind of to our second question, in what role you think or what we, as a Senate, think University Faculty Senate should play. For example, when faculty propose a course or curriculum, they provide that justification. They provide the learning goals and objectives. They engage in assessment of those programs. And so perhaps if we can think about what role Senate has in microcredentials and badges, that might help us to answer the question that you raise.

John Champagne: Sorry, if I can just follow up quickly. They also place an incredible burden on scheduling, especially at the campuses, where we get locked into having to offer courses with three and four people in them. And then what happens is the professor teaches the course as an unpaid overload.

Chair Szczygiel: So, we have a comment in chat from the expert that, no, these do not appear on anyone's transcript. Thank you, Bob, for that. Nathan?

Nathan Tallman: Tallman, University Libraries. I admit that I'm somewhat out of depth on the topic. It's not an area I have specialty in, but it does seem that since the Senate has curricular authority over courses and certificates— thank you, Joe, for confirming that in the chat— that there should be some sort of oversight role from University Senate.

It doesn't have to be overly burdensome, perhaps, but some level of being involved in oversight of these and to also ask some of the questions like John just asked. Is it actually providing value? Is there a pedagogical reason for using these that has proven to be effective? And hey, maybe the answer is yes, but you know it would be nice to have a group that is asking those questions and digging into those matters.

Chair Szczygiel: Any other thoughts? Annie?

Ann Taylor: Taylor, from EMS. I think that was a really great point. I would just add that we did with certificates, if we wanted to have things— a rule, if you will— about needing to have them go through Curricular Affairs, we need to put some parameters around what we mean by microcredentials There are so many things people refer to as microcredentials that really— I'm an instructional designer by trade, so that's where I come from— that really aren't microcredentials, in the terms of what we've been talking about here.

So, if we did want to have them go through Curricular Affairs, then I just think we'd need, like we've done with minors, like we've done with certificates, to put some parameters around to describe what would need to go through Curricular Affairs and what would not.

Mary Beth Williams: Yeah, thanks, Ann. I just want to say for the record, for Curricular Affairs, that we don't need more work. Yeah, I'm not pitching that. And really, the heart of this question is whether it's credit bearing or non-credit bearing, what the difference might be there. Faculty Senate does not--
you're right, we don't define these in any way. And I don't know if or how your answer might be different for credit bearing credentials versus non-credit bearing credentials and what Senate might do.

Chair Szczygiel: Welcome.

Robert Kubat, Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education and University Registrar: Hi, Bonj. Bob Kubat, University Registrar. This has been a very popular topic in my world, as being the registrar. And many of the things that have been said, like Annie, is there a central system that the University can use to support all the colleges that want to do this? How do these get verified? Is it through a curricular process? How are faculty involved or University staff involved in verifying that the student has earned the badge or that they have completed the experience? There is work, I believe, going on through Michael Zeman with Student Engagement about similar concerns around co-curricular records and such.

What we're talking about here is not unusual that many other universities across the country are talking about now, too. So, we're not behind the times. I think we're moving along really well in trying to define all this. What are some of the policies? If you think about it, some of these have been created for addressing the hot topics, the critical items, whether they're through College of Engineering, Science, IST, or wherever. A lot of these are really trying to keep up with what the hot topics are in educating our alumni, business, and industry. So, I think that we are right along with a lot of other institutions still trying to figure out the best way how we, as a University, can handle this topic. So, this is kind of exciting for me, and I'm looking forward to helping in any way that I can.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks, Bob. Can I just point out that President Barron posted an interesting chat about the parallel with the start of World Campus? So, if you get a chance to read that. Ira?

Ira Saltz, Penn State Shenango: Yes, Saltz, Shenango. I guess my take on this is that faculty own the curriculum, and whatever is put out there has Penn State's name on it. And so, I think we want to make sure that anything that is put out there, we are proud to say it is Penn State. And I would hate for us here in the Senate to sort of cede any of our duties.

Now, I understand, Mary Beth, you don't need more on your plate. So maybe there could be a separate subcommittee or separate committee or something that could be set up to review non-credit or microcredential things that are not for credit. But I think it should have some peer evaluation to ensure that it is Penn State quality, something that we would be proud to have our name on.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks, Ira. Michele?

Michele Duffey, College of Health and Human Development: I am going down a very similar path as Ira. Duffey, HHD. Sorry about that. Coming from the position that the faculty own the curriculum, if a program is educational and especially if it's credit bearing, it seems that Faculty Senate should have some level of involvement in the decisions made around microcredentialing.

Chair Szczygiel: Ed, I see your hand up?

Edward Fuller, College of Education: Yeah, I was going to--

Chair Szczygiel: Give your name and--
Edward Fuller: Oh, sorry, Ed Fuller, College of Education. I was going to respond to those comments. I think those are good comments and well-intentioned. I would just be scared that it devolves into the two-to-three-year time frame that it takes to get a course name change, you know. It takes forever to get a name for a course changed right now. So, if it takes two or three years to get a microcredential, then I don't think it's worth the review process. So, it has to be shorter.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks, Ed. Melissa?

Melissa Hardy, College of the Liberal Arts: Melissa Hardy, College of Liberal Arts, University Park. I'd like to see us try to brainstorm a little more on how microcredentials could be defined and created in a way that would increase student perhaps motivation or flexibility or their interest in building competencies bits at a time so that if there are already courses on the books but one could create a small package of courses with some options and perhaps even some on World Campus so that it wouldn't be an issue of people having to treat or to teach very small sections, that would be a kind of multidisciplinary take on a particular function that an employer might be interested in, like being able to lead group projects.

And perhaps they would get a course in cooperative learning and group work and leadership, and I don't know what it would actually look like. But it would be some combination of courses that a student could think, well in the job that I'd like to have, that's something I'd like to do. And so instead of just saying, well what's your major going to be and are you going to minor in something? It would be thinking even more concretely about this is the kind of place I'd like to work. These are the kind of tasks I'd like to be able to say I at least can point to something that an isolated course somewhere and say, oh, well I took a course on that.

I don't know that transcript approach is very persuasive for employers anymore. And so, I think one possibility at least to think about is how microcredentials be used in a university like ours to let our curriculum be more responsive to particular employer needs at a particular point in time. They can be offered for a while but then they're not relevant anymore. So, they go away. It doesn't necessarily need the development of new courses, but rather the integration of some small set of courses. So, I'm not sure we need to limit ourselves to well, they've been used this way and well, they've been used that way. Perhaps we can try to entertain the notion of how might they be used, then what would that require.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks, Melissa. Well, Ed.

Edward Fuller: Sorry for making one more comment. This may have been said. I had to go pick up my son from school so I may have missed it. But I think it ties in to the larger conversation that either President Barron or Provost Jones talked about in terms of enrollment. Not that administrators have spare time, they're just sitting around with nothing to do but trying to figure out what the impediments are to creating such programs and even creating new majors or emphasis areas or things like that to attract more students might be helpful.

We're trying to do that in our department in college and sometimes you just throw your hands up and you just want to quit because it takes so long. But I think the University, if they've got feedback from faculty trying to do this work, they could probably figure out a way to expedite the process. And that would then help enrollment and then help revenues and down the line. So that's just my suggestion.
Mary Beth Williams: I see another hand up, but I just want to remind you all that you are welcome to email me separately afterwards too. And we really appreciate all these comments. I'm sorry, go ahead.

Denise Potosky, Penn State Great Valley: Hi, thanks. I was thinking that the microcredentialing is a new way of thinking about bundling our courses, attracting new students and new types of students. This is a great opportunity for innovation. And I know at my campus, I've been directly involved in bundling courses within our programs to attract students and also to enable them to stack certificates within a degree program. So, we talk about stackable certificate programs.

And then the issue of badges has come up at my campus as well, with the idea of badges being a forward facing or an external thing. So, you get a badge, and you can put it on LinkedIn, and it has the Penn State logo that you got this badge. That might be connected, say, with a set of courses like a certificate or maybe a minor or even the degree program. But I think-- do you think that it's so early and the opportunities for innovation and growth of student enrollments are greater than the need to try to control and review and regulate it at this point?

I think it's a little early in the process to say, well, we're going to devise a Senate review process for all certificates and microcredentials and badges before we really know what we want in terms of these microcredentials. So perhaps it's more of a way for the Senate to stay on top of it, stay informed in order to determine how much oversight is needed. Anticipating that our faculty really are working with the best interests of Penn State and their programs in mind.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks, Denise. And before you leave, I let you slide without your name and unit.

Denise Potosky: Oh, sorry. Denise Potosky, Penn State Great Valley.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Annie.

Ann Taylor: Thanks. I really appreciate the comments that were just made. I think, though, that what we're talking about is that work-- I was so grateful that Gary Chin shared again the report that is-- if you look at our Agenda, the word "report" in this forensic report actually links to a very extensive work that was done two years ago by a group at Penn State about the current status of microcredentials and what we need to do next.

And we absolutely need to do some things next. I have been waiting for over a decade to have some of these things put into place that we've been talking about, including a common platform. So, I think the real question, I would suggest-- maybe Mary Beth is happy to. Mary Beth, you can correct me-- is should Senate be involved in a formal way in those next steps? And I would say yes, absolutely. I think there are groups that I am aware of already starting to work on those next steps. There's talk of a task force being charged. And I very much feel that the Faculty Senate should have a formal role in that. Not just one or two people from the Senate on that but something a bit more formal. Maybe it's a Joint Committee or something to that effect.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Annie. And I think we're going to have to move on, but this has been a great conversation. Thank you, Mary Beth so much and everyone else for contributing to it. Please continue to send your comments to Mary Beth and put them in chat if you prefer or directly to her. And I do think as was pointed out by Denise and Annie, this thing is coming down the pike. Obviously, it's
already here but it's growing in terms of what it wants to be at Penn State. And so, I'm delighted that we have this conversation and I suspect hopefully it will come back to us. So, thank you all very much.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Szczygiel: And let's move on if we can then to Agenda Item H, Unfinished Business. It is in this section of the agenda we will vote to approve legislation. So, in preparation, if you could all please log into TallySpace and Erin and Anna will-- there it is. Voting instructions. We'll pause for a little bit to give everyone time. And what we'd like to do next is to conduct a present vote, which will simply aid. It won't be the ultimate indication that you were here, but it will help the Senate staff with attendance and to make sure that everyone has correct access to TallySpace.

Erin will put up the present vote. Whenever she feels it's ready. And someone is asking about why the appendices are not alphabetical. The agenda was changed kind of late in the game after designations replaced. It took me a while to figure that out as well, what was going on, why we weren't following the alphabet but that. So, I don't think that's-- so Anna, are we ready to go?

Anna Butler, Senate Office Staff: Well, we are getting votes in. We have 76 so far. I'm assuming there's going to be more.

Chair Szczygiel: All right well, I'll tell you what. You can obviously leave that process up. If your phone is having problems, just let us know in chat and we'll get some help to you. So, while those votes are accumulating, we can move on to our two items in the unfinished business.

Fall 2021 Return to Campus University Faculty Senate Survey Report (Ad Hoc Data & Policy Committee Penn State Abington) – Appendix G

Chair Szczygiel: The first is a report sponsored through Senate Council, “Fall 2021 Return to Campus University Faculty Senate Survey Report (Ad Hoc Data & Policy Committee Penn State Abington),” presented by the Ad Hoc Data and Policy Committee at Penn State Abington. It can be found in Appendix G.

I just want to provide a little bit of background to us all to remind us of what this report is about, as classes are about to begin this fall, just days away from the Senate having passed a vote of no confidence in the University's plan for the fall return to campus. I decided we needed to hear from a wider audience, not just the Senate, if only to confirm that what had been clearly indicated through the Senate vote. The results of that survey will now be presented, and 10 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion. At this time, I now invite Judy Ozment, faculty Senator from Penn State Abington, Russ Webster and David Hudson, both associate professors of Social Sciences at Penn State Abington to take the floor.

David Hudson, Penn State Abington: Hello, everyone. Thank you for inviting us to talk about the results from the return to campus survey. As Bonj said, I'm David Hudson, an Associate Professor of Sociology. My colleague Russ Webster is an Associate Professor of Psychology. We're both at Penn State Abington. To give some background, Russ and I were asked if we could analyze the findings from the survey. At the Abington Faculty Senate, we created a committee called the Data and Policy Committee to collect and analyze data, in order to drive policy decisions.
We conceptualized the committee as a purely neutral body. We simply do the social science work without an agenda and then we, as a committee, don't propose policy. We supply the data and analysis for others to make policy recommendations. So today we will present the findings from the survey, both the quantitative and qualitative results. And for full transparency, Russ and I only assisted with the data analysis and the report writing. We did not help with the survey construction or distribution. So, I'll turn it over to Russ, who can go over the quantitative results.

Russ Webster, Penn State Abington: Thank you, David. So just briefly going over the procedure and sample, data collection started on August 25 and ended on September 2. After some standard data screening procedures, the final sample size was 1,344 faculty. And there were some demographic questions included in the survey and we were able to make some comparisons, including gender identity, those that identified as female versus male, as well as racial identity, comparing the responses from those who were exclusively white versus non-white, although there was a substantial portion of missing data for both of these items. And then we are able to compare University Park faculty to non-University Park faculty as well as tenure track versus non-tenure track faculty. And then among those that are tenure track, those tenure versus non tenure, even though there weren't a lot of meaningful differences in terms of these demographic comparisons.

So, I'm going to present very briefly the quantitative questions and the results from the survey. And so, we sort of conceptualized two questions as the primary outcomes or dependent variables here. Satisfaction with the overall in-person classroom experience and then satisfaction with the University's overall COVID-19 plans. And so, faculty responded to both of these items on a one to five extremely dissatisfied to extremely satisfied scale.

And then there were five other questions on here that we sort of consider the predictor variables or independent variables here in addition to the demographic variables on the previous slide. And so, the first question addressed the difficulty to provide remote course accommodations for multiple students and this was on a one to five, extremely difficult to extremely easy scale. And then there were four questions asking about satisfaction with a student masking in classrooms, satisfaction with student COVID testing process, satisfaction with the University's vaccine mandate, and then satisfaction with reporting COVID vaccine status. And again, this was on the one to five extremely dissatisfied to extremely satisfied scale. And so, what I'm going to present first is the median responses to the seven items that were on the previous slide. And I'm highlighting here the primary outcomes or dependent variables on the right here.

And so, the first thing I'll point out is the items that faculty seemed most dissatisfied with. So, faculty found it relatively difficult to provide remote accommodations for students. And then faculty were also pretty dissatisfied with the vaccine mandate, dissatisfied with reporting vaccine status, and then overall really somewhat dissatisfied with the University's COVID plans.

On the other hand, looking at the items that faculty seemed somewhat or very satisfied with, faculty reported actually being very satisfied with student masking as well as were somewhat satisfied with the classroom experience. So, the next step that we did was we thought, OK, what predicted faculty satisfaction with the classroom experience and satisfaction with the University's COVID plan? So, we did some analysis looking at how responses to these five items, as well as the demographic variables predicted differences in satisfaction for these two items.

And so, I'm just going to highlight the best predictors of these outcomes. So, with regards to satisfaction with the in-classroom experience, satisfaction with student masking was by far the best predictor. So as
faculty reported being more satisfied with student masking, they were much more satisfied with their in-classroom experience. Satisfaction with the student COVID testing process it was also a strong predictor here and all the independent variables impressively explained 42% of the differences or variability in this outcome.

With regards to sort of dissatisfaction with the University's COVID plans, dissatisfaction with the vaccine mandate or lack thereof was by far the best predictor. But dissatisfaction with the vaccine status reporting and student COVID testing process, both of those were strong predictors as well. And the independent variables explained a very impressive 77% of the variability or differences for this outcome. I want to note, there were some faculty demographics that did uniquely predict both of these outcomes. But these demographics explained a very small portion of the variability. That is to say, demographics were not meaningful predictors here.

And then lastly, I just wanted to talk about there are some questions about faculty use experience with work adjustment. And so, I know maybe a lot to look at first but very quickly. The first question asked faculty were you aware of workplace adjustment? And 83%, the vast majority of faculty, said yes, they were aware. Among those faculty who were aware of the workplace adjustment option, the vast majority did not apply, 93%. Seven percent said they did and about half of those who applied actually received the workplace adjustment. Interestingly, among the 93% who did not apply for workplace adjustment, most faculty, almost 60%, said they didn't apply because they didn't feel like they needed a workplace adjustment. One-third said that they did not feel like they would receive the adjustment and then 11% were worrying about a negative reaction from their unit head. So yeah, so that was sort of a brief overview of the quantitative results. I'm going to hand it over to David, who will talk about the qualitative results.

David Hudson: Great. Thanks, Russ. So, I analyzed all of the responses to the survey question that asked, what are your current teaching concerns, if any? As you can see in the table on the right, there were four broad themes that emerged during the qualitative analysis. Health concerns, pedagogical concerns, administration concerns, and then reactions and responses. Each theme had a varying number of codes within it. For example, health concerns were expressed as concerns over infection, masking, vaccination, social distancing, et cetera. I'll go over each theme very briefly, but I'll note that of the 1,344 participants, 110 said that they had no teaching concerns with going back into the classroom and 260 left the answer blank.

There's not enough time for me to go through detailed examples of people's responses. I have some quotes on the next slide so you can get a sense of what they said but I'm going to refer everyone to the report that we wrote for a much more extensive presentation of the qualitative data. I included 78 excerpts in the qualitative section as examples of the codes that were discussed in the survey. Go ahead to the next slide.

So, health concerns. The theme of health concerns was the most represented category in the qualitative responses. This is one area where the quantitative and qualitative results really did converge. People expressed significant concern with their health. For example, the code of infection had the highest frequency here at 253 mentions, with masking coming in just behind it at 248. Often infection concerns were not only about faculty getting infected themselves, but about passing that infection to unvaccinated children or older adults living at home.
Concerns with masking in the classroom were primarily about masking not being adhered to by students, other faculty and staff. And then vaccination emerged as a prominent code at 206 mentions with social distancing right behind. People felt very strongly about wanting a vaccine mandate and about needing more room to socially distance in the classrooms. Go ahead. I'll mention this very briefly because all of these were significantly lower frequencies in the data. But the codes of student health, mental health, and testing also did emerge as points of concern that faculty expressed. Student health was talked about as fears over students becoming sick, possibly passing that on to other students and how returning to work might impact people's mental health. OK, go ahead.

Pedagogical concerns. Another theme involved pedagogical concerns. Participants at very high frequencies noted concerns about how much more labor they might be required to do, particularly around accommodating sick students. Also concerns with the classroom environment came up repeatedly in the survey, often focusing on air quality, heating and cooling, and Wi-Fi quality in the classrooms. Code of student success emerged at a relatively high rate as people expressed worry over how students might fare in this return to campus context. And while not a frequent concern per se, people relayed worries about student conduct in the classroom. That would be confrontations with students or students acting out in some way. Go ahead.

The next theme that emerged involved administration concerns. And please note that I titled this administration, not administrative concerns because this theme involved participants discussing their frustration with the administration broadly conceptualized because this was a multi campus survey. For example, participants noted that unclear guidance was leading to confusion at the start of the semester, and they were worried that this unclear guidance was leading people to have a loss of faith in the University and worry about the public image of Penn State. Some participants were also frustrated with the lack of flexibility in teaching modes that were available, and a handful of respondents were concerned about potential retaliation and continuing inequality. OK, go to the last slide for me. Thanks.

So lastly, there were a few participants who gave what I thematized as reactions and responses, as these seemed to cohere around the idea that we do not need masks either because people seem to be kind of anti-mask or at least anti-mask for vaccinated folks. And some participants were worried that faculty complaints might undermine the administration's efforts to effectively deal with the pandemic. And again, I want to point people to a more detailed analysis. For additional excerpts that illustrate each of these codes, please refer to page 12 through 23 in our report. Russ.

**Russ Webster:** So just to sum up the conclusion, the survey found that faculty were generally satisfied with being back in the classroom. Approximately 25%, or about 1/4 seemed very or somewhat dissatisfied with being back in the classroom. But as long as masking compliance was followed, that was the best predictor of faculty satisfaction with in-classroom experience, but they reported relatively strong dissatisfaction with the University's COVID response, particularly concerning the lack of vaccine mandate. And that is our presentation. And so, I don't know if we have any time for questions, comments.

**Chair Szczyciel:** We have a little bit of time. I want to thank the authors aided by Judy for all of their hard work, their professional expertise that was delivered to this analysis. I think it is fascinating information and we have a document for posterity. It's a snapshot in an incredibly fraught time but it's worthy of our attention I believe because there are lessons to be learned by a variety of universities sectors. Right, so many people can pick this report up and say, you know, I see how this certain decisions affected people this way. So, I would encourage everyone to take a deeper dive into the report. So, are
there any questions? Yes. I see there are some hands raised. So, Mike, over to you. You could identify yourself and your unit.

**Michael Tyworth, Smeal College of Business:** Mike Tyworth, Smeal College of Business. So, I have a little bit of a concern about the findings as presented in mainly that in the qualitative analysis, you describe the feedback of people expressing their concerns about University policy, lack of a mandate and things like that I think in an implicitly positive way. But then in the examples of people who are saying, look, the mask mandates aren't important to me. I don't see a need. You use what I would describe as pejorative terms in the form of complaining or undermining University policy.

That strikes me is not neutral in the analysis. I'm not sure. I mean, maybe that's what it is. But I'm not sure that a faculty member who says, for example, I'm vaccinated. I don't see the need to wear a mask when I teach in class is undermining policy any more than when someone says, I don't like the way the University is handling the COVID response. Thank you.

**David Hudson:** Yeah, I can address that very quickly. The category code "they're complaining" wasn't my word that I put. On that analysis this was faculty expressing concerns that other faculty were complaining about vaccine policies and things like that and that faculty complaints were going to undermine the administration's ability to handle COVID effectively. Did that make sense? Did I clarify that?

**Michael Tyworth:** Yes. I see. Thank you. That makes it a lot clearer. Thank you.

**David Hudson:** Yeah, absolutely.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Roger.

**Roger Egolf, Penn State Lehigh Valley:** Yes. I was wondering if you could speak a bit to the difference in response between UP and outside of UP?

**Russ Webster:** So, I handled the quantitative portion, and I don't remember what the difference is between UP and non-UP faculty, although there weren't a lot of meaningful differences as I said in terms at least in how that difference related to differences in satisfaction with in-classroom experience or satisfaction with the University's COVID plans. So, there weren't any meaningful or important differences. I would refer you to the report to see what exactly those differences were. I highlighted what were the best predictors of satisfaction with in-classroom experience and the University's COVID plans. So sorry that wasn't entirely helpful, but they weren't important predictors. So, I left them out of the presentation.

**Roger Egolf:** Thank you.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Yeah, and just in the interest of time, we'll move on. But my deep appreciation for your efforts here and thank you to everyone at the Abington Coalition-- go Abington. And there's even a request in the chat, hey, can we conduct the survey again? Well, I'm putting that positive ask on it. So, it would be a great-- I think there would be a great exercise as well. Thank you all very much and you can access that report through the Senate website into the future. So, by all means, take a deeper dive into it.
Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article II – Senate Council, Section 1(e) and Standing Rules, Article IV – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(a) Committee on Committees and Rules – Appendix H

Chair Szczygiel: All right, our second report in Unfinished Business is from the Committee on Committees and Rules, “Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article II – Senate Council, Section 1(e) and Standing Rules, Article IV – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(a) Committee on Committees and Rules,” and it's almost hard to say that without sort of giggling at the absurdity of that title. And is listed on the Agenda as Appendix H. Listen, as a reminder, this is just the proposal to move the oversight of the Unit Constitution Subcommittee to the Committee on Committee and Rules. It was first presented at the October 19 Plenary. And because it is a change to our Bylaws, it is required to be brought forward at the subsequent meeting today for a vote. Annie Taylor is here to stand for any questions.

Ann Taylor: Thanks, Bonj. You said it all. Everyone has seen this multiple times now. If you do have any questions or concerns, now's your time. But it's pretty harmless. It's just putting the unit Constitution Subcommittee under the Committee on Committees and Rules-- which I giggle too, Bonj-- instead of Senate Council because that's de facto how it has functioned.

Chair Szczygiel: I see no questions rising to the front so if we could announce, Anna start the vote.

Anna Butler: Got the vote up.

Chair Szczygiel: OK, senators, you may cast your vote. TallySpace, A is to accept the motion and this report and B to reject it. A to accept, B to reject. And thank you, Annie.

Anna Butler: And I have many votes coming in.

Chair Szczygiel: Of course, in the desire to speed things up, we will wait until the end to see the results of our votes. Anna, you be the one to give me the go ahead when you think it's OK that we move on to the next. We're going to have a sequence of rapid-fire voting, but we can only handle them one at a time. So, we want to make sure everyone has time to cast their votes.

Anna Butler: I think you can go ahead, Bonj, because I have the majority.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Szczygiel: OK folks, keep voting. We're going to forge ahead. Legislative reports. We have four of them. All our additions are diversity, equity, and inclusion language to committee Standing Rules.

Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (h) Committee on Global Programs – Appendix I

Chair Szczygiel: All right, so we're going to get very used to seeing these coming through our Plenary until all of the committees have had submitted their revised Standing Rules. Our first legislative report is from the Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and Global Programs. Revisions to Standing Rules, Article 2, Senate Committee Structure, Section 6H Committee on Global Programs, and it can be found in Appendix I.
Chair, Annie Taylor, CC&R, and Mathias Hanses, Chair of Global Programs will answer any questions before we vote. Are there any questions for this?

**Ann Taylor:** And I will add that Mathias had an emergency and was not able to join us. But I told him I think I can handle it.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you.

**Ann Taylor:** I hope.

**Chair Szczygiel:** I think you're going to be able to handle it quite well. All right, I see no discussions or questions. So, Anna, are we ready to go to vote?

**Anna Butler:** Yes, we are.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Yes, we are, OK. There we are. Once again, senators, please cast your vote. A to accept, B to reject. And Anna, you're just going to stick around, right? Do you remember the old days in Kern building? You could actually see the numbers accumulate. It was kind of exciting. This a little less so, it's like watching paint dry. Anna, you can tell us when to move on.

**Anna Butler:** Just maybe one more minute. I think you can go ahead and move on, Bonj.

**Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (i), Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics – Appendix J**

**Chair Szczygiel:** All right. Our second report is from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules and Intercollegiate Athletics, titled, “Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (i), Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics.” And you can find this in Appendix J. Do we have Danny Perkins with us? Maybe not. So, Annie? True.

**Ann Taylor:** Again--

**Chair Szczygiel:** True.

**Ann Taylor:** --just making some important additions to the Standing Rules for this committee, an overall statement of commitment and also adding something to the mandated reports to make sure that data that is in their reports are disaggregated by gender identity, race, ethnicity and other categories of concern. Or of interest. I actually am seeing: I think we had agreed to-- either's fine. We'll say concern. I don't want to make this harder than it is unless someone has a problem with that word.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Any questions or concerns, please raise your hand. Anna, go ahead and start the poll. We'll still keep it open. All right, so there we go. You know the drill. To accept, press A, B, reject.

**Ann Taylor:** And don't forget to click save my vote.

**Chair Szczygiel:** And don't forget to-- thank you. Save my vote.
Anna Butler: OK, we have many votes coming in. Just a few more minutes.

Chair Szczygiel: Annie, I hear your voice all the time on WPSU trying to drum up some money. This is dead airtime that would never, never be allowed on that radio station.

Ann Taylor: No way.

Chair Szczygiel: There would be chatter, constant chatter going on.

Ann Taylor: Give often.

Nathan Tallman: It is Giving Tuesday.

Chair Szczygiel: It is Giving Tuesday.

Anna Butler: I think we can go ahead and move to the next.

Revision to Standing Rules, Article II- Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (n) Committee on Student Life – Appendix K

Chair Szczygiel: Bless you, Anna. OK, next we have the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules and Student Life, “Revision to Standing Rules, Article II- Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (n) Committee on Student Life,” listed as Appendix K. Might Tim Palmer be with us?

Tim Palmer, College of Medicine: Why, yes, I am. Once again, another one of the additions due to the faculty consideration for the DEI. If you can go down, we can find the specific wording that was changed.

Ann Taylor: And I can add, Tim, that it's very similar to what the Senate approved for CC&R, a general commitment statement.

Tim Palmer: I believe if CC&R is where we've stolen it from. I think we added a word or two, but it wasn't--

Chair Szczygiel: Are there any questions or comments on this report from Student Life? OK, Anna, if you still have breath in you, could we start the poll?

Anna Butler: Yes, we can.

Chair Szczygiel: She's sticking in there, hanging in there. OK, to accept the report, press A, to reject, press B.

Anna Butler: Votes are coming in very quickly.

Chair Szczygiel: Good news.

Anna Butler: About another minute or so, probably.
Chair Szczygiel: Tim, can you give us an update on how things are going on the medical front in your world?

Tim Palmer: Well, at present our own institution is dealing with the fact that everybody has to get immunized and/or tested on a regular basis. We haven't had too many people decline, unlike some institutions around the state where—in one particular institution, 100 of the work […] people said, hey, we are going to sue for not having to have any of this done. And I believe the judge said, sorry. You lose. And I believe some of them have actually quit at that particular place.

Tim Palmer: Did I use up enough time to get a count?

Anna Butler: Yes, I think we can move on.

Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (o) University Planning Committee – Appendix L

Chair Szczygiel: I'm a little depressed now, but OK. So, we are ready to go to our final Legislative report, which is from the—thank you, Tim and Annie— which is from the Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and University Planning. This time, “Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (o) University Planning Committee,” Appendix L. Are there any questions for Jim Strauss? Is Jim still around? Of course, Jim is here, right? OK, Annie. Over to you.

Ann Taylor: Thank you very much. Like the last committee, this one is adding a general statement that fit best, they felt, with adding their commitment to promotion of an advancement of diversity, equity, inclusion in all of their activities. So, a simple but important statement added to their duties.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. I see no hands rising into the air. So, let's go to the vote if we could, Anna. Please start the poll.

Anna Butler: The vote is started.

Chair Szczygiel: Senators, please cast your vote on TallySpace. A to accept, B to reject and then hit submit. Anna, I think we can just move on and let the poll run, correct?

Anna Butler: Yes.

Chair Szczygiel: All right, so thank you for all of the Standing Committee chairs and members for working so hard to make diversity, equity, and inclusion a central part of every committee and their work now and into the future. That's what we've just done for these committees. So that's a wonderful thing.

______________________________________________________________________________

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Chair Szczygiel: Moving on to Agenda Item J, Advisory and Consultative Reports. We have two reports.
Revisions of AC23 – “Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations” & AC21 – “Definition of Academic Ranks” – Appendix M

Chair Szczygiel: The first from the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, revisions to AC23, entitled, “Revisions of AC23 – ‘Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations’ & AC21 – ‘Definition of Academic Ranks.’” These can be found in Appendix N. It will be presented by Chair Josh Wede.

Josh Wede, College of the Liberal Arts: Thank you, Chair Szczygiel. And first off, I just want to apologize for those of you that print out a hard copy of the meeting Agenda. I think this added almost 50 pages to the Agenda. But while the report may be long, the changes to AC21 and AC23 are relatively straightforward. Just a very brief summary, AC21, the definition of academic ranks was updated a few years back to formalize the titles, ranks, and promotion process for non-tenure line faculty, with the exception of non-tenure line faculty members in interdisciplinary and defense related research units. These faculty are in the Applied Research Lab, otherwise known as ARL. These faculty members remain governed by policy AC23, promotion and tenure procedures and regulations, which meant that promotion for these individuals ultimately rose to the level of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. So, what this advisory report recommends is moving the non-tenured line faculty members and interdisciplinary and defense related research units from governance under AC23 to governance under AC21. This would bring all non-tenured line faculty under the same policy.

Dr. Lora Weiss, Senior Vice President for Research and Dr. Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs held a meeting with ARL leadership and a Town Hall with faculty members at ARL about this proposed change. I also communicated with Allen Sonsteby, Director of ARL, and everyone was supportive of making this change. So, it's fairly straightforward but if anybody has any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

Chair Szczygiel: Any questions or concerns, please raise your hand. All right, thank you, Josh. I think we are able to cast our votes for this one as well. Anna, are we in a position?

Anna Butler: We are.

Douglas Wolfe, College of Engineering: Bonj, I'm sorry. I raised my hand.

Chair Szczygiel: Oh, I'm sorry, Doug.

Doug Wolfe: No, I just want to say to the College of Engineering and Applied Research Lab fully supports this. I get it's a long time coming, and we appreciate the committee for reviewing this. So again, we just want to offer our support with regards to the recommendations. Thank you very much.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Doug. Any other comments? All right, it is now time to vote. And we have a poll.

Anna Butler: Votes are coming in quickly. But we have to wait a couple of minutes if you want to go on to the next report. Keep it open?
Revision of AC80 – “Outside Business Activities and Private Consulting” – Appendix N

Chair Szczygiel: Let's do that. We'll keep it open. Next, we have from the Senate Committees on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity and the Faculty Affairs Committee, the report, “Revision of AC80 – ‘Outside Business Activities and Private Consulting.’” It can be found in Appendix N. And if you recall, this was sent back to committee for a little bit more work and it was resubmitted, I think, in improved condition. This will be presented by Chair of Research, Roger Egolf, and I believe-- are Roger and Clint still presenting this?

Roger Egolf: Yes.

Chair Szczygiel: OK. The floor is yours. If you want to say anything.

Roger Egolf: Yes, I do, thank you. After the report was sent back to the committee's last meeting, we held the Zoom office hours for senators and any other interested individuals to attend and talk to Clint Schmidt and I. And we received some useful feedback. In response, we made a few changes to the policy, including putting exhibitions and performances back into the policy as requested at the last Senate meeting. We also specifically exempted appointments for teaching at other institutions during the non-appointment period from requiring permission in the section that requires permission for other types of appointments at other institutions.

I hope we made it more clear why the changes have been made and explained how most of the additions came from the combination of AD77 into AC80 so that most of the changes are not really changes to overall University policy and that faculty now are covered only by AC 80, or will be, I should say, after it's implemented and not both AC80 and AD77. Most of the other changes are being required by federal regulations.

Overall, we feel that we have done our best to make the policy as streamlined as possible and also require that units stick to the policy and not put more onerous requirements in place. This will make things more consistent and more fair across the University. So, I hope you can support this revised policy.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Roger. Are there any questions before we go to vote?

Roger Egolf: There's Clint also. I think Clint is going to--

Chair Szczygiel: Clint? Oh, I'm sorry.

Clint Schmidt, Director of the Conflict of Interest Program: I have a few slides similar to the ones I showed last time but if I can share my screen, I'll do that if everyone wants to see them.

Anna Butler: You should be able to, yes.

Clint Schmidt: OK. Looks like I might be frozen. OK. Bonj, can you see my slides?

Anna Butler: You should be able to, yes.

Clint Schmidt: OK. Looks like I might be frozen. OK. Bonj, can you see my slides?

Chair Szczygiel: Yup.

Clint Schmidt: So, I'll quickly go through these. I think Roger touched on a lot of this already just in his brief introduction. But there are currently three policies that kind of cover the same thing. They're all
focused on outside activities. The first one, financial conflicts of interest, most of you fill out a COINS disclosure, at least once a year. That is focused on the financial aspect of outside activities. The AC 80 policy is the one that we’re looking at today. And that's focused on time commitments and other kinds of commitment issues. And conflict of commitment, policy AC77 is very similar, has a slightly different focus and asks colleges to have their own guidelines on outside activities.

So, one of the things this revision will do that I think will be very favorable to faculty is it will make AC77 a staff policy so then faculty will just have two, AC80 and then the RP06 conflict of interest. And the revisions will also allow us to combine the reporting and disclosure cycles into one process where people can go into one system and get it all done at one time. So, you're really not thinking about two policies even and certainly not three.

There is some redundancy and also some confusion between the policies. So, we just want to make it simpler and more straightforward. Now, I realize there's a fair amount of text in the policy, but it will be more straightforward than what's out there across all three of these right now. Happy to answer more questions about that if anyone has them but just a brief overview of some of the federal requirements that are referenced in the report and which Roger mentioned.

Some federal agencies already have policies on conflict of interest and conflict of commitment but due to the National Security Presidential Memorandum, which came out in January of this year, there is a requirement that they all have such policies or regulations so we're expecting many more to come out in January of 2022. And the Joint Committee on the Research Environment and the Office of Science and Technology Policy has a lot of guidelines that we're going to need to follow and that these agencies are going to follow.

And we need to apply those to all employees who are in any way involved in the research enterprise at our University. So that's what some of the revisions in here are focused on. And then I think we mentioned the last time around and it's in the report, but we did have a committee comprised mostly of faculty that met over the summer and early fall to make the policy revision, so these revisions were made by your peers, and they were very well thought out.

Morgan Reinhart from my office and I worked with this group, and we guided a group in certain ways, and we did the drafting, but the faculty really gave the input and said what they wanted and what they thought would make sense for the faculty in general. So, you were well represented there. We had four committees, four senators on the committee and Josh Wede also gave input, although he wasn't actually part of the committee.

A timeline of the process was last year and into this year we recognized the need for revisions. Some of these revisions we've considered for longer than that but we're trying to make the policy better in a lot of ways in addition to the necessary revisions. So, we did meet with Bonj and a few others last spring to talk about what we wanted to do. And we presented an informational report to the Senate Plenary in April of 2021. And it was actually the meeting with Bonj and Beth Seymour that we decided to put together this ad hoc committee of faculty. And with Kathy Bush's support and Laura Weiss' support, we convened the committee and charged it with working on the revisions.

So, the group met, like I said, over the summer and into September and presented the revisions to their committees, Faculty Affairs and RSCA. And both of those committees passed or approved these revisions. After this went to the Plenary in October and was sent back to the committee with instructions
to go through it with a fine-tooth comb and look for errors and any other things that needed to be ironed out, Roger held office hours, which I took part in, and we answered some questions. We identified a couple of changes we could make to respond to the feedback from senators. And we also had a person do a very thorough proofreading, someone who is not intimately familiar with the policy, so it was new to her eyes. And she did catch some typos in a couple of things like that.

And then the committees again reviewed and voted to approve these at their last committee meetings earlier this month. So, I think Roger already talked about some of these policy revisions and especially the one about being able to teach over the summer without requesting approval. The required prior approval we got some comments on last time because it looks like it's much bigger and it's true. There are six new activities in addition to seven that already exist. And actually, two of the seven come from AC77, college specific guidelines, which were widely basically ubiquitous across all colleges and units.

So, it looks like a lot but the new activities are actually very narrowly focused and some of them are similar to each other. So, it's not going to impact people in a major way. I think these things, the four that are focused on affiliations with other institutions and research agreements, those are the ones that are really being driven by federal policy and regulation and we just have no choice but to include those. The one on conveyance of IP rights is just reiterating what's already in the IP section lower down in the policy.

And the one on becoming an employee outside of Penn State is referring to being a what would be called a W-2 employee as opposed to a 10-99 independent contractor. So, a lot of times when people are consultants, they are independent contractors, or they have a business that's allowing them to do that. But that is just basically saying, when people become employed by another entity, that requires prior approval. And that was pretty standard at other universities and is considered to be a good-- just a generally reasonable thing to have.

The training requirement will be-- basically, we're going to be required to have training on this topic in addition to conflict of interest. So, we'd like to just have it all in one training, so you don't have to do another one. Most of you already do the COINS conflict of interest training once every four years. Our intention is to just roll this, just some additional content into that. And then there are sections of the policy that have been cut and pasted around so a lot of the changes in the marked-up version, the accessible marked up version are just reorganization for clarity.

And then of course, Roger already mentioned the consistent treatment of summer teaching across colleges and units. This way faculty will not have to seek approval for teaching over the summer. They'll just need to report it. That is the end of my--

Chair Szczygiel: OK, Thanks Clint. Any questions for the duo? Barnes. William.

William Kenyon, College of Arts and Architecture: Yes. Kenyon, Arts and Architecture. I just had one sort of friendly amendment, a minor edit to offer. If you look at the section titled “Scholarly Activities,” the first sentence is "activities that are generally expected of a faculty member as part of their professional portfolio." and then where we added back in the musical and other creative performances sentence, it then says "if there is an expectation, then the faculty members discipline that. They engage in such." But that's the only one of that list that includes that sort of duplicative caveat. So, I would suggest if you just say musical and other creative performances and expedition's period, then it kind of follows with-- well, I guess it's a semicolon-- follows with the rest of the list because the assumption is that
anything on the list is something that's generally expected of the faculty member as part of their professional portfolio. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: William, was there a motion?


Chair Szczygiel: A friendly amendment. May I call on my colleague Keith, our Parliamentarian.

Keith Shapiro, Parliamentarian: Yes. It sounds like a motion to me. So, I think we need a second and a vote.

Chair Szczygiel: Do we have a second? And the motion would be to amend the-- could you paraphrase it, William again?

William Kenyon: Sure, just to strike the duplicative language so that it just says--

Chair Szczygiel: Is it possible to pull up the text in question?

Clint Schmidt: Yeah, let me--

William Kenyon: I can put it in the chat.

Clint Schmidt: I think what he's referring to is a scholarly activities, activities that are generally expected of a faculty member as part of their professional portfolio as the intro, the part of the definition. And then when it lists all the activities after the last bullet point, it said "musical or other performances and exhibitions if there's an expectation in the faculty member's discipline." so I believe--

William Kenyon: Yeah, I'm just saying after "exhibitions" just to strike everything beyond that because it's duplicative language and isn't necessary. The assumption is that every single one of these things is part of their professional portfolio, otherwise it's not necessary.

Judith Ozment, Penn State Abington: I'll second this motion. Ozment, Abington.

Chair Szczygiel: Erin, are you able to highlight the text in question?

Clint Schmidt: Need me to stop sharing?

Chair Szczygiel: Or Clint, can you highlight it so that we know where--

Clint Schmidt: So, he's moving to strike this.

Chair Szczygiel: All right so everyone is clear what is going on. I heard a second from Judy Ozment. Is there a discussion about the motion that's before us? Are we able to just do a verbal--

Keith Shapiro: General consent.

Chair Szczygiel: General consent.
Keith Shapiro: General consent, you would say, are there any objections? If there are objections, we go to a vote. If there are no objections, we have agreed to accept it and we save a little time, since this seems like a pretty innocuous change.

Chair Szczygieł: Are there any objections? What Keith said. Anna, can we go to a vote? I think this is pretty straightforward. John, your hand has been up. Is relevant to this issue or this motion? If not, if you could just hold on.

John Champagne: Yeah, no, it's not to the change in the--

Chair Szczygieł: OK. All right. We'll get right to you.

Keith Shapiro: So, Bonj, you've heard no objections?

Chair Szczygieł: Correct. No objections.

Keith Shapiro: You don't need a vote.

Chair Szczygieł: Oh.

Keith Shapiro: There are no objections. We have general consent.

Chair Szczygieł: OK, I see what you're saying. I thought you meant--

Keith Shapiro: Hearing none, the motion has passed is how--

Chair Szczygieł: Hearing none, the motion has passed.

Keith Shapiro: That's the way they say to do it in Robert's Rules.

Chair Szczygieł: All right, I like this one.

Keith Shapiro: Isn't that fast?

Chair Szczygieł: That's sweet. OK. John, you have the floor.

John Champagne: I may be mistaken. So please correct me if I am but it sounded like one of the new additions was that we have to apply for approval to work outside of Penn State, even in periods not covered by our 36-week contract. Is that correct?

Roger Egolf: No, it's exactly the opposite. Some units have required approval in the past other units have not, but some do. And this explicitly says that faculty will not have to.

Clint Schmidt: Well, actually, Roger, that's for the teaching.

Roger Egolf: Yeah.
Clint Schmidt: But for other types of employment--

Roger Egolf: Oh, you're talking about other parts other than teaching.

John Champagne: So, if I want to work as a waiter during my summer, I have to apply for approval?

Clint Schmidt: No. Because the whole policy only applies to things that are in the field of your expertise for which you're hired in at Penn State.

John Champagne: Well, writing? If I want to write something and be paid for it out of that 36-week period, I have to apply for approval?

Clint Schmidt: Not if you're-- it's just--

John Champagne: Well, what would it cover then? Let's do it that way. What would it cover?

Clint Schmidt: So, I'm not sure. What's your area of expertise? What are you a professor of?

John Champagne: English.

Clint Schmidt: OK, so, I guess if you became an employee of a publisher of books for example, with benefits and a salary. I mean, I think the concern was over people becoming employed and this really came from general counsel and it's something that-- there's more risks of conflict of commitment when people are actually employed by multiple entities rather than just--

Roger Egolf: This is one of the things that comes from the federal requirements, isn't it, Clint?

Clint Schmidt: Can be I mean, it's really--

Roger Egolf: Some of it. Some of it, yeah.

John Champagne: I think this really needs to be clarified. Because if my contract with Penn State is 36 weeks, then am I employed outside of my 36 weeks by Penn State?

Clint Schmidt: I know I know Kathy Bieschke has talked about this before, that even though it's a 36-week appointment, faculty are still considered employees of the University year-round.

John Champagne: So, I'm a non-paid employee.

Kathleen Bieschke, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs: Well, but you do receive benefits during the summertime, and we do expect you to follow our policies during the summer in terms of-- the vast majority of policies would still apply to you. You're considered a full-time employee of the University and you have the option of earning an additional 12 weeks.

And I think what Clint has said is-- correct me if I'm wrong, Clint-- is we're talking about becoming an employee, not getting paid by another entity, which many of our faculty are earning additional compensation as consultants. And my understanding as an author if you wrote something is that you
would not be a W-2 employee, but as Clint was saying, a 10-99 employee. So, you're not getting benefits from them. You know you're not conflicting in any way. Does that help a little bit?

**John Champagne:** Sure, sure. It's just hard for me to imagine what the conflict might be.

**Kathy Bieschke:** I think every situation is-- well, maybe not in terms of the writing what would the conflict be, but you would then be subject-- you'd be writing something as our employee potentially then there's the intellectual property conflicts.

There's different policies that they may have that we may have that we wouldn't permit you to do but they would. And I think that Clint's office, they have a team and when we get a lot of questions just like this, like I want to do this. Can you help me figure out what's possible and what's not possible?

And then they usually write Clint, and he kind of digs into it and figures out what they can do. We have nurses working for hospitals. We have nurses who have to work in order to maintain their license. So, they're certainly getting paid to do something we're employing them to do but we've worked it out with them and we try to work it out to the extent we can with each employee.

**John Champagne:** OK, thank you.

**Kathy Bieschke:** I mean, you wouldn't want a lawyer working for two places at the same time. You can see how that would be conflictual. Some cases just aren't conflictual at all.

**John Champagne:** Sure.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you. Denise, you've got a question. I'm sorry, identify yourself and location.

**Denise Potosky, Penn State Great Valley:** Yes, thank you. Denise Potosky from Penn State Great Valley. My question relates to the point on the form that says, "things that don't have to be disclosed is being a member of a masters or doctoral or graduate committee at another university" but then "chairing a doctoral or graduate committee at another university must require prior written approval." And it makes sense that holding a foreign or domestic position or an appointment at another university would require prior approval.

But I question why the distinction between being a member versus chairing a doctoral or graduate committee in addition to just belonging to some sort of professional affiliation with another university. Is it redundant? Is it necessary? Can you explain that distinction?

**Clint Schmidt:** Actually, it looks like Kent wants to say something I think probably about this because the committee, the faculty committee weighed in heavily on this issue debated this quite a bit. So maybe someone else could speak to it.

**Kent Vrana, College of Medicine:** Bonj, can I address that?

**Chair Szczygiel:** Kent, you're recognized.

**Kent Vrana:** Thank you. Kent Vrana, College of Medicine. To both Denise and John's point, a lot of this is being driven by the federal government and in this particular case, Denise, the thought is if you're
chairing a committee at another institution, and frankly, it was foreign institutions is what the feds are worried about, you're directing a research program in another place. In this case if you're being paid with federal dollars for a grant, for instance, there's a worry about intellectual property. So, I stand in support of this proposal. And in full disclosure, I was on the committee that consulted it.

But we worked quite assiduously to prevent us from intruding in your professional activities and your freedom to consult. The point here is it's when you take responsibility for a research program in my environment, is being the chair of the committee and telling the student what to do. So, it's not redundant. It's very specific. And it just requires prior approval, I think, right, Clint? It's not proscribed.

You just have to have prior approval. But these other things, that's part of our life. We do this all the time. We give seminars. We belong to groups and we're committee members. You just can't be the chair. And to John's point, your consulting is-- we're not interfering with your consulting, but you can't be employed by two universities simultaneously. Thank you.

Denise Potosky: Can I just ask a follow up question, then? Thank you for that response. It's very clear. And I don't inherently object to it, but it sounds like it's not just chairing a doctoral graduate committee at another university, but the concern is being under a US federal grant or using Penn State resources when doing so. Could that statement then reflect that more narrowly tailored idea?

And I guess just to put a little context around it, we have international faculty who maybe are continuing to chair a doctoral thesis at their prior university, or they are still engaged. And some of them are at foreign universities but the resources and the students really don't have anything to do with Penn State in this incident. So again, they would already have to disclose their affiliation with the bullet right under chairing that says, if you're involved in another university or a foreign university in any way, and that would include chairing a doctoral committee. Since we already have to disclose that, why the additional bullet for chairing a committee?

Roger Egolf: Well, I'll speak-- you can follow me up, but I just wanted to say it's not a prohibited thing. It's just something that needs to ask approval for. The reason for that is there are enough situations that could cause real conflicts. The idea here is that after it's looked at, if there are no conflicts, the permission would ordinarily be granted. But the importance of asking approval is because of the possibility for those problems. I see no situation where a faculty member who left another institution and came to Penn State couldn't continue to share their students at their former institution unless there was some kind of grant prohibition or something like that, something new that they did. Clint, go ahead and fill in from what I said.

Clint Schmidt: Sure. Well, I mean, part of it is it's not just what Kent was saying about the foreign activities or the use of resources. It's also that it is a greater time commitment, potentially to chair a student at another-- just to chair a committee. So, if it's at another institution, you're doing that for something other than Penn State. But I want to reinforce what Roger was saying, was actually a point I want to make just to back up a little bit about all these prior approval activities. I mean, we would expect to see approval to be granted in almost all requests. It's rarely denied.

And these situations are ones where there is they're seen as being a higher risk of a conflict of commitment. And so, this gives department heads, deans, the University an opportunity to review and discuss and vet the activities. Oftentimes concerns can be alleviated with discussion but it's just they're building in a stop and a check there.
Denise Potosky: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you—Tai-Yin, and then I think we need to wrap this discussion up just for the sake of time.

Tai-Yin Huang, Penn State Lehigh Valley: Hello, this is Tai-Yin Huang, Lehigh Valley, Penn State. Yeah, so I just have a question. So, for faculty, let's say the fact that this is having a sabbatical and is a visiting faculty at another institution that's an international institution. So, because the faculty has to maintain two households, so in that case, there might be monetary compensation from the host institution. So, is that allowed as long as we get the approval from the institution, or it is not allowed?

Kathy Bieschke: It is allowed, Tai-Yin, and there's detail about the amount of earnings. I think our general rule is you can't earn more than you would normally have earned. But we work with you on that. We have a lot of faculties who do just that, are visiting scholars at another institution. We try to structure it in a way that it doesn't interfere with any of our policies, but this will have--there's a whole separate policy on that and separate guidelines that would guide that. So, this does not preclude people being visiting scholars while they're on sabbatical.

Tai-Yin Huang: Great. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: All right, well, thank you very much for everyone who presented. I see that we've exhausted I think a discussion about this. We are ready to move over to a vote on its modified acceptance. Anna, if you could please start the poll.

Anna Butler: I've started the poll.

Chair Szczygiel: Senators, you can cast your vote on TallySpace. A to accept, B to reject. as amended. And we're going to just let this run its course while we move on to some informational reports. Anna, is that all right with you?

Anna Butler: That's fine.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Chair Szczygiel: OK, we've got three informational reports on our Agenda today.

Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics Academic Year 2020-2021 and FAR Discussion – Appendix O

Chair Szczygiel: Coming from the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, “Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics Academic Year 2020-2021 and FAR Discussion,” which can be found in Appendix O. Twenty-five minutes have been allotted for presentation and discussion. The report will be presented by Faculty Athletic Representative Dennis Scanlon; Sandy Barbour, Vice President for Intercollegiate Athletics; and Lynn Holleran, Deputy Director of Athletics Dennis and friends, the floor is yours.
Dennis Scanlon, NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative: Thanks, Bonj. This is Dennis. And I know the meeting is kind of moving along here so we’ll try to be efficient. So as the Faculty Athletics Rep, I have a charge of writing this report, presenting it for approval from the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee and then it goes to the Senate. And so, I'm here to answer any questions and also highlight some of the key findings, also answer any questions and then Sandy Barbour, as the Vice President for Athletics and Athletic Director will make some comments and updates as well.

Just as a reminder, as the NCAA Faculty Athletics Rep for University Park in our Division I Athletics programs, my charge is faculty oversight of athletics independent of athletics, and so, I report to the President Barron also with accountability to the Senate. And so my focus in this role is on making sure we maintain academic standards and guidelines are followed, we're compliant with NCAA and Big Ten Conference academic and other eligibility requirements, that we're compliant with our Faculty Senate 67-00 policy as it pertains to things like missed classes, competition eligibility, so forth and so on, a focus on student athlete welfare, institutional control and then weighing in with an academic perspective on the emerging issues that are occurring nationally and also at the state level.

And as I'll mention in a few moments, this has been a real plethora of activity even in the last year, year and a half relative to the prior years that I've been involved in this role. So included, I believe, with your Agenda is the report, the informational report from the faculty athletics rep and again, that went through the Intercollegiate Athletics committee, I won't go over all the details there. Be happy to address any questions but I did want to highlight a few things.

First, I guess a few positives that I'm pleased that at Penn State we offer a broad-based set of athletic participation opportunities for students of all genders to participate. We have 31 teams with about 850 student athletes participating. One of the statistics I think that's quite telling is in the academic year 2020-2021 across the three graduation dates, we had 176 student athletes that graduated and 81% of those student athletes graduated with a cumulative GPA of 3.00 or above. And so, I think that's indicative of some of the other statistics that are included in the report that says on average, I think our student athletes are doing quite well academically.

Also included in the report are information on a series of checks and balances we do either annually or every other year, really to make sure that we're functioning properly. And I want to highlight a couple of those. One is 67-00 Senate policy has rules regarding how much class time student athletes are able to miss for competition, either on campus or off campus due to travel, with eight days being the guideline per semester. And we have ways in which we estimate that depending on when they depart for campus for these competitions. And so, we've done some checks to make sure the way we're estimating that, recognizing each student has an individual class schedule, actually reflects reality.

And we did a pretty detailed investigation of student athletes on four teams and found that our policy as per 67-00 is working quite effectively. So, our student athletes are definitely sticking to within that allotted Senate-mandated time frame and the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee and myself regulate that fairly rigorously. We also look at the use of reserve spaces for student athletes and make sure that we're sticking within those allotted by the Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid and that any change of assignment due to admission to another Penn State campus to University Park is within guidelines. And again, we continue to-- actually, Intercollegiate Athletics continues to use significantly fewer number of reserve spaces than allotted by that committee.
We look at class grades in courses that have 20% or more student athlete enrollment, looking for grade inflation or preferential grading for student athletes. This is in conjunction with Bob Kubat in the registrar's office, with Yvonne Gaudelius and her office, and Russ Mushinsky, and myself in the Morgan Center. And again, we found that there's no evidence that there is preferential grading as we looked at those classes. And one of the things that I'm very happy about as well is when we take a look at clustering within majors or within college years, our 850 or so student athletes are spread across really multiple colleges and multiple majors.

So, for example, 27% in the DUS, which is understandable given new students entering the University. About 17% Liberal Arts, 10% in Health and Human Development, 9% in Smeal, 9% in Bellisario, 7% in Engineering and about 4% or 4.5% in Education and Eberly College of Science, for example. So, when I first started in this role, I heard a student athlete say that the reason she decided to come to Penn State is she was told she can major in whatever she wanted and didn't have to pick a major based on practice times and such. And that seems to bear out quite well as we look at what our students are majoring in.

And it's a diverse setting, which I think is what we all want. I won't go into all the detail but for those of you that either have seen or would like to look at the report, there are a variety of statistics with longitudinal data and benchmarks relative to other Big Ten institutions, as well as other Power 5 or R1 institutions with major Division I athletic offerings and you can compare generally three types of rates.

There's the NCAA graduation success rate, which is based on a cohort and measures the degree to which an incoming cohort graduates within six years. Our rate is at 92%. We're about to report an update of that and I think it certainly will not be any worse than that and that is an indicator that we have actually increased over time. Another measure is something called the academic progress rate.

This is kind of viewed as a progress towards degree rate. The idea here is to make sure that student athletes are enrolled in courses that are working towards their actual major or degree and not just enrolling in courses for which they might be able to pass or just get stuck in 100 level courses. And again, our numbers here I think are quite good. Also, federal graduation rates are reported there as well. And there's a little nuance there described in the report, which does impact, I think, the way athletics rates are interpreted because transfer students and others and that's happening more frequently in athletics, tend to face a little penalty in that rate.

But I guess what I'd say is lots of data reported in the Appendix, with graphs, charts, tables and those benchmark comparisons if one would like to take a look at those. I guess the last thing I'll say before I'll turn it over to Sandy and then we can entertain any questions, I continue to track, as I know Sandy will talk about as well, some significant change in the national landscape, the environment in intercollegiate athletics nationally is changing rapidly. A lot of this driven by legal challenges, some that have risen to decisions by the Supreme Court, by state legislatures, and state laws being passed, NCAA policy changes, as well as public attitudes and perceptions related to the concept of amateurism and the views of the degree to which student athletes should be entitled to revenues generated from media rights and other sales of tickets and merchandise and such related to their sport.

So lots of change. Some of this are terms you may have heard name, image, and likeness. There's an Appendix that a subcommittee of the Intercollegiate Athletics did some work on this, and you can read that report. I believe Sandy will address what we're doing here at Penn State with respect to this. So, I'll leave that to her. The Supreme Court decision that I mentioned, which came about this past June, has
allowed for some, quote, "academic award payments" to student athletes as a way, quite frankly, I think, to redistribute some of the revenues being generated in major Division I athletics to student athletes. And lots of institutions, including our own in the Big Ten conference, are having discussions about the right way to handle that now that it's allowed by law.

And to a large degree, there's an expectation that these payments will be made, but yet doing it in a way that will be consistent with the values and the goals of our different institutions. The transfer environment, meaning student athletes that go from one institution to another, oftentimes driven by playing opportunities, is an increasing volume certainly here at Penn State, both coming in but also student athletes leaving. It's a national phenomenon. And of course, what I worry about is the impact of that on academic progress and performance both for students going to another place but also students we may be taking in and their ability to successfully complete their academic work here at Penn State.

And then a couple of other issues Sandy might mention. This time of year, we always hear discussion of expanding the College football playoff and also the Big Ten Conference recently announcing an alliance with the two other conferences, the ACC and the Pac-12, which I think are like-minded conferences in terms of at least the academic institutions that make up those conferences. Not a lot of details yet on what that ultimately means.

Sandy may have more to say about that. But I guess I'll end there and turn it over to her by saying that if things continue to change very rapidly and evolve, some of this is driven by acts of Congress, acts of state legislatures and also the acts of the courts. And so, we need to think about how to react and adjust and of course, my focus as the FAR is to think about how to do that consistent with our academic principles. So maybe turn it to Sandy and then we can open up for questions after that.

Sandy Barbour, Vice President for Intercollegiate Athletics: Great thank you, Dennis and always appreciate the opportunity to come before the full Faculty Senate and talk about intercollegiate athletics and our student athletes and their pursuits both in the classroom and in their various athletic pursuits. I will follow directly on Dennis' comments about the NCAA GSR data. This is a very timely meeting as it relates to that. The latest set of data will be released on Thursday of this week and per Dennis' comments, the number that will be announced will tie our historic high of 92%. And this will be the fourth straight year that we have either set a new historic record since the NCAA has been doing GSR data, either set or tied a new graduation success rate for Penn State. So, a new historic high. So, we're quite proud of that.

I'm going to make a couple of really quick comments about some of the things that Dennis just talked about. Happy to answer questions about it. But I'm really going to focus on name, image, and likeness today. But first and foremost, since we're talking about 2021, I really want to acknowledge all of you. And as an institution, obviously having to operate and teach students and educate and try to do all the things during a worldwide pandemic, obviously we had our challenges as an Athletic department, not unlike the entire University. And you all as faculty and professors trying to teach students but we established very early on a couple of objectives.

First and foremost was the health and safety of our student athletes and staff and to some degree, by extension, then our community. And then once we established that we could do that, could we then give them the ability to play the sport that they love. And I think as you probably know, the seasons were truncated. We didn't play anything other than football in the fall. So, some of the seasons were moved, et
cetera. But I think all in all, we did quite well certainly with the health and safety piece and then with giving our students the ability to play the sport that they loved.

Just a couple of cursory comments before I get to name, image, and likeness about the landscape. Dennis mentioned it. Just a really challenging time, a lot of change, a lot of forces coming from out of the legal system which are challenging. But whether it be transfers or name, image, and likeness, or the Alston case, or CFP expansion or conference alignment, it's a lot to juggle, both as an athletic department. And obviously many of those things if not all of them, have broader institutional impacts that also need to be managed.

But probably the thing that's gotten the most publicity if you will, is name, image, and likeness. And so, I just wanted to make a few comments about how we're handling that at Penn State. We have come forward with our program that is called STATEment, Make Your STATEment. This is a little bit about building an individual or a personal brand. But that really speaks to education being first and foremost in everything we're doing around name, image, and likeness, whether it be individual brand building, whether it be-- we've really talked about name, image, and likeness for students being about this entrepreneurial adventure and I'll get to that in a minute.

But more about the educational piece, whether it be education about contracts or business principles or tax or finance, et cetera. And then I would say the second half of it, only out of necessity, really is the regulatory side, which is whether it's you're talking about-- Pennsylvania is one of I think 22 or 23 states that actually have laws about college student athletes and name, image, and likeness. So, there's PA law. There's NCAA legislation, there's some federal and state tax and financial aid regulations, and then there is an ICA, Penn State ICA institutional policy. So, we established some principles right up front that I think really have guided us with our students, guided us with our program, both the statement program and then as well the ICA institutional policy.

But it starts with giving student athletes the same opportunity as any student on our campus. I mean, we have some pretty talented students in musical theater that heretofore would have had the opportunity to capitalize on their name, image, and likeness and student athletes really were the only students on campus that were prohibited from doing that by NCAA regulations. So, it established giving the student athletes the same opportunities as any student. And that's been really helpful as we've developed our policy.

The second I've really already mentioned but it always bears mentioning, and that is that the program is rooted in education. The third is that our programming will help prepare you as a student for maybe what's at the next level, whether that next level is professional sport or whether that next level is business or science or education or whatever it happens to be. And so again, as we've put together our educational programs, as we've put together our policies, we've tried to mimic what our students will encounter as they exit Penn State and their educational opportunity here.

The fourth principle was kind of get to yes, if we can. The fifth is-- we've got it written in our principles as keep the main thing the main thing. But what that really means is their education comes first. And certainly, from an athletics perspective, we're also interested in their training and their competitive opportunities coming second. And then these other endeavors, whether it be their entrepreneurial adventure, those take a backseat to those main things.
And then the last principle is to stay flexible. And we've seen over the course of it's now been almost four months that name, image, and likeness pursuits have been possible for student athletes, that our students have taught us a lot. We've taught them some things. Taxes come to mind. But also, we've stayed flexible with our program to adjust as this is evolving. A couple of other categories, the NCAA rules. To be honest, there are very few. This is where the NCAA has kind of gotten caught up in that regulatory environment, the legal environment. And they really taken a hands-off—

As I mentioned before, there is a Pennsylvania bill, where one of I think somewhere in the mid-20s. It's a very simple bill, but I think it's a really good bill that protects students as well as it protects the universities—colleges and universities. It does require disclosure. It does not allow the institution to arrange name, image, and likeness deals, if you will. So, I think all those things are-- in the main, I think the Pennsylvania law is really an outstanding one.

And then finally, the ICA institutional policy. It includes, obviously the Pennsylvania bill and Pennsylvania legislation, but also a number of excluded prohibited categories from an institutional standpoint, mainly around values that students are not being able to participate in. But finally, I think one of the greatest pieces of this has been the collaborations with campus resources. And that is the number of-- both within ICA that we've always had, whether it's our student welfare and development programs that have always tried to help prepare students for what's next, or whether it's our compliance operation that's helping them from a legal and an NCAA standpoint.

But really things like the Small Business Development Center in our law school, the Student Legal Services offerings, Launch Box and the so-called Miller Financial Life Center, which we've always used, we've always collaborated with as an athletic department particularly through student welfare and development. But this obviously puts new light on it. And we've had many faculty, particularly spotlighting business and law faculty, who have stepped forward to assist in our programming and to assist with our students.

We also are using technology from an athletic department standpoint to help our students. One is something called Spry, which is our disclosure app. There is an educational element to it as well but it's primarily our disclosure app. It's something-- we're trying to meet students where they are so it's on their phone. And give them the opportunity to submit disclosures for NIL activity through their phone.

There's another content platform called Influencer, where our student athletes can meet up with content, primarily pictures and photos through the athletic department. And then finally, something called Athletes Network, which we've been using for about four or five years but it's again, it's kind of taken on new meaning in this NIL world as it relates to our student athletes having the opportunity to engage with our alumni, particularly our former student athlete alumni.

So that's a quick overview of name, image, and likeness. Again, something that's occupied a lot of space for us since the first of July. Something that I think can be very exciting in terms of an opportunity for our students and taking kind of the entrepreneurial approach to it. So, with that, I'll stop and certainly Dennis and I are happy to take any questions.

**Chair Szczygiel:** All right, are there any questions for this dynamic team? Paul. Name and unit, please.

**Paul Frisch, Penn State Scranton:** Hi. Frisch, Scranton. Looking at the report, I just had a clarification possible follow up in section C, Item 6, where you're looking at the major clustering section. I never
understood what this fully meant. Are the numbers that are there—is it by sport that they track what major or is it by athletics in a total or both?

**Dennis Scanlon:** Yeah, those I believe-- and I'm happy to double check and follow up with you-- but I believe those are the denominator there would be our student athletes more broadly. So roughly 850 and so the percentage that have chosen a major in any of those colleges. Of course, within college there's a variety of different majors. So, the intent here in building off of some of the concerns with some other institutions where there have been academic programs where lots of student athletes have clustered and allegations of not really getting real academic program, we look at this to make sure that that's not happening here at Penn State.

So, I'm pretty certain that-- I will double check that this isn't an averages of sports teams. This is an average with a denominator of 850. I'm pretty sure that's how we computed it. But that would be across the denominator of roughly 850 student athletes.

**Paul Frisch:** So then if let's say randomly a sport, basketball because there's not terribly many on the team, that say half of them happen to randomly pick the same major. Would they then be monitored more because of that with the major clustering or would the NCAA say, sorry. Some of you can't do that major. How would that then-- this is the part where I don't understand what the NCAA would then do with that sort of thing. Because I remember the UNC basketball case many years ago, that they were accused of that and got problems. So how does that then affect the actual students with what they want to major in?

**Dennis Scanlon:** Yeah, no. That's a great question and that's one of the institutions certainly that raised some concern about this. We do compute and we do look at within sport as well, clustering. So those are not reported here but we have those numbers and we have looked at those. And I would also say we have not observed problems even in sports like you mentioned with smaller roster sizes. Basketball is typically around 15 or so roster sizes. Golf for example, might maybe even smaller, somewhere in the order of eight student athletes. So we do compute those. We do look at those, which reported here are the broader numbers.

Per your question about the NCAA, and Sandy can correct me if I'm wrong, this is an area where I don't believe the NCAA has specific guidelines. They would not say, you have to tell a student to major in something else. This is more an institutional decision. And so, we're doing this because we think it's the right thing to do.

Interestingly, we have not seen data that would ever raise us to a level of concern where we'd have to go that. Just natural selection of majors fortunately, we've had pretty good spread. Sandy, I don't know if there's anything else that you would add but I'm not aware that the NCAA has any specific rules on this.

**Sandy Barbour:** Yeah, Dennis, that's correct. And as a matter of fact, the steps that Penn State is taking under the guidance of Dennis and our FAR and the Senate Athletic Committee are certainly considered best practice, but they are not required.

**Dennis Scanlon:** Paul, we have those sport by sport so if maybe working through a member of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, if that's something that somebody wanted to see, we could certainly share that.

**Paul Frisch:** OK. Thank you very much.
Chair Szczygiel: Thank you Dennis and Sandy. There was a lot of information you gave. Thank you so much for pulling that together. I personally am very gratified to hear that there's a positive sort of rainbow at the end of NIL and if anyone could have pulled that off, it'd be this group, I think. So, kudos. Thank you.

Sandy Barbour: Thank you. Always appreciate the time.


Chair Szczygiel: Well, appreciate your being here and sorry about the long wait. We are going to move on then to the next Senate Committee Faculty Benefits and the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits, “2020 – 2021 Annual Report on the Status of Benefits Changes,” which is found in Appendix P. Fifteen minutes have been allotted for presentation and discussion. This report will be presented by Denise Costanzo and Jill Musser.

Denise Costanzo, College of Arts and Architecture: Thank you very much, Bonj. Since we've reached what I would call the happy hour phase of the Senate Plenary, we'll keep this as short as possible. I'll simply share my screen to show the report just to have that as a reference. First off, this is a report that our committee, Faculty Benefits, receives from the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits, and is a report on what our health care plans, and spending have been for 2020 and the 2021 year.

So, it's kind of easy because there were no major changes to the plan unless you were someone interested in signing up for the short-term disability, which did have a change regarding pre-existing conditions being replaced for evidence of insurability. So that was something that makes it easier for those employees interested in that plan to not be turned down, which was happening at an uncomfortable rate. So essentially-- and also, I just want to thank Jill Musser from HR. She is here to help answer questions that I might not know how to answer, and her office has been fabulous as always in providing information.

So probably the most remarkable thing about our otherwise unchanged plan is this data here. The fact that from 2018 to 2021, there has been no change in our deductibles and out-of-pocket maximums. This is true in both what we're looking at here is a description of the PPO plan, which is the non high deductible plan so what we might think of as the standard one. And so, in the report, we simply have the structure of that plan presented and none of that material has changed since 2018. Here we have similar information regarding the structure of our high deductible plan. And again, during that same period, those numbers have remained fixed. So, this is just kind of a snapshot of how that plan works.

And obviously, these are very complex plans and if anyone does have questions or things that they need to clarify and they want to keep talking, they're welcome to ask those questions to Jill and myself. We also get an update on the Retiree Health plan which again, I do not believe has changed substantially. So here on page 4 is where we have kind of a snapshot of what made 2020 interesting or distinctive. So going into through 2021, first off, what it shows us here is of the 18,000 total employees at Penn State that are enrolled in both plans, it is about a 70/30 split with about 30% of employees opting for the high deductible plan and 70% staying in the more traditional plan. We do see just about a 5.5% in participation in the Penn State health plans.

These are numbers that I find interesting as well, looking at how many of us are choosing to move from one plan to another. And I pulled out my calculator and did the math. So essentially, there have been 1.7, the 218 comes to 1.7% of employees switching-- if I did my math correctly, which I may not have-
- actually, I did that wrong. So, I'm not going to give you my statistics. If you're interested in how many people are switching from one plan to another, you can divide the opposite of what I did in those numbers. So essentially, this is how many people are changing plans from one to the other. So then--

**Chair Szczygiel:** Denise, could I just ask. Did you find a rationale for that? I do find that interesting.

**Denise Costanzo:** Yeah, actually. And I would have to-- I think people make those changes based on a lot of different experiences. Jill is our high deductible plan cheerleader. She is someone who is well-equipped to explain the financial benefits of doing that. But going into a high deductible plan requires people be comfortable with a high initial outlay, at least what feels like a high initial outlay of expenditures for the year. You have to be someone who's not going to talk yourself out of an important medical visit because you may need to see $300 leave an account. And there's also a certain amount of unpredictability in what your total annual costs might be.

So, there are a lot of complexities regarding who is more comfortable in what kind of plan. So, I think people make those changes for a lot of different reasons based on their experience or even just their gut level comfort with one approach versus another. So just going on, I would say on page 5 is where we see some more interesting data. We have the total health care costs, which we spend on each other. We are self-insured. So, approaching $277 million. And in Appendix A at the very end of the document you have-- this number only includes current active employees. The number in the final Appendix also includes retirees.

And it gives a comparison between 2020 and 2019, and it shows that total expenditures on health care, including retirees actually were $4 million lower in 2020, which is likely because-- and we see this addressed here-- because of COVID-19, there was a lot of health care that just didn't happen. People were not going for certain kinds of preventative and possibly elective procedures. So essentially, there was reduced health care usage and so we see that in some of the total numbers.

One of the interesting details here, you see at the bottom of this chart the total cost sharing between employees and the University is roughly 73% to 27%. One of the principles that the University maintains in its health care plans and plan design is to maintain something close to a 75%, 25% cost sharing where we collectively, individually-- this is going to vary based on who you are and what your needs are in any given year but the idea is that employees collectively pay about 25% of their total health care needs and the University as a collective pays the other 75%.

If we look up at what the difference is for the traditional PPO plan versus the high deductible PPO savings plan, however, we see a considerable difference that the traditional plan for 2020 was right on target with that 25-75 split, whereas the high deductible plan was 65-35. And that disparity is likely due to the fact that with reduced overall health care spending, a larger number of employees on the high deductible plan just didn't consume enough health care to meet their deductible. And so, the insurance part did not kick in in a certain number of cases.

**Provost Jones:** Or that or their out of pocket, Denise. Sorry, just to add.

**Denise Costanzo:** Sorry, thank you. Yes, on the out of pocket. Thank you very much, Provost Jones for that clarification. And then we can just sort go down here is the Appendix that shows that comparison and those numbers that we were looking at for the entire year and here's where you see that lower 4.22% overall expenditure. So that is the information that we received, a kind of snapshot of how 2020 looked in
Chair Szczysgiel: Denise, if Provost Jones gives financial benefits advice and he's kind of sort of employed by you, the committee, would we have a problem with AC80? I'm just tossing it out. Might just want to be careful.

Provost Jones: Yeah, I'm counting on it being a conflict. So that's why I'm keeping quiet mostly.

Denise Costanzo: Our consultant’s fees are quite low.

Chair Szczysgiel: Consultant's fees are something else.

Denise Costanzo: Yes.

Chair Szczysgiel: Thank you. Jill, did you have anything you wanted to add?

Jill Musser, Manager of Benefits Program & Services: Denise, you've captured the spirit of the report very accurately and I appreciate that. I can just let you know that the reality of the fact that services were significantly reduced in 2020, that's an accurate statement. It's not an assumption. We saw that in the claims. And as a matter of fact, 2021 has really rebounded to the prior pre-COVID level, if you will. And through September of 2021, we're actually coming in at around 91% of projected costs. So, the data really proves that the doctors’ offices, the hospitals, everyone resumed some of the more elective surgeries.

People were trusting that they could go to the health care facility again without risk of-- or exaggerated risk, I should say, of COVID. So, things are bouncing back as we would expect. And I did see a couple of comments in the chat that the high deductible plan, the benefits mentor, which is the tool that we've used now three years in a row, directed individuals and basically 75% of the time, the benefits mentor tool based on your prior claims as well as the information that you've loaded into the tool to take advantage of it during open enrollment will point you to the high deductible plan.

And I know we don't have time to go into that. Denise mentioned that I'm the cheerleader. I like to think that I'm the educator rather than the cheerleader because it's a great plan and when you really take the opportunity to understand how it works in comparison to the PPO plan, most employees, regardless of age, regardless of income and regardless of claims experience really end up better off financially in the PPO Savings plan, the high deductible. And part of that is because of the health savings account, the HSA, which is a tremendous tax savings vehicle that carries from year to year. And so, everything Denise said is accurate. If anyone has any questions, certainly I hope to have the answer if you choose to ask.

Chair Szczysgiel: Thank you, Jill and Denise. Denise, you knocked it out of the park. Jill, I think you just piqued a lot of people's interest with that last education. Do we have any questions, comments for Denise and Jill? Seeing none, thank you both very much. Excellent job, Denise. Thanks.

Denise Costanzo: Thank you, Bonj. Thank you, Jill.
Chair Szczygiel: Our last report is-- and Provost Jones-- our last report is the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, “Annual Report for 2020-2021*.” It is Appendix Q. It will be a web only report. If you have any questions after you thoroughly read it, please contact FR&R Chair Keith Shapiro. All right, so if we could have a look at our earlier votes. Anna, if you could please share your screen and read out each report's name and the results of the vote for the record.

Anna Butler: All right, so with our attendance vote being first, we had 152 senators present at the time. For the revisions to the Senate Bylaws, Senate Council, and Standing Rules, Committee on Committees and Rules, we had it pass, 146 to 3. For the revisions of the Standing rules, the Committee on Global Programs, it passed 136 to 1. Revision on Standing Rules Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, it passed 137 to 5.

Revision to Standing Rules Committee on Student Life, it passed 135 to 4. Revision to Standing Rules, University Planning Committee, it passed 135 to 4. Revision of AC23, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations, and AC21, Definition of Academic Rank, it passed 134 to 2. And the revision of AC80, Outside Business Activities and Private Consulting, it passed 124 to 14.

Chair Szczygiel: Anna, thank you so very much. You've been a trooper through this long, long afternoon. And congratulations to everyone

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS - NONE

Chair Szczygiel: Item L, New Legislative Business, there is none.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Szczygiel: Item M on our Agenda, Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the University. Are there any additional comments for the good of the University? Raise your hand. Seeing none, I want to thank everyone who is still here, all 150-some of you for hanging around for the sunset tour.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Szczygiel: May I please have a motion to adjourn?

Judy Ozment: So, moved.

Roger Egolf: Second.

Chair Szczygiel: Seconded. All in favor say, heck yes. Or just wave or say whatever.
Chair Szczygiel: The next Senate will be held on Tuesday January 25, 2022, at 1:30 PM. We will all see you in the new year. Thank you, everyone. Have a great day.

The next Regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, January 25, 2022, 1:30 p.m., via ZOOM.
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>