



PennState
University Faculty Senate

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

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

THE SENATE RECORD

Volume 55-----January 25, 2022----Number 7

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

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

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

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

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Final Agenda for January 25, 2022	Pages ii-iii
II.	Minutes and Summaries of Remarks	Pages 1-59
III.	Appendices	
	a. Attendance	Appendix O

FINAL AGENDA JANUARY 25, 2022

A.	<u>MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING</u>	Page 2
	Minutes of the <u>November 30, 2021 Meeting</u> in The Senate Record 55:6	Page 2
B.	<u>COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE</u>	Page 2
	<u>Senate Curriculum Report of January 11, 2022</u> <u>http://Senate.psu.edu/curriculum/Senate-curriculum-reports/</u>	
C.	<u>REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL</u> Meeting of January 11, 2022	Page 3
D.	<u>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR</u>	Pages 3-8
	Senate Committee on Student Life <u>Student Sustainability Literacy Project</u>	Pages 3-8
E.	<u>COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY</u>	Pages 8-9
F.	<u>COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST</u>	Pages 9-20
G.	<u>FORENSIC BUSINESS - NONE</u>	Page 20
H.	<u>UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE</u>	Page 20
I.	<u>LEGISLATIVE REPORTS</u>	Pages 21-25
	Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and Faculty Affairs <u>Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (f), Committee on Faculty Affairs</u>	Page 21
	Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity <u>Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II– Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (m), Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity</u>	Pages 21-22
	Senate Committees on Committees and Rules, Faculty Affairs, and Intra-University Relations <u>Revisions to Standing Rules, Article III, Section 6, Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities</u>	Pages 22-23
	Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs <u>Editorial Separation of Existing Curricular Policies and Procedures, Creating Policies 100-10, 130-00, 130-10, 130-50, 130-70, etc.</u>	Pages 23-25
J.	<u>ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS</u>	Pages 25-27
	Senate Committee on Intra-University Relations <u>Report on Access to University-Wide Online Resources that Support Education</u>	Pages 25-27

K. [POSITIONAL REPORTS](#)

Pages 27-45

Senate Committees on Education Equity and Campus Environment, Faculty Affairs, and Intra-University Relations[Resolution in Support of Academic Freedom and Rejection of Attempts to Interfere with the Teaching of Racial and Social Justice](#)

Pages 27-45

L. [INFORMATIONAL REPORTS](#)

Pages 45-54

Senate Committee on University Planning[Annual Budget Report](#)

[This report is being moved to the 3/15/22 plenary for presentation]

Page 45

Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid[Annual Report on Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded to Undergraduates 2020-2021*](#)

Page 45

Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs and Intra-University Relations[One Penn State 2025 Guiding Principle Two Committee Update on Educational Communities](#)

[This report was changed to “web only” during the plenary meeting on 1/25/2022] Page 45

Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology[Presentation on Data Digest \(formerly known as Fact Book\)](#)

Page 46-50

Senate Committee on University Planning[STARS Report: Assessing Sustainability Progress and Opportunities At Penn State](#)

Pages 50-54

*Web-only reports.

M. [NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS](#)

Pages 54-57

[Letter from faculty at PSU Greater Allegheny on update of Code of Student Conduct](#)

Pages 54-57

N. [COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY](#)

Page 57-58

O. [ADJOURNMENT](#)

Page 58

The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, January 25, 2022, at 1:30 p.m. via Zoom Webinar with Bonj Szczygiel, Chair, presiding.

Bonj Szczygiel, College of Arts and Architecture: Welcome, everyone, to our Tuesday, January 25, the first Plenary we're having in the year 2022. It is 01:30 PM and the Senate is now in session. Once again, we are meeting in a Zoom format.

Let me just go through the instructions one more time. I know you have them memorized, but who can speak at a Senate meeting? This is important to reiterate, only those who are elected or appointed student, faculty, administrative or retired senators, or past chairs have the privilege of the floor. The meetings are public, and others can join and listen, but please do not try to ask a question if you are not a senator. You can email Erin Eckley at the Senate Office if you'd like to request to speak at a future meeting.

Our Zoom capacity is 1,000 people, and if we reach that capacity, then whatever is going on should be on the nightly news, and you'll hear about it. Or if you should have to miss a meeting, a complete record will be available within three weeks of the meeting time. This meeting, like all Senate Plenary meetings, is being recorded.

Please be mindful of your microphone setting, so we don't have background noise, dogs barking, etc., interfering with the meeting. If you are comfortable in so doing and able, please feel free to share your bright and shiny faces.

Regarding the use of the chat feature of Zoom, you all did a great job at our November meeting. Thank you. This is just a reminder. The chat feature is available for attendees to communicate with each other as appropriate during a professional meeting. It should be used to post relevant comments, for example, links to content, sources, or to share special insights with attendees, anything to promote discussion, or report a technical problem. Please remember, chat posts are not anonymous, neither are they private, so I ask that those who wish to engage to please do so, but with restraint and consideration for everyone attending this meeting.

How do you raise a question? You do not use chat. You're going to use the Raised Hand function. It's usually at the bottom of your Zoom screen. Wait until the chair recognizes you. 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. If you are presenting a report, when it's time, we will call on you. Please, wait to speak until you are introduced by the chair. When you are finished, please mute.

If you have an emergency technical or otherwise, email Kadi Corter at kkw2@psu.edu, that's kilo, kilo, whiskey 2. All importantly, how do you vote? In order to get an accurate vote, we are using TallySpace, and we're getting very good at it, I am told by the Senate Office. We will be posting that link in chat, but you can also find the link on the agenda. Please, retrieve your nine-digit ID now, have it handy. You might want to hold off logging into TallySpace until we're ready to vote as it does have an expiration date of about two hours. But you will need your Penn State ID to be able to log into the system. The office staff are very busy supporting this meeting, and they won't be able to assist you in looking up your ID. It's a good idea just to go search for it now and have it handy.

Of course, a final note as we must do in all of these Zoom meetings, please be patient. Running a meeting like this has a lot of moving parts. Believe me when I tell you that all of the Senate Office staff are with us here and now working behind the scenes. You don't see them. But know that they are all busy and vigilant.

I want to welcome everyone. Thank you very much for being here. Welcome to a brand-new year. Again, a very heartfelt thank you for your commitment to the Senate. It's more important, I believe, now than ever. I know it can be exhausting and time-consuming, but I am hoping that it is also incredibly rewarding for you somewhere along the line. It's important work. I just want you to know that I see you, I value your time, your commitment, your effort, and folks, I'm here to support you, so please don't hesitate to reach out to me.

I want to thank our resource people and guests for attending and engaging in the work of the Senate. I want to thank the Senate Office again for their hard work. Without their support, the Senate could not get its work done.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Szczygiel: Onto the Agenda. Item A, the Minutes of the Preceding Meeting are now in two forms. I believe I mentioned this at our November meeting, a video recording of the meeting that is posted within a few days of this meeting and the formal Senate record providing a full transcription of the proceedings of the meeting. The transcription takes a while. If it is to be produced, if it's not available and ready, approving the minutes may simply mean the recording that is posted on the website. In this case, today, both have been posted.

My question to you, are there any additions or corrections to the November 30, 2021, Plenary Minutes? If there are, please raise your hand. Seeing none, may I hear a motion to accept?

Victor Brunsden, Penn State Altoona: So, moved.

Chair Szczygiel: Second?

Timothy Palmer, College of Medicine: Second.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. All in favor of accepting the minutes, please unmute and say aye. Got to work on that timing. Opposed, please say, nay. The ayes have it. Motion carried. Thank you. The minutes of the meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Szczygiel: Next, Item B, Communications to the Senate. The Senate Curriculum Report of January 11, 2022, is posted on the University Faculty website and listed on the Agenda as Appendix A.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Meeting of January 11, 2022

Chair Szczygiel: Item C, Report of Senate Council meetings from the January 11 Senate Council Meeting can be found in the link on your Agenda. Included in the minutes are topics that were discussed at the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President at our January 11 meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Szczygiel: Item D. Moving right along. Announcements By the Chair. I do have some few things, mostly housekeeping items to share with you. First, I have an announcement regarding the University Faculty Senators Unit Elections, the Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on Committees & Rules, this is the Elections Subcommittee of CC&R, is holding a forum for all Senators on Tuesday, February 22 from 02:00 PM to 3:30 PM.

The reason for the forum is to look at the process by which our Constituent Units elect Faculty and Student Senators. This is going to be talking about your home bases. Discussed will be the benefits and challenges faced with the current process for these elections and to consider possible strategies to make sure that Senator elections are consistently conducted, transparent, and accountable. Reminder with meeting information will be sent out in advance.

The second announcement, I share with you in light of recent racist hate mail that was sent to some in our Penn State community and for all who suffered at the hands of those with such hatred in their hearts, I first want to thank President Barron for his quick denunciation, and then I want to remind ourselves that this University is no home for such sentiments and that these actions and words are not to be tolerated.

Moving along, another acknowledgment. Thank you to all who attended the evening forum regarding a preamble to our constitution on shared governance. It was held January 18. It was, by all measure, a valuable and productive meeting, a great discussion, and we will be hearing more about that hopefully in our future.

Then one last formal act and that is to inform you of the need to hold a special election. One of the elected members of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, a very important committee, is not able to continue their term. We need to hold a special election to fill this position before February 22, as the work of this committee will begin soon as in March 1. CC&R serves as the nominating committee for this ballot and has the following candidates. Again, this is for the University P&T committee. John Champagne from Erie. Denise Ogden, Lehigh Valley University College. David Livert, Lehigh Valley University College.

At this time, I'd like to take any nominations there may be from the floor. Please raise your hand if you wish to nominate anyone. Hearing and seeing none, the nominations are closed. You will receive an email next week with a link to the ballot.

Now, I'd like to introduce Erin Boas, President of the University Park Undergraduate Association, who by now is a familiar face, name to many of us in this room, and who will present an update report sponsored by the Senate Committee on Student Life, titled "Student Sustainability Literacy Project." You can find it in Appendix B.

Erin is aided by members of the Student Sustainability Advisory Council, Divya Jain, Isabella Briseno, Lauren Waer are Erin's co-presenters. But before I hand this over to them, I'd like to just take a moment to reflect upon the significance of this presentation. I find this a momentous opportunity to welcome student activism and leadership within the Faculty Senate. We have, of course, witnessed student activism in the past, but this year, Erin not only served on the Presidential Search and Selection Committee for this University—good job, Erin—but is, to my knowledge, the first student to hold a Standing Committee leadership position as Vice-Chair of Student Life. Her accomplice in this regard is Tim Palmer, who serves as Chair of Student Life. This was an experiment, but one that I believe has opened the path for greater student engagement and meaningful involvement in the inner workings and deliberations of this University Senate. Thank you, Erin and SSAC colleagues and thank you to everyone on Student Life. You've had an interesting semester, I understand.

With that, I turn it over to Erin and her colleagues.

Erin Elizabeth Boas, University Park Undergraduate Association: Thank you so much, Bonj. It's been a great honor to have such an open environment where students can really have that activism and engagement within the Senate. So, I want to thank the Senate for always allowing students to come and speak on such important matters. I really do want to credit both Bella and Lauren and Divya for this presentation now, and as I share my screen, I'll hand it over to them to start off our presentation.

Isabella Jane Briseno, Executive Director of Environmental Sustainability, University Park Undergraduate Association: Thank you and again, we want to extend our ardent gratitude to you, Bonj, for letting us here today and for the opportunity to present to you all, introduce you all to some current initiatives and collaborative efforts that we are working on in our different units, all aimed on building on the existing sustainability curricular offerings in order to promote sustainability literacy among all Penn State students.

That gets me into what is sustainability literacy so we're all on the same page. This is taken from the Sustainability Institute's definition, but to hearken back to the definition of sustainability itself, that it's not just about pursuing environmental quality but also the simultaneous pursuit of human health and happiness, environmental quality, and economic well-being for current and future generations. Sustainability literacy is a measure of how competent students are to be confronted with the sustainability challenges that they will face, and then be instrumental in the problem-solving and the decision-making process to help build this sustainable future.

Part of the support that we feel for increasing sustainability literacy goes to things like 2019 Climate Survey that was conducted by Penn State Faculty, in which students surveyed agreed that climate change is happening, that Penn State has not prepared them well to meet the challenge of climate change, and 74 percent agreeing that they should be doing more to address climate change, which serve as our motivators that students are asking for formal sustainability education in the classroom and the other motivation that every student will face sustainability challenges in their professional and personal futures. Which is why

it's important that we continue to build on our curricular framework so that every student graduates sustainability literate to tackle the future challenges that they will face.

Laurie Marie Waer, Member, University Park Undergraduate Association: As Bella mentioned at the beginning, there are some already awesome and amazing things that exist within Penn State related to sustainability literacy. The first one of those is coursework. We have 74 sustainability focused courses and 111 sustainability-inclusive courses.

The second of that is degree titles. We do have a major and a minor and a handful of certificates that are all sustainability focused as well. However, we do see gaps across these two, throughout campuses and throughout colleges and cross degree titles, there are different gaps wherein reachability of those sustainability literacy programs.

Lastly, another gap that we see is how sustainability curriculum is advertised to students. Most of the time, students do not know what access to sustainability resources that they have and so they do not know that either of those courses, their major offerings exist, which is something that we would like to work on. Then in terms of how our curricular affairs side of things relates to Erin's project at the Student Sustainability Literacy Project, which we'll talk about in a moment, our overall goal is to revamp the Sustainability Curriculum that exists within Penn State.

We can see on the slide here we have a couple of shared values and shared goals that are a little bit more specific. The first one that we'll talk about is interdisciplinarity and how that relates to institutionalizing sustainability competencies. Interdisciplinarity, when we say that, we're referring to how sustainability fits in with other areas of study and then institutionalizing that is incorporating into the University in order to foster both students, faculty, and staff's sustainability competencies. That can relate to the more general overview term of knowledge and then how that can work to empower students. We want students to have a general knowledge of sustainability so that when they go into our professional career inside and outside of Penn State, they're able to tackle these sustainability challenges that they will most likely face in the future.

Then lastly, collaboration, which is a big part of what we're doing right now and how that can foster partnerships within and across groups of students, faculty, and staff. We've already seen a lot of that and so continuing with that in terms of sustainability education is super key.

Erin Elizabeth Boas: As we mentioned, while we can acknowledge that there's certainly gaps in mediation that we need in order to really reach that potential full sustainability education, there's also a lot of key players also at the moment within Penn State's efforts. Within Penn State Strategic Plan, for example, ensuring a sustainable future is one of the five foundations which really focuses on emphasizing the importance of climate change, sustainability, environmental stewardship, and social justice.

Then within the thematic priority of stewarding our planet's resources, there's also specific funded initiatives through seed grants that are looking to do things like developing technologies for implementation, improving our modeling competencies, foraging broad and relevant partnerships. It really brings together a lot of the key players at the University as well. We know that the Sustainability Institute has done a great job at consulting and coaching those in order to have a broad sustainable reach across the University. It's brought together many different groups and has also helped to start the consortium to combat climate change.

We've also seen from student-led efforts, while there's a variety of different student groups that work on sustainability efforts and policies and advocacy, and education, it's really about empowering those groups and empowering the student-led efforts and acknowledging, as both Isabella and Lauren have said, that we need more sustainable education as well. The Student Life Committee has been partnering a lot with the Curricular Affairs Committee in order to establish how we can best really have this sustainable education in a holistic view.

One of the biggest things that we want to do first is maintain a benchmark and get a student pulse of where we currently are as a University. Within the foundational area of ensuring sustainable foundation, it really looks to uplift and empower the parts of UN Sustainable Development Goals and the 2030 Plan. When we were looking at how we can really have the best pulse of what the student body currently is feeling in terms of sustainability literacy, we're looking to administer the Sustainability Literacy Test or the SULITEST of Higher Education.

Currently, 70 different institutions are participants in this SULITEST. It will not only allow us to have minimum level of knowledge of the economic, social, and environmental responsibility literacy that students have. But it will also allow us to compare it to other institutions as well and use that as a benchmark. We'll be partnering with a lot of different student groups, including Student Governments, the Sustainability Councils, Ego Reps and etc. to publish out the Student Access Code and make sure that we have the greatest reach as possible, so that we have the best reporting in terms of sustainability literacy.

Moving forward to as we're about to get into, we're looking to use this as the catalyst as long as well as building upon the work and advocacy of current groups and current actions, and really using it as a collaborative effort to progress into hopefully getting to the standpoint of having full sustainable education across the University.

Isabella Jane Briseno: The complement to the incredible work that Erin is doing is the work of Brandi Robinson that's in progress of inventorying the currently existing courses, sustainability-focused courses, that are already offered at Penn State. Getting an understanding of what wealth of courses we already have, as well as perhaps gaps that we can revamp courses to address, that's where the educational workshops for faculty come into play. For those who are interested in revamping their courses to be more sustainability-focused, they can go partner with the Sustainability Institute, enroll those workshops.

These last two touch points pertain to SSAC's vision for how the foundational work that Erin and Brandi are doing relates to how we can harness that energy for future curricular changes. We won't get into those right now, but these are some ideas that we have and I'm sure there are plenty of other ideas throughout the University.

Something that we all want to leave you all with is asking for participation in these efforts, as well as your continued engagement and support for sustainability efforts among your peers and colleagues as well as your students. So, thank you so much for having us here again today. Thank you for taking the time to listen to us.

Chair Szczygiel: That was wonderful. Thank you all. You nailed it. You hit ten minutes exactly. I don't know. You must have practiced. Senators, just take your queue. Thank you all very much for that interesting presentation. It's just meant to be an update, also a way to highlight the student work.

Do we have any questions for this group? If you do have a question, just raise your hand or a comment.
Ray.

Raymond Gabriel Najjar Jr, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Yeah, it's really just great to hear about this activity. I would just ask you, is there anything more that faculty, in general, can be doing or the Senate in particular to support you?

Erin Elizabeth Boas: Sure. I don't know if Bella or Lauren also want to hop in, but I would just say as we're trying to get the information spread to students. If you want to publish this within your classes and encourage your students to also participate in the survey, obviously, once it gets to the curricular affairs side too, we're going to be looking for faculty participation that way as Bella had said, But definitely any support in getting the word out would be really helpful.

Raymond Gabriel Najjar Jr: So the test can be taken now?

Erin Elizabeth Boas: We're currently still establishing the marketing materials, but that access code that is on the PowerPoint can be taken now, yes.

Raymond Gabriel Najjar Jr: I don't know what to do with that access. Could students know, if they see that access code, what to do with it?

Erin Elizabeth Boas: Yes, I'm planning to put out a mass communication. I have the ability to send out some mass communication that way that has a little bit more information also included.

Raymond Gabriel Najjar Jr: That's great. I'll look out for that. Thank you so much.

Isabella Jane Briseno: I'll just jump in unless Brandi wants to speak. But on behalf of the Inventory Work, we've been really partnering SSAC with Brandi and trying to find the best way to disseminate that out to faculty. In the past, it has been sent to individual units and colleges, but we're exploring some alternative methods that right now make it uncertain. But I would reach out to Brandi if you're interested in taking the inventory and participating in that survey.

Chair Szczygiel: Erin, I see there's a comment in the chat about wouldn't make any sense to post that resource code in chat now?

Erin Elizabeth Boas: Yes, I can do that.

Chair Szczygiel: Great. Dawn.

Dawn Pfeifer Reitz, Penn State Berks: Thanks, Bonj. Reitz, Berks. I just wanted to give some kudos to our three presenters. I teach CAS 100 exclusively at Penn State Berks and I want to commend you on your well-organized, succinct, and well-delivered presentation today. You give our students a good name. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Well, thank you very much, Erin, for all your work. Bella, Lauren, I know Divya has contributed. Thank you so much for your great work this year and for some of you, you will be continuing on. We look forward to hearing more and see more of you. Have a good rest of this semester. Thank you for coming. We move on to Agenda Item E, comments by the President of the University. Just

a reminder, the President will be followed directly by the provost in making their comments with a 20-minute period for Q&A to both from the floor immediately afterwards. It is now my pleasure to recognize President Barron for his comments.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Eric James Barron, President, Pennsylvania State University: Well, thank you very much. I appreciate being here. I grew up in a family and a community that viewed freedom of speech as a critical constitutional right that basically ensured our democracy. Testing ideas and the marketplace of society enabled us to reject what was flawed and strengthen what was promising and thereby letting society advance.

Today, as I think many are thinking about, I believe this foundation and democracy are threatened. I want to emphasize here that I'm not talking about one side of the political spectrum, but rather from both the left and the right, so to speak. Milo's visit to University Park, I think, is instructive in this way. In one year, there was strong support for the Chicago principles, or rather a strict adherence to be an open to free speech.

Then all of a sudden, we wanted to throw those principles aside because we had a strong need to silence Milo. In my view, his history is ugly and there's no doubt he causes pain and discomfort for many, including particularly for this visit, our LGBTQ+ family. But it's worth examining the outcome of having him come on campus. Milo seemed wholly unprepared to speak. Perhaps he assumed he wouldn't have to speak because he'd be rejected and then it would give him the opportunity to file a lawsuit, win, and get resources from it and use that rejection as a platform to say that universities did not actually support free speech.

Whatever he thought, few saw him speak. Many of those who did found him disorganized and frankly rather pathetic. In contrast, the Love is Louder, but 1,700 people standing in long lines to support our LGBTQ+ family. It created something that was the very opposite of what Milo intended, it was actually a celebration of individual rights and individual identity that totally obliterated Milo's intent. As a community, we rejected the flawed and instead sent a powerful positive message in my opinion.

Well, this is a Penn State example, but nationally, the same issue is playing out and frequently on University campuses and frequently coming from the left or the right to silence and control what people hear and what people say even on a University campus. It's my belief that this is a real threat to our way of life, this effort to narrow and restrict the marketplace of ideas.

Part of the reason why I'm bringing up this topic is because I believe that the topic of academic freedom and even tenure is closely aligned with this very same issue. Having internal and external entities try to control what is taught is not particularly new. The need for policies on academic freedom and tenure are born out from scores of examples and many, many decades where we needed to protect the scholarship, especially in the social sciences related controversial issues.

Although clearly, my own field of climate science, these threats have crossed into the physical sciences as well. In my view, for a lot of years, this was entirely manageable and even the most egregious cases, we had things like accrediting bodies that were willing to step up and protect us. But today, the calls to

control the scholarship and teaching environment from both the left and the right have grown stronger and more frequent and more concerning.

Social media has become a megaphone for individuals scanning syllabi for good sound bite or something that appeared controversial or clipping parts of lectures as a way of creating outrage. In my view, many times false outrage. Protecting universities as a place for scholarship across the spectrum from science to social sciences, to the arts, as a place for discourse and ideas, as a place for testing ideas in the marketplace, in my view, is at the very foundation of the University. It must be protected in the same way speech must be protected. We have an obligation to produce critical thinkers and we must learn whether or not ideas stand up to scrutiny by testing them in the marketplace of ideas.

I know in my own class, I merely switched sides when my students describe their views. I love to set up debates in which you have to take a side for which you don't agree. It strengthens your arguments. It's a fundamental way in which we promote learning and critical thinking. I'm sure all of you know that. Frankly I can't imagine a better place, a better marketplace of ideas than a classroom full of bright, thoughtful students who represent a remarkable spectrum of politics, and religion, and ethnicity, and economics, and identity, guided by a scholar who has deep knowledge of the subject matter.

Today, so many are demanding control of this marketplace of ideas, demanding and amplifying a range of reactions from disappointment to outrage. We can't afford to give in to that pressure. I cannot imagine a university in which ideas are not being challenged and not being debated. I cannot imagine if we could only teach what no one objects to. But I also want to add a caution, academic freedom is not a blank check. It's not an impenetrable shield that we can put up just because we take for granted that we're a community designed to attract and support scholars. It is being tested in the marketplace of ideas today and I worry we're losing the battle of protecting our academic freedom, and we will continue to do so if we don't go deeper in just rejecting external pressure.

Academic freedom is thwarted if we're not open to diverse viewpoints. Importantly, from the left and the right, I hear the very same issue and response. The belief, or in many ways worse, the assumption that we're indoctrinating, not creating an environment for learning or debating designed to develop critical thinkers, not an environment open to ideas. We must and I will continue to push back on those that inappropriately try to narrow the scope of the marketplace of ideas. But we must also do this with open discourse and debate and by accepting a responsibility for a deeper and more significant role to educate those that are around us.

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to express my thoughts on a topic that is clearly very important to the Senate and to the University as a whole. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, President Barron. Provost. It's my pleasure to recognize Provost Jones for his comments.

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY

Nicholas P. Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: Thank you very much, Bonj. Good to be with you. Hello, Eric leaves a little bit of a tough act to follow with his remarks. I want to update you all

on three things; admissions, the status of the various searches that we have underway, and of course, COVID.

Let me begin with admissions and I will focus on undergraduate admissions because we're still at that critical time with graduate applications and admissions where we don't have a lot of good data to report yet. For undergraduate applications, for the current class, applicants who had submitted their materials by the early action deadline of November 1 received their decisions prior to the December break, with the exception of some international students in situations where we needed more information. First-year baccalaureate applications for '22 summer and for admission are up 22.5 percent over the 2019 cycle with 105,622 applications received so far. That's a pretty remarkable number. This is a nine-and-a-half percent increase over 2020.

Earlier, we had avoided comparing to 2020 because of pushing the early application date back to November 15 last year due to complexities associated with the pandemic. But this shift is now behind us and so we can use those direct comparisons to 2020 again.

Little bit more breakdown in comparison to 2020 for the Commonwealth Campuses. International applications are up 21 percent, out-of-state applications are up 1.3 percent, and Pennsylvania applications are down 3.1 percent. For University Park, international applications are up almost 15 percent, out-of-state applications are up just a little over 13 percent, and Pennsylvania applications are up 5.1 percent. We're basically getting offers out the door. Another trench of offers going out this week, actually.

Let me just give you a bit of an insight into the offers accepted so far. As of yesterday, we had 3,784 applicants who had accepted their offer, which is an increase of six percent over 2020. Of those, 1,617 are at our Commonwealth Campus, up 1.8 percent over 2020, and University Park has 2,074 students, up 10.3 percent over 2020. It's very early yet. The 3,784 students is a relatively small fraction of the total of around 16,000 that we expect, so don't place too much stock in these numbers yet, but everything is at a positive gradient and of course, as we hoped to be emerging from the pandemic, driving these numbers back to pre-COVID levels is really important to us.

I can tell you that every campus location, everyone in admissions, and I know many of you are doing a full court press on if it's a yield, the students to whom offers have been extended. This is going to remain a critical focus over the weeks ahead.

For searches, we have a lot of searches going on. Important for the University Faculty Senate is a search for the permanent Executive Director. We have Laura in obviously as the interim in that role. That search is chaired by Jonna Kulikowich. We will be charging them very shortly. The position description is out and posted, and so we will be proceeding with that process.

The search for the Dean of Penn State Law in the School of International Affairs reported out to me last Friday, recommending four finalist candidates for further consideration. I accepted the recommendation and we are in the process of scheduling those four finalists for in-person and hybrid interviews. They, as individuals, will come to campus. Much of their interviews will be in-person, but there will be components that are hybrid as well, as needed. We are fortunate, again, to have Jim help serving in the interim capacity.

The Search Committee for the Dean of the College of Medicine was charged back in December. They are working on finalizing and posting the position description in collaboration with the Search Consultant.

The search for the Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost for Graduate Education did not have a successful outcome. Kathy Drager from College of Health and Human Development kindly agreed to step in and serve as the Interim Dean, so we're thankful to Kathy for stepping up to that role. Kathy and I are dusting off, looking into retaining a search firm, and we will restart that search this spring.

We're also searching for a Chief Information Officer, Vice President for IT. That search is up and running with the aid of a Search Consultant. Michael Büsges is serving as the Interim CIO while that process plays out. We're also searching for a Chief Information Security Officer with Rich Sparrow's departure to industry earlier this month. Again, we're fortunate to have Keith Brautigam being willing to step in to the interim role.

On a good news outcome, we did announce last week that we successfully concluded the search for the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses, and Kelly Austin was appointed to that role. So great to have Kelly in that position. We will be announcing, within a couple of days, an Interim Dean for University College. Stay tuned for that announcement that will be coming very soon. I think that's it in my list of searches.

COVID, we are managing through the semester, several weeks in, so far, so good. Of course, the data for all campuses is available on the dashboard. I won't go through all of it. Obviously, there's a lot there, the data we just refreshed today at one o'clock, if you want to visit the dashboard. At University Park, positivity is up, certainly, compared to where we were in the fall with Delta.

The seven day average is running at bubbling around 6-8 percent positivity. It was as high as almost 14 percent earlier in the month but has trended down to 6-8 percent. I would advise a little bit of caution in trying to interpret the positivity data, certainly, in comparing to last semester, but even comparing two earlier this month. Because I think, as most of you are aware, there is a lot of rapid testing capability available now.

Many of you probably have applied for your government provided rapid tests. Many more people now are testing themselves at home and not reporting those data. It's not clear how representative our numbers are certainly in comparison to what we saw before. Many of you will recall from the holiday period, they were long lines for testing as people were very concerned about spending the holidays with family with the rapid onset of Omicron. We're not seeing those lines anymore, so the amount of testing is decreasing, which probably means that the number of positives that is being reported is decreasing as well, certainly, if you look at the CDC website. Just take some of those comparisons with a bit of a grain of salt.

Quarantine and isolation is at around 64 percent at University Park. We have students in Q&I at the campuses in relatively small numbers. There was a bit of an increase, obviously, as we came into the first few weeks of the semester that seems to have leveled off. Students are in Q&I for a five-day period now. Again, it's a little difficult to compare those numbers to last semester because the turnaround in Q&I is much faster.

We have a vaccination clinic at the Bryce Jordan Center later this week. We targeted that for students with the idea that if we didn't fill only appointments, we would make it available to employees into the general community, and we have gone through that process now and are extending invitations to members of the community to come in and avail themselves of that opportunity.

Mask compliance seems to be going reasonably well. We're hearing generally positive reports from deans in the colleges and at the campuses. We had a little bit of a hiccup last week with the compliance for students who had their Canvas access cutoff. There were a number of false positives. This was a programming issue with the algorithm that was identified. We restored access to everybody within a couple of hours. Then this Monday, we launched that process for University Park, and we'll roll it back out for the campuses next weekend again. That was just a mistake in programming, but it is being fixed.

I know that there is a question out there about what fully vaccinated means in the current environment. It's a hard question to answer because even if you look at different government websites, they are using different definitions of fully vaccinated. They sometimes are now using the phrase, "up-to-date with vaccinations," so that's a soft form of fully vaccinated. At this point, we are taking fully vaccinated as following the official CDC guidance, which means one-shot of J&J or two shots of Moderna and Pfizer. We will likely update that definition as the semester rolls on and we get updated guidance from the Feds on that. We will be putting a process in place to provision uploading of updated vaccination data to our database.

I think that's about all I have to share about COVID. I would just say, so far so good through this semester and we're optimistic that we'll continue to see declines in positivity as the peak passes. I'll stop there, Bonj, and I guess we're open for questions.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Provost Jones. Yes, we are. We'll be taking questions posed to either you or President Barron. To ask questions, please use the raise hand function, which you can see at the bottom of your screen. I see some of you have found that. A reminder, the floor is only open to Senators. Again, we're going to limit this conversation to 20 minutes. Please begin your questions with your last name and academic unit or campus, for the record. Mike, you're up first.

Michael J. Tyworth, Smeal College of Business: Hi. Mike Tyworth, Smeal College of Business. First, I just want to preface this, that I have a little bit of a preamble, but the question is simple. This could be either for President Barron or Provost Jones. I want to say that I've been wholly on board with the decision to return to in-person instruction in the spring. It's where I want to be, I think it's great, and I've really appreciated the philosophy of built-in flexibility into the administration's approach to its COVID response.

In that vein, I guess my question is, given the new reality on the ground posed by Omicron in the sense that the CDC has said that cloth and paper masks are not effective at preventing the transmission of Omicron, why doesn't the University move away from mandating mask usage on campus to allowing those that would prefer to wear a mask to continue to do so? But those of us who are fully vaccinated and feel comfortable not, choose not to do so for whatever reason we might have. Thank you.

Provost Jones: I can take that one, Eric, if you like. I don't think the CDC is saying that those masks are not effective. I think they are saying that they are considered less effective than the higher grade masks, the procedure masks or the N95, KN95 masks. We're certainly encouraging people to upgrade their mask quality. But still, there are cloth masks that are really quite effective as well, have multiple layers and some you can install filters in, and I'm sure many of you have those.

The way Omicron works is, people, even if fully vaccinated, can still be infected with the virus. We're seeing many cases among the fully vaccinated. People generally tend to not get particularly sick when they are so infected, but they are still able to spread the virus. The wearing of masks really has two

purposes. It is to protect the wearer, but it is also to protect people with whom the wearer interacts. From a public health perspective at a large complex institution with lots of people interacting with one another, our strong preference is to continue to have people masking while they're in buildings and in proximity to others.

Michael J. Tyworth: Thank you. If you don't mind, I have a quick follow-up. I wasn't trying to say that they were not effective in their entirety, so I apologize for that. To your point about that people who are vaccinated can get it. That's certainly the case. Anthony Fauci has said that basically everybody's going to get it at some point regardless of vaccination status and that people who are vaccinated, I think the data's have, regardless of vaccination status, that Omicron impact on average is 60-70 percent less. I think there was a study out of Oregon that showed that.

But again, independent of that, I guess my question is, if you're vaccinated and you are at risk, I guess I'm having a hard time struggling with this, what's the benefit of telling, for example, someone who's in a classroom and let's say he's never closer than 10, 15 feet away from the students that they have to wear a mask while lecturing. What is the public health benefit of that, I guess, is what I'm confused about.

Provost Jones: Mike, I think I would say that every classroom environment is different and the way faculty members, instructors in those classrooms interact with their students varies a lot. It's hard for us to give a whole vector of requirements for different classrooms at different types of interactions. Our position is that out of an abundance of caution and with public health and the health and safety of our community being paramount, we come down on the side of requiring the masks in all those indoor environments.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you very much, Provost Jones, for answering that question. I see we have Rose Jolly. Rose, you want to identify yourself and your unit?

Rosemary Jane Jolly: Rosemary Jolly, Liberal Arts Senator. I just have a question for President Barron, and that is that I really appreciated the talk that he gave about free speech. The thing that is puzzling me, and puzzling here is not a euphemism. I'm just genuinely puzzled. I'm trying to understand this—is the situation of Oliver Baker, who has been found non-guilty in the courts. But Penn State still wants to terminate his employment. That, on the face of it, does not at all appear to support the notion that we are a community that supports diverse expressions of public action and speech, especially since he's been found non-guilty in the court.

I think a lot of us are very troubled by this. This isn't to say that I think that the institution is hypocritical. It's just to say that I think that we, as faculty, who came up with the provisions of by which one would find Professor Baker either having acted in a way that invokes a Senate clause or not around disciplining, are having a lot of trouble understanding what's going on and feel that the obvious answer is, well, that's a particular case, so I can't discuss it. But the issue is it's affecting all of us in terms of our understanding of what freedom of speech means on campus. Thank you very much.

President Barron: You say the logical answer. But in fact, we have a process and the process involves faculty as well as administration. But in that process, as a Final Arbitrator, I cannot address this particular point. It's not a matter of a better answer or an answer that you might expect. The process is such that I cannot answer this question. But we do have a process and the process involves faculty.

Rosemary Jane Jolly: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, President Barron. Galen, you have a question?

Galen A. Grimes, Penn State Greater Allegheny: Yes. Grimes, Greater Allegheny. This question is for the Provost. What is the delay in getting the letters out from Students Support Services informing us that students are in quarantine? I currently have three students out in my classes. All three of them have contacted me, two of them have COVID, one suspects she was exposed to it, but I haven't gotten letters from anybody telling me that these students are under quarantine right now. A couple of them I've called our Local Director of Student Services on campus and asked her, and she's confirmed one of them. But I'm still waiting to hear about the other two. What is the delay in getting these letters out? I've talked to some faculty members that say that they've gotten the letter the day the student came back to class.

Provost Jones: I don't know what the delay is, Galen, but I'm happy to look into it and we'll get a communication out through Kelly Austin's office that lets people know what's going on. I wasn't aware that these delays were happening, but I'm happy to look into it.

Galen A. Grimes: Yes. They have been. Obviously, it's somewhat troubling that we don't know that a student is out or whether a student is trying to game the system, whether they're legitimately out sick or what, so it would really help to get these in a more timely fashion.

Provost Jones: I can certainly look into that and get a message out through the VPCC's office.

Galen A. Grimes: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Galen. Nathan?

Nathan Tallman, University Libraries and Scholarly Communications: Tallman, University Libraries. Thank you, Chair Szczygiel. President Barron, I recently hired a part-time employee and discovered that they are unable to get a Green B parking pass that would allow them to park in any parking deck the closest to the Pattee Library. I was told that there's a new University rule that part-time employees are now only permitted to obtain commuter parking passes at the University Park. And that this unpublished rule was established because there was the potential for a part-time employee might not make enough money to pay for the parking pass and therefore, there's an inability to deduct the cost from the paycheck.

My employee was bounced back and forth between our unit facilities and the transportation offices with different responses each time. Last week, she was told in writing by the transportation office that she could get a pass if it was prepaid. But today, when she went to the transportation office, they told her no. Parking in any parking deck is reserved for full-time employees with benefits.

President Barron, I contend that this rule is antithetical to the espoused Penn State University values. This rule lacks integrity as there are alternative ways someone could pay for parking. This rule disrespects a large class of employees at Penn State and forces them to add up to 90 extra minutes to their working day. This rule is not responsible because it is not published anywhere and has not been announced. This rule does not promote discovery because it unnecessarily burdens employees and contributes to a feeling of not being appreciated. It may also force them to do things they would prefer not to be doing during a pandemic, like riding the bus. This rule does not promote excellence because it is just plain wrong,

inequitable, and classist. This rule does not promote community but promotes unnecessary division amongst Penn State employees.

I asked you today to please take action to eliminate this rule and allow all Penn State employees to be able to park in a location nearest to their place of work if they so choose. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: I don't know if there's a response forthcoming.

President Barron: I'm happy to look into it. I have really no information about that particular rule or its characteristics, written or not. But I'm happy to look at it and make sure if they're rules that may have a reason in that we publish them.

Provost Jones: I'm not familiar with it either and neither is Sarah Van Dyke, the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business, so we can certainly look into this and try to understand what the circumstances are.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Nathan. I see John. You are up next.

John Gerard Champagne, Penn State Erie: Thanks, Bonj. I want to return to AC70. Does it have to be confidential? It's my understanding, however, that procedures should not be confidential ever. We should all know what greets us if the AC70 process begins. I read the process and it says, "University Administration can begin the process." Does that mean any administrator? Does that mean the person's unit head? How is appropriate determined in terms of going forward on a case by whom? What is the role of HR?

When all of us know who are familiar with the case that HR was involved early on in this process, there is nothing in AC70 about HR playing any role in this. Who oversees the role of this person in HR? Are accusations confidential? When you look at the process, confidentiality begins with the trial, not prior to the trial. Yet in fact, we don't know where this is coming from, by whom, what the accusation specifically is. It's really disturbing when Rose said the chilling atmosphere, If some unnamed person can accuse you of something, and then require you to pay \$30,000 in lawyer fees to keep your job. Well, of course, that's going to be chilling around issues of free speech. Thank you.

Provost Jones: John, there was a lot in there. Let me attempt to address some of them. The process and people allegations are confidential to the public, but that not to the person who is in an AC70 process. The allegation is brought. Generally, the administrator is for an AC70 case, which obviously pertains to faculty. Generally, the administrator is a dean. The process is not confidential, but the details of the process are confidential, not to the person who is the subject of the AC70 process. Things are fairly clearly laid out and there were a series of steps that are followed with some care and rigor to ensure that due process is afforded.

John Gerard Champagne: My question again is then, why is HR involved? Because there's nothing in the document about HR being involved and I don't believe a dean can instigate a process through HR, and I don't even know in this case if the dean didn't instigate the process or HR took it upon itself to instigate the process, which is particularly chilling.

Provost Jones: I'm not sure why you are saying that HR is involved in the process and I don't mean this specific process because I'm not talking about the details of that, but I'm not sure why you are saying that HR is involved in the process?

John Gerard Champagne: Because before the process got to the point it is, plenty of people were interviewed by HR and they wanted to know why were they being interviewed by whom on whose authority.

Provost Jones: There was an investigative process that was conducted. Well, the University conducts investigative processes in order to figure out what occurred. I'm trying to be very careful here because I cannot talk about the specifics of the case at all. That would not be appropriate to do so, but it is not unusual for the University to conduct internal investigations when situations arise, and the people who are tapped or asked to participate often have an administrative role within the University. It may be academic or non-academic administrative role, but they are being used in that process by virtue of their role as investigators. Does that help, John?

John Gerard Champagne: Yes. But I'm so confused, where does this begin? Does HR decide it's going to conduct an investigation? Is it because legal matters were involved that HR automatically triggered this investigation, or did someone say to HR, "You are now to conduct this," and who is the person who is authorizing HR?

Provost Jones: You're talking about the specifics of the case when you refer to this investigation, so I can't really. Again, I'm not in a position where I can speak to the specifics of the case.

John Gerard Champagne: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Thank you, John. Julio?

Julio Palma, Penn State Fayette: Julio Palma, Penn State Fayette. Thank you. I'm going to continue this conversation in a bigger issue that I see in the University. President Barron, you start saying that in your house, you grew up appreciating academic freedom and freedom of expression. That is something that growing up in another country, I appreciate it from the outside. I think it's one of our strongest tools, values, our worth, our expressions.

I am worried about the culture that we live in our house, in our University. I am in the tenure track, and when things start happening with COVID-19, I wanted to raise my concerns. We wrote, some faculty, including me, wrote emails to our administrator, at the time Madeline Haines. People suggested that I remove my name. People are afraid to speak up because of fear of retaliation. People are concerned that their employment can be terminated. I think this is a culture that we have to acknowledge that that exist in our University.

We have addressed the situation, at the Plenaries, we have addressed the situation in town halls, but I think statements are not changing that culture. I don't think faculty is at fault of this culture, so my question to you is, how can faculty trust the processes? I understand the confidentiality, but still, there's not clarity in the process. How can faculty understand the process?

I think what is very important about the academic freedom is not only the censorship from our supervisors, but it is also the self-censorship because we're afraid or because some people are afraid. I

Speak up, but just showing that people speak up is not enough. What actions can be taken from the leadership of the University to regain the trust of faculty and to guarantee that there is no retaliation and retribution actions from the chancellors, from the deans, from any kind of supervisor, so I'm asking you to acknowledge the fact that this is a culture in Penn State and I'm asking you to take action on this and help us to change that.

President Barron: Okay, so I have to be very careful here because I'm personally insulted by that particular viewpoint. I cannot imagine a retaliation, and I spend an enormous amount of time pushing back in great detail to protect this faculty and the right to teach and to speak, and so do my colleagues in the administration. We all came from the faculty. None of us magically switched sides and decided we were going to retaliate against someone for speaking. I've heard lots and lots of messages within the Senate that were quite hard and quite hard to take personally in terms of how I might do things.

Obviously, I don't know of any retaliation that occurred. In my view, the notion that University Faculty would believe that they would be retaliated for taking a position on whatever it is just so offensive to the University culture that it is really difficult to think about, because we do constantly look at where were we going to retaliate? What were we going to do? I grew up as a climate scientist quite used to having people demanding that I take a particular position or not take a particular position, and I always felt that this University supported me in taking those positions as we have for many other scientists that have talked about climate change, and this isn't just a matter of deciding to do this because we agreed with a position or don't agree with a position.

I personally think that one of the great strengths is, even though I disagree, is it this Faculty Senate has no hesitation to tell me what they think, nor do people that are writing op-eds or anything else. They have no hesitation to telling me what they think or telling Nick what they think, and that is the way it must be, whether I agree with you or not, that is the way it must be, or we cannot be a successful University environment. I think if you go back and look, we may have people that are worried about what retaliation might be, but if you go back and look, this has been a very direct and honest conversation that has gone on for the eight years that I've been here.

I'm deeply saddened by the notion that people feel like they'll be retaliated against, and if there are examples of a retaliation that's occurred, then I think personally, Nick and I would both work hard to point out how unacceptable that is in any university environment and certainly at Penn State, in my opinion.

Julio Palma: Just a quick comment, because I think, at no point I was asking you to take the blame. What I was asking was to acknowledge that this is part of the culture of the University, so I think I am not personally telling you that you are retaliating about people. I am saying that I hear that in the hallways and by culture, I don't think we have to be offended that this is in our culture. I think we should be aware and take actions together as a University that honors shared governance, and I am raising a concern that I hear, that I hear from colleagues, that people have suggested me to address. As a Senator, as a representative of a unit, they have asked me to bring this issue to the Plenary. By no means I am trying to attack a person, I'm highlighting a culture.

President Barron: Yeah. I'm happy to look, as I said, into any instance in which there's the feeling of some level of retaliation because we can't afford the culture. But I do believe that there is an element here which I'm not sure we would describe in culture in the same way that I heard it, that people are worried about this. That is something which I won't deny to many people who want to express an opinion and

actually their opinion is weakened by not having their name attached to it. It's just wrong. If retaliation is part of the culture, we have a problem. If there's a perception of retaliation, then we have an opportunity. That also is very unhealthy, but it's something that I think we can deal with. I really do not see the cases that, for a political perspective or a scientific perspective, that there is retaliation in this University. It saddens me very much to hear that perception.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you.

Provost Jones: I would just say ditto to what Eric said. It saddens me, and Julio, I'm happy to have a conversation. You and I don't agree on things from time to time, but I am happy to have a conversation with you to hear your thoughts on how this could be addressed. It is problematic. I hear it a lot, that there is a fear of retaliation and I, like Eric, get frustrated because I can't put my finger on what it is and where it is. I know that if I'm aware of any instance, or one of the deans or chancellors is aware of an instance, my expectation is that they will bring this to my attention. That's that, but the perception piece of it is another story, and figuring out how to get underneath that and address that issue, I'm happy to have a conversation with you or others and Senators to how we might address it because it's unhealthy that it exists.

Julio Palma: Thank you. I will actually take you on that invitation and I will follow up. Thank you. I appreciate it.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, everyone, Julio. Joyce.

Joyce Adele Furfaro, College of the Liberal Arts: Thank you. Senator Furfaro of Liberal Arts. Thanks for taking my question. I have been tracking the COVID cases for Center County and by zip code in Center County since August of 2020 every week and I make it public for anybody to see it as well. For all of those weeks, every single day. Curious, occupational medicine, if we call them to report that we took an at-home COVID test and it's positive, we're told not to bother to come in for a PCR test. Because I care about the counts, I wondered if you could let us know. I looked for this online, I couldn't find it. Does that get counted by the Pennsylvania Department of Health? How would we find out if that is being counted and if it isn't being counted, and people are going for the PCR tests after getting an at-home rapid test that is positive, is that something that we should reconsider?

Provost Jones: Joyce, I know that Kelly Wolgast is listening, but she's not a panelist, so I think can't speak. But I'm happy to make sure that she addresses that specific question. I know it's something that has been discussed and considered. I'm sure if Kelly were able to speak, she would have an answer. But I will make sure that it's in FAQ and a prominent position and ask Kelly if she's listening to reach out to you directly with an answer to the specifics.

Joyce Adele Furfaro: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Nick, I see that Kelly now has the ability to speak.

Provost Jones: Okay. Well, I hope Kelly can speak to that.

Chair Szczygiel: Kelly, if you have anything brief.

Kelly Ambrosi Wolgast, COVID-19 Operations Control Center: Yeah. Thank you for the question. Hello, everyone. If someone does take an at-home rapid test individually, that report is not made to the Department of Health unless it is done through an official barcode on the test where you're doing an observed test. There's various tests and companies do have observed testing capabilities, so some of those could get reported.

In general though, the ones that most people are using are not reported and if they are calling Oak Med, then Oak Med, we're not reporting them to the State because we're not required to. However, it is important that you report that to your personal healthcare provider to record that in your health record. I think that's an important process.

All of you, though, as a reminder, and I know there's been some delays in some of the shipment, but you can do a PCR through Vault Health. If you order those tests from the University supply, then that is a recorded test to the Department of Health. If, however, you've had COVID within the past 90 days, it is not recommended that you do a confirmatory PCR after a rapid just because we know that that confirmatory PCR will likely be positive. I hope that helps, Joyce.

Joyce Adele Furfaro: I'm wondering if people should be encouraged to follow up with their primary because, I mean, my husband tested positive today and was told, "No, just stay home." I was like, "Go, go get tested at AMI or something." I want it to count.

Provost Jones: It is true. I'm not monitoring the chat, but I did see yours pop up, Joyce, that, as Kelly indicated, the at-home tests, including the ones that are going to be distributed by the federal government are not counting. This was my comment earlier that we have to be a little bit careful about interpreting the case data that are being reported now because it's not necessarily as representative as it once was when the only place you could get a test was a place that would report it and now that's not the case.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Joyce, Kelly, Nick, everyone. Busi, I see. I think you're going to have the privilege of being the last hand raised and recognized for this session.

Busi Makoni, College of the Liberal Arts: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Busi, could you state your last name and location.

Busi Makoni, College of the Liberal Arts: Busi Makoni, University Park College of Liberal Arts. Mine really takes you back to the issue of the professor who is facing AC70. A perception has been created in the part of town where I am, the community, especially among African immigrants who are teaching at Penn State, that one of our own was slammed on the concrete. We never really had much from it other than snippets of information that we picked up from the press. When we try to follow up, we also get the same response that it is confidential information, it cannot be discussed.

I notice personally a few days back that a very senior person, not in Penn State, but in another company. He threw a smoothie to an employee and that person got fired. The company did put up a statement to say that the individual no longer works for them because the individual does not reflect the values of that institution.

My question or what has been bothering me is why can't we even just get an indication of what happened to this person who did slam one of our colleagues. Is the person still at Penn State? Should we be afraid

that he's going to slam any one of us? We feel isolated as African immigrants. We feel uncared for. We feel like, perhaps what former President said that we come from shithole countries may be the way that we're being viewed, at least coming from this incident.

Provost Jones: Busi, I can make an attempt to respond here. I know it's frustrating and it's constantly frustrating in any of our disciplinary processes that these processes are considered confidential, including the outcomes. But I think maybe the best thing I can say is that there are some probably reasonably straightforward ways that some of the questions you asked or post about whether the person still works for Penn State, you can address those questions yourself by looking on the department website, for example. But we have to be very careful about disclosing the outcomes of details of the process or the outcomes of what are considered to be confidential personnel matters. I know that is less than satisfying. I know it's very frustrating, but we're bound by that.

Busi Makoni: Just to jump in and say yes, I did check personally at the department's website and the person's name is still there, but I cannot draw any conclusion from that because I also noticed that the website had last been updated in 2019. It is quite possible that.

Provost Jones: Let me say I will try to figure out to see why the website hasn't been updated since 2018.

Busi Makoni: It's 2019.

Provost Jones: Probably it needs to be updated.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Thank you Busi for the comments. Thank you everyone for, again, a very frank and honest conversation with the President and Provost of the University. These are important issues and I appreciate you bringing them up. I have extended our time spent in this Q&A session mainly because of the significance of the issues, but also because as they will relate to an item on the upcoming Agenda. Thank you all. Thank you, Provost Jones and President Barron, for spending some time with us this afternoon.

FORENSIC BUSINESS — NONE

Chair Szczygiel: Our next item on our Agenda is Item G, Forensic Business. There is no Forensic Business today.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS — NONE

Chair Szczygiel: Agenda Item H, Unfinished Business. Again, same situation.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Szczygiel: So, we move on to our Legislative Reports. We have four Legislative Reports. The first two are "Additions of Diversity Equity and Inclusion Standards to Standing Rules of Committee Duties"—sorry.

Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (f), Committee on Faculty Affairs – Appendix D

Our first legislative report is from the Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and Faculty Affairs, “Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (f), Committee on Faculty Affairs.” It can be found in Appendix D. We have Chair of CC&R, Annie Taylor, and Josh Wede, Chair of Faculty Affairs to answer any questions before we vote. Annie or Josh, anything to add?

Ann Hamilton Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Nothing from me. Our Committee has looked at these additions to the Standing Rules and supported them. Josh, is there anything you would like to point out in particular?

Josh Wede, College of the Liberal Arts: No, not really. We took a combined approach that a lot of other committees have done with making a general statement and then adding any specifics and where needed, and appropriate.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Do we have any discussion from the crowd? Please raise your hand. Seeing none, Anna, I think it's time to vote on this. Senators, hopefully, you have logged into TallySpace by now with your nine-digit Penn State ID. Anna, anytime you can tell me that we are ready to vote. We'll go ahead.

Anna Butler, Senate Office Staff: The poll is open.

Chair Szczygiel: The poll is open, thank you. To accept the motion, press "A", to reject the motion, press "B". As always, Anna, tell me when the flow starts to slow down, and we will move on. Of course, to keep things rolling, we will wait till the end of the meeting to see all the results.

Anna Butler: We have a good start on the votes. I think you can move on.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Anna, and thank you very much, Annie and Josh.

Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II– Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (m), Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity – Appendix E

Chair Szczygiel: Our second legislative report is from the Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and the Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity. It is titled, Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II– Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (m), Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity.” You can find it in Appendix E. Are there any questions for Annie who will remain and Chair of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, Roger Egolf? Annie or Roger, did you have anything you wanted to say?

Roger Egolf, Penn State Lehigh Valley: Nothing from me unless there's questions.

Chair Szczygiel: Okay.

Ann Hamilton Taylor: Much like the last one. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Anna, I guess we are ready to move on to Poll Number 2, whenever you are. Senators, just remember you can cast your vote on TallySpace. Press "A" to accept, "B" to reject.

Anna Butler: Poll is open, Bonj.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. A to accept, B to reject. Now I'm going to suggest that we move on at this point because I think this next report might need a little bit more time spent describing it or talking about it. Does that sound all right?

Anna Butler: Yes, you may.

Revisions to Standing Rules, Article III, Section 6, Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Appendix F

Chair Szczygiel: Okay. Next, we have a report from the Senate Committees on Committees and Rules, Faculty Affairs, and Intra-University Relations titled, "Revisions to Standing Rules, Article III, Section 6, Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities." You can reference this, access this in Appendix F. Here to introduce the report are Annie Taylor again and Chair of FR&R, Keith Shapiro. Annie and Keith.

Ann Hamilton Taylor: I will immediately turn it over to Keith to do I know a good job of trying to explain how we are simplifying some rules here.

Keith Shapiro, Parliamentarian: Thank you, Annie and if there's anything that I'm missing, please step in and clarify it. Although it may look a little complex, it's really a simple piece of legislation whose job is to make the idea of choosing alternates on FR&R. Alternates, we currently define as runners up for a given FR&R election that fill in if a member has to step off the committee or resign from the committee for some reason.

Currently, they serve a three-year term. The idea being an alternate must come from the year of the election. That sometimes comes as a surprise to people, although we don't have alternates very often, it does come as a surprise for people when they're called on two years after an election to actually sit on a pretty complex committee when their lives have changed quite a bit from when they decided to run. In order to simplify this, because it gets very complicated for the Senate Office, especially now when they're very busy with many complicated things, to keep track of that kind of alternate cycle.

The recommendation was to make it a little easier and clearer for people to understand that instead of serving a three-year term, that alternates would serve a one-year term. That's to say that the alternates would be activated using a plurality from the unelected candidates for the most recent election and we believe that'll just make it much easier for everybody. It simplifies the rule. We treat alternates as temporary members who are basically an exception. So it's really an exceptional rule.

For that short period of time between the time a member resigns and the alternate serves out the rest of the term, it would be less than a year. Given that, because it's only a one-year or as much as a year, but usually less, and given that, we've decided to allow faculty to serve in that position, faculty members, regardless of their location or tenure status even though we have all those cohorts, until the end of the term when FR&R, or rather CC&R would call a new election and then re-establish the balance and attempt also to make sure we maintain that staggered pattern. I think that pretty well covers it, Annie, doesn't it?

Ann Hamilton Taylor: Yeah. I think that's great, Keith. In September 2020, as the report says, we added fixed-term faculty to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. Part of this also was that that unintentionally made the current system of how alternates work very complicated. Because if someone had to step down, we would try to match them with the year they had been elected as an alternate, their type of appointment, their location, whether they were UP or common.

Now that we were adding fixed-term faculty, well, we no longer call them, fixed term, you know what I mean, we were broadening this population, it was going to be unnecessarily complicated. So we deliberated a lot on how to deal with this and try to streamline it and I really applaud Keith and CC&R for coming up with, I think, a very elegant solution.

Keith Shapiro: Also, that increase from 9-12 members assures us that we will maintain at least one member from all the cohorts if we do need to bring in an alternate. I think before, when it was nine members, because it was a smaller, committee people were a little concerned about that. But now, I think it's expanded quite a bit and it gives us maybe a little bit more room to be able to do something somewhat simpler. At this point, I understand if the rules can be simplified and still be fair, I think it's just much, much easier for the Senate Office and for CC&R to figure out when it comes time to hold those elections.

Ann Hamilton Taylor: Any questions?

Chair Szczygiel: Just going to open it up to questions. Thank you both for giving a concise explanation of this and I do not see any questions. So, Anna, please start the poll.

Anna Butler: Voting is open.

Chair Szczygiel: Senators, please cast your vote. To accept the motion, A. To reject the motion, B. Thank you, Annie and Keith, for your help here. Give it just a little bit of time, but I think it might be safe to move on.

Anna Butler: Yes, please.

Editorial Separation of Existing Curricular Policies and Procedures, Creating Policies 100-10, 130-00, 130-10, 130-50. 130-70, etc. – Appendix G

Chair Szczygiel: Our final legislative report is from the Senate Committees on Curricular Affairs titled, "Editorial Separation of Existing Curricular Policies and Procedures, Creating Policies 100-10, 130-00, 130-10, 130-50. 130-70, etc." That was the title folks, and can be found in Appendix G. Here to present this report and explain what it is I just read is Mary Beth Williams, Chair of Curricular Affairs. Mary Beth?

Mary Beth Williams, Eberly College of Science: Sure. Thanks so much, Bonj, and good afternoon, everyone. The very lengthy report you have in front of you, as the title suggests, is an editorial change in the ways that we organize the policies that govern our curricular structures and requirements. All of these are contained within the Guide to Curricular Procedures. If you have not ever taken a glance at those, I put it in the chat, the link to the Guide to Curricular Procedures, which has been a combination of policy and procedure in a somewhat disorganized mixture for some time.

Our charges this year, Committee Charges, were to take a look at the Guide to Curricular Procedures and to update it. This report is the second phase of that work and that is to pull out from the Guide to Curricular Procedures the policies with which we make decisions as a Senate body. We've organized and numbered these to make them clearer, to make them obvious and transparent, and easier to find and refer to. We have not, in this report, made any changes to the policies themselves. We've only numbered them.

Appendix B is there in the interest of transparency, so that you can see where these policies came from, unchanged from the Guide to Curricular Procedures. So it's all laid out there. The final appendix, Appendix C, is what remains in the Guide to Curricular Procedures after we removed the policies, it is now focused on just the procedures. The next phase will be actually going in there and making updates to these policies. But this editorial change is important so that we can make obvious to everyone what our Curricular Policies actually are. I'd be happy to take any questions about that.

Chair Szczygiel: Any questions from the floor? Keith?

Keith Shapiro: I just wanted to say thank you—

Chair Szczygiel: Keith, could you identify yourself, please?

Keith Shapiro: Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture. Thank you, Mary Beth. It's awfully nice to be able to find these things in one place and understand what's a policy and what's a procedure. I think it's high time that we did this. I want to congratulate you and thank you for all the work, the tremendous amount of work that you and your committee put into this.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Keith. Judy?

Judith Ozment, Penn State Abington: Ozment, Abington. I want to second Keith's comments. I was chair when we did an overhaul of Curricular Affairs' Guide to Curricular Procedures back in the day. It's a gorilla that you have done a good job of taming into a monkey and a great gorilla. That we can distinguish between what we're supposed to achieve and what we're supposed to do. Thank you.

Mary Beth Williams: Thanks, Judy. I know you understand this one.

Chair Szczygiel: Jonathan? Would you identify yourself, Jonathan, please, for us?

Jonathan Mathews, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: My apologies. Jonathan Mathews, EMS. There's a lot here, I offer the following observations of minor omissions. FYE, standing for First-Year Engagement is not defined as an acronym. I would also suggest that such things as requiring two submissions for new proposals is related to the paper error and could be easily dropped as an inconsequential item. Also, the multiple links to requiring a financial impact form, we could link the multitude of those to make life easier for the faculty. Again, there's a lot here, and thank you for doing this.

Mary Beth Williams: Well, Jonathan, I totally agree. There are so many places in both the procedures and the policies that are out-of-date and because this edit was really an edit, not an update. That's the next phase. We have a lot to dig into and a lot of work to do. I've noted your observations and I thank you for that. We'll take any observations from anyone now that you can see all of it in its glory.

Chair Szczygiel: That was some very serious spring cleaning you did there, Mary Beth and crew. Thank you so much from the whole of the Senate. I see no other questions. Anna, how are we doing with our poll?

Anna Butler: Poll is up.

Chair Szczygiel: Senators, please cast your vote. Maybe those who are watching the check can tell me, but we seem not to have many problems with polling this round?

Anna Butler: I think you can go ahead and move on, Bonj.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Chair Szczygiel: All righty. Next, we move on to Advisory/Consultative Reports. We have one.

Report on Access to University-Wide Online Resources that Support Education – Appendix H

Chair Szczygiel: From the Senate Committee on Intra-University Relations, " Report on Access to University-Wide Online Resources that Support Education," and that can be found in Appendix H. It will be presented by Michele Duffey, Chair of IRC, and Kelly Karpa. That's correct. Folks, the floor is yours.

Kelly J. Karpa, College of Medicine: Thank you and good afternoon. I actually was charged with identifying gaps that exist around the access to resources across the campuses and then proposing processes for increasing awareness to resource availability. We spoke with a variety of stakeholders across the campuses, ranging from students, grad students, faculty, administration, librarians, instructional designers, you name it. We identified numerous gaps, both in terms of students' and faculty knowledge about access to resources and then disparities in terms of accessing those resources.

For example, students didn't know that certain things even existed to them. Especially when we went to the remote environment, students didn't know that they had access to a variety of tools because there was no communication to them, for example, or a faculty at one campus didn't know that there was resources that other campuses were using to fill in some of the technology gaps that they encountered.

COVID really made some of those disparities come to light pretty quickly. One of the things that we noted when we were talking with a variety of stakeholders was that Penn State has a number of websites devoted to locating various things like coursework or software. There was at least seven different sites that we were directed to and interestingly, none of them is a complete catalog. None of them holds all of the things that are available to students and faculty. None of them are searchable in ways that allow for comparisons to be made across different products and resources.

What IRC has recommended is that the University create a central, searchable repository of all the databases that exist, the educational technology's courseware software and that a Standing Group maintain that repository. That as requests for new resources come in, that they should be reviewed by this committee to avoid duplication of resources to help promote fiscal responsibility, and that there should be intentional communication mechanisms that go out to departments and faculty and students regarding the availability of these resources.

Certainly, timing is everything. It's interesting that our report is coming to light today when just last week, OER's repository that was managed by Earth and Mineral Sciences has now been taken over by the University Libraries and it was recently rebranded as ROAM, standing for Repository for Open and Affordable Materials. Big shout out to Annie Taylor and others for their work and dedication to making that happen.

Additionally, we learned during our stakeholder meetings that there was a group, I believe it was being led by John Cage out of Penn State Harrisburg, that was involved with recording with 100 different laboratory experiments, engineering things, biology lab, chemistry labs, etc. There's this definite forward momentum in terms of creating open educational resources for faculty to use.

Moving forward, we just think that it's really important that we also be mindful of learners. Things like, does the learner taking different courses really need to download, to purchase, to access three different computer programs that similarly do the same thing, especially if they have to pay for access to these technologies? Are there better ways for the University to keep costs down, to keep students' costs down, etc.? That's the gist of our report, which you can find.

At this point, I turn it over to Michele, if you have anything to add, and also Annie, maybe you could put a link to the ROAM article that just was released yesterday, that'd be great too.

Michele Lee Duffey, College of Health and Human Development: Great job, Kelly. I think you hit all the key points here. I just want to impress, I think we're really excited not only to have this report finally come to the floor, but just the timing with ROAM coming out. Annie, Rebecca Waltz, Gary Tin, this is fantastic work to share with the University at large and we're just really excited to see that come so that everyone can have access to that. It's just such a wonderful start for us to be going down this pathway together. Thank you all for your time.

Chair Szczygiel: Any questions, comments for this group? Nate, I see your hand is up.

Nathan Tallman: Tallman, University Libraries. Thank you. I recognize and agree with the rationale and it's hard to see some of the stories in the report about students buying expensive things unnecessarily. But I'm really concerned that this solution is just going to add more bureaucracy and confusion by creating another web resource and adding more process to how these purchases and procurements happen at the University.

I'd like to suggest that this is really an issue in knowledge management and that there are solutions from Microsoft and Amazon Web Services which Penn State has relationships with to use artificial intelligence to build solutions around this exact problem of having too many disparate sources of information that aren't connected. I would think that that's going to have more bang for the buck if we're going to be investing time and resources into a solution, rather than creating yet another place that'll take more time. You'll have double duty to update and keep resources maintained and then there's this whole extra review process that's added in. I'm just concerned that the solution might lead to more complications or be deleterious to the goal. Thank you.

Michele Lee Duffey: Nathan, thank you for that. I love the vision of the product that you just described and perhaps having less issues in the future with that, so I think it's a great recommendation.

Chair Szczygiel: Any other comments, observations? Seeing none. Anna, if you kindly start the poll.

Anna Butler: Poll is started.

Chair Szczygiel: Senators, cast your vote in TallySpace. To accept the motion and adopt this report, press "A". To reject the motion, press "B". Our poll will continue to run for a while, I suspect. Thank you very much, Michele and Kelly.

POSITIONAL REPORTS

Chair Szczygiel: Let's move on to Item K, Positional Reports. Are you okay, Anna, to do that?

Anna Butler: Yes, I am.

Resolution in Support of Academic Freedom and Rejection of Attempts to Interfere with the Teaching of Racial and Social Justice – Appendix C

Chair Szczygiel: Okay. You may recall that on October 19, 2021, the Faculty Senate approved a brand-new type of report called a Positional Report. These reports are used to make a statement of resolution on a particular issue. Today, we have our very first Positional Report being sponsored by the Senate Committees on Education, Equity and Campus Environment, Faculty Affairs, and Inter-University Relations. This report is titled, "Resolution in Support of Academic Freedom and Rejection of Attempts to Interfere with the Teaching of Racial and Social," and it can be found as Appendix C.

Just to add some context to why this report is appearing before you now. This past fall, I've received a communication from the African American Policy Forum regarding their fight against partisan politics, politicians attempt to dictate those things that President Barron was just addressing. We all see these forces for educational censorship sweeping the nation. There are bills that have already been adopted and there are bills pending. While we haven't been directly hit with a local version yet, one might wonder how long it will take, especially in our political reality, before there are external threats to faculty autonomy in curricula choice. I think it is time for us to be proactive.

It is also a moment, I believe, for us to be a bit reflective of where we stand right now in light of the earlier conversation that we've been sharing. Just want to remind us that we are on a cusp of a new era at Penn State, one in which we will have a female person of color for the very first time as the University President. No offense to President Barron, but you don't exactly fill those two criteria. This strikes me as a very good time to join forces with institutions across this nation to proclaim a zero tolerance of any form of academic censure or charges of teaching "divisive" content.

In passing this resolution, we will be joining a growing list of University Senates nation-wide who support academic freedom, and that of open race and gender education. I handed this opportunity to some of the Senate committees most directly involved in curriculum content, those aforementioned, and asked for volunteers from each committee. Thus, was formed a working group of about 10 or so individuals. That group's effort is what is being presented to you today. It will be officially presented by the respective chairs of the listed committees on the agenda, specifically Doug Bird, Josh Wede, and Michele Duffey, as well as one of the report's several authors, Paul Frisch. I'd like to hand it over to you all to make whatever comments you think are appropriate this time.

Michele Lee Duffey: Many thanks, Bonj. I think we can agree this is a sensitive time for academic freedom in the nation, and President Barron, I very much appreciate your comments earlier on the University as a place to test ideas and to protect that place to test those ideas. As the Faculty Senate at this point do not have a position on academic freedom and this seems like a really good time for that. Thus, a group of Senators representing several committees, as Bonj mentioned, Faculty Affairs, Inter-University Relations, Education, Equity and Campus Environment, along with some other colleagues across the Senate, devised our statement.

We stand here today asking the Senate to adopt a position on behalf of our collective colleagues across the University, with the interest of preserving student learning in an open educational environment in mind. As a Faculty Senate, I think we have an opportunity to be proactive in leading versus following and to affirm ourselves as a foremost advocate for academic freedom. We ask you to consider supporting this position statement. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Michele. Any other comments from the group? Turning it over to questions or observations from the crowd. Greg, please identify yourself.

Gregory C. Shearer, College of Health and Human Development: Hey, guys. Greg Shearer, College of Health and Human Development. I just want to take the time to point out that this is one of those issues where I think we're being hurt by our lack of viewpoint diversity on issues like this. We've constructed this document and even its title and its whereas's and wherefores, they cite a limited set of cares and concerns.

My problem is, I'm worried that this sets us up for failure. We're basically playing right into the hands of the narrative; the counter-narrative to this, that academics misrepresent objections, and I think there's a little bit of that going on here, and academics act merely to protect our own power by hiding behind principles. I don't think that's true here. But we're playing right into that narrative, and that we don't really hold these principles, and the principles are only accessible to like-minded elites.

I think we could do better by adding in the co-narrative, the opposite viewpoints from this in our justification because there's a lot of other viewpoints that are concerned over censorship and wish to support academic freedom. I think in the interest of inclusivity, they should be included in this document. I'm going to post in the chat three links to examples that support this claim, and they outline issues related to academic censorship and express the cares and concerns from a viewpoint ignored in the current document.

I'm going to point out one link, in particular, that's occurring right now. It's the third link, and I obviously haven't posted it yet, but its censorship occurring right here at Penn State at this moment. It's a disallowed access to a report by our colleagues at Harvard, Oxford, and Stanford. Unless you think those institutes don't qualify as academic censorship of such information is concerning and it's occurring right now under our present leadership. So, by ignoring the need for inclusivity, the document may outline worthy principles, but how is someone like myself going to convince the community that's pushing these, that academics are really and truly committed to these principles, and you're setting me and us up for failure. I'd like to rework the preamble to include a broader set of cares and concerns, and I move to send this back for rewording. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Greg. Keith, did I just hear a motion, too?

Gregory C. Shearer: You did.

Keith Shapiro: It was a motion to refer to Committee. Is that what you're saying there?

Chair Szczygiel: That's right.

Keith Shapiro: It needs a second.

Chair Szczygiel: We have a second to return this motion?

Keith Shapiro: It can be debated.

Eli Christopher Byrne, Eberly College of Science: I'll second it. Byrne, College of Science.

Chair Szczygiel: Mr. Byrne, you second it, and discussion. We will need to eventually wrap this up and have a vote on the motion. Noah, your hand has been up for a while. Do you have any comments to make on this motion? Because we have to restrict comments to the motion.

Noah Robertson, College of the Liberal Arts: Not on the motion, no.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. I'll ask the same of Mike. Is this about the motion?

Michael J. Tyworth: It is, Bonj. Thank you. Yes, Tyworth, Smeal College of Business. As a free speech absolutist, I am all on board on anything the Senate does that endeavors to protect and encourage the rights of faculty to speak their minds, teach the things that they think are valuable and important. As I read the proposal, I would say that I think Greg maybe is right to recommend it goes back to Committee. Because I think I would like to see an inclusion of to teach these topics or not teach these topics, as the faculty feels is important or not.

As I read it, I didn't really think the afterthought about supporting of K-12 was appropriate given that I'm not even sure the concept of academic freedom really even applies in the K-12 context. Certainly not in terms of pedagogy or curriculum, it doesn't. So, I'm not sure if that should be separate or is important there. That would be my reasoning for encouraging maybe taking it back to Committee, making some minor revisions, and then putting it back up for a vote.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Mike. Nathan?

Nathan Tallman: Tallman, University Libraries. I have a point of order clarification. I thought we were discussing Appendix C, a Positional Report resolution in support of academic freedom and rejection of attempts to interfere, so on and so forth. But Greg mentioned the word preamble, which is not part of this, and reminds me of the Senate Forum earlier about adding a preamble to the Senate Constitution which has not yet come to Plenary. So, what exactly is this that Greg is objecting to here? Is it the Positional Report that is now shared on screen? Or is it the preamble to the Constitution which has not yet been introduced to Plenary?

Chair Szczygiel: The preamble has not been introduced and it is not up for discussion. It is simply this Positional Report.

Nathan Tallman: Thank you very much.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Nathan. John, I think you're next. You have a comment on this motion to send this Positional Report back to Committee.

John Gerard Champagne: You have to help me with this. There are some problems with the pros in the document that I think need to be remedied. There's a semicolon that's misused, there's a syntactical error in such teaching approaches have been labeled divisive intending the center and controlled content. So I would say it needs to be sent back to Committee for some editorial work.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, John. Ira, do you have a comment on the motion?

Ira S. Saltz, Penn State Shenango: Yes. Saltz, Shenango. My comment is that I guess I'm trying to understand the motion. I understand there hasn't been time to work on some alternative language, but can the person who made the motion explain to me what's missing briefly and what thinks needs to be added?

Chair Szczygiel: Mike, that is a point of clarification directed at you.

Michael J. Tyworth: Actually, it was Greg that made the motion.

Chair Szczygiel: Excuse me.

Gregory C. Shearer: Yeah Ira, sorry, Tallman, I forget your first name. I was just referring to the whereas's and wherefores. But what I'm trying to do is set us up by including a broader perspective on what academic freedom means, why it's valuable not just to liberal elites, but to a broader community. If I took this document and tried to use it for a lot of friends that I have, as evidence that academics stand up for academic freedom, stand up for principles and stuff, they'd laugh me out of the place. So if we include their values and perspectives alongside these values and perspectives as worthy of being defended in the academic forum, I think we get a lot more traction. That's why I'd like to send it back.

Ira S. Saltz: All right. Thank you for that clarification.

Chair Szczygiel: Chris, is your hand still up or is this a new comment you'd like to make?

Eli Christopher Byrne: I'm sorry, I got to get more quick on the mute button. Thank you. Byrne, College of Science. That's why I seconded it. I just thought I'd say a few words. I do think it's an important document. It's not just going to be registered and filed away, it's going to be used as justification for further action. I do think it's important to get it right. I want to compliment and give kudos to the people who did the work to put this together, it's not bad. I think it is important. I think it's worth putting the time in to get it right.

I think that the concerns Greg raised are legitimate. There's a lot of free speech cases in the news that have gotten attention. I felt bad for some of the victims. I didn't know that's what the right word. But, one guy in Tennessee or something lost his job and he was a beloved teacher. But when I listened to the quotes, from the classroom, I felt bad for him because he was quoting as facts, things that many of us might, in fact, accept as fact, but we don't have absolute scientific proof of all these facts. If instead he said, "Here's what I believe and here's why I believe in," and if you disagree, teaching people to make these critical distinctions and support their beliefs with evidence and so on.

Whatever, I think this academic freedom issue is very important. But it doesn't mean that we're going to be talking with people who disagree with us and really putting forward, they always say Freedom comes with responsibility and it's like, yeah, the responsibility to defend and support your beliefs and so on. I think this document is just very important and it should be something that everybody, no matter, right, left, middle, whatever, everybody should be able to look at it and say, "Yeah, that's what we want, real critical thinking, real debate and so on." I just think it's worth putting a little more time.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Chris. Mike, is hand a remnant hand or did you have something to add to that?

Michael J. Tyworth: Sorry, I just forgot to lower, and I'll do so.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Thank you. All right. We've had discussion about the motion and to remind us all, the motion is to send this report back to Committee for reconsideration of the comments that have been made. Ray, you got a comment to share.

Raymond Gabriel Najjar Jr: Yeah. I mean, I'm agreeing with the number of that—

Chair Szczygiel: Could you identify yourself?

Raymond Gabriel Najjar Jr: I'm sorry. Najjar, Earth and Mineral Sciences. The critiques are quite vague, except for John's critiques about the English and syntax, which I don't think is really a reason to send it back. I mean, we can deal with that separately. So, we can vote on the motion, but have English cleaned up, so I don't think that's an issue.

But I find Greg and Chris's critiques vague, and I just wonder if they can get a little bit more specific. Are they talking about removing Racial and Social Justice from the emphasis of this? Because that's what this is about. It's not a generic statement about academic freedom and that sort of thing. It's very specifically targeting issues of racial and social justice, which I mean, it's not actually mentioned here, but I imagine it's coming out of this whole race theory debate or whatever you want to call it.

I don't really know what we're sending it back to Committee for. It's very vague and I'm just looking for more specificity, and if it's to say remove Racial and Social Justice and just make it about academic freedom, then just please say that and then we could vote on that. Otherwise, I don't really know what we're talking about.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Ray. I'd like to get some more voices heard. Kofi.

Kofi W. Adu, Penn State Altoona: Just to add to what race theory.

Chair Szczygiel: Kofi, could you please identify yourself?

Kofi W. Adu: I'm sorry. Kofi Adu, Penn State Altoona. Just to add to what Ray said, if Greg and Mike can give specific statement that they think, since they've already thought about these things, that come be included to make it more broadly appealing to everyone, I think that will shorten the back-and-forth discussions.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Kofi. Paul.

Paul Frisch, Penn State Scranton: Frisch, friend. I just wanted to briefly talk about, I was one of the authors of this document of why some of these things were put in here just to give some clarification. The way it is written with the whereases that's just procedure of how to write the document. Many of those are already things that have been discussed, have been talked about and have been passed by Senate in the past year, 2, 3, etc. As you can see, the last one is literally the very first statement of the University Faculty Senate Constitution, stating that the Faculty Senate is responsible for curriculum at Penn State. What we tried to do is put in things that are not new, that we did not create that have already been done by Senate and just simply putting them in one place to say, these are our positions. They have been our positions because the Senate has brought these to the floor and said, this is what we would like to do.

As regard with the K-12, the last item here for the results, Penn State has a very large College of Education. We educate students, hundreds of them every year to go out and be teacher's primary, secondary, higher-ed elsewhere. Why that was put in is because in many states, there are faculty who are being sought after, I'm trying to think of a nice way to put this, that the laws are being passed that target them. I think it would be un-Penn State of us to say, "We gave you an education, now we're going to ignore you. That once you're a Penn Stater, you're always at Penn Stater. We educate you and we stand behind that and therefore we support you." That's why that last item was put into place. I just wanted to give some context of where the document and some of the things we're coming in as we move forward. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Paul. Tim?

Timothy R. Robicheaux, College of the Liberal Arts: Robicheaux, Liberal Arts. Going back to what Ray and Greg said. my question, I guess is to Greg, ultimately. But it is the goal to move this back to Committee because of disagreement with the focus of the actual document, which is specifically academic freedom specific to teaching of racial and social justice or is it the issue of if this is meant to be our Senate's academic freedom document that we're pushing through. That it's too specific.

In other words, I mean, I'm just going to bring it up as, is Greg's issue this is not like a Chicago statement or is it disagreement with the attempts to interfere with teaching of racial and social justice, specifically with the current context. Because I would say with regards to that we need a more general statement of Senate, I could see where I could run into issues teaching criminology, there's a lot of touchy issues there.

I'm very careful when I talk about certain issues regarding crime and racial disparities, because someone's going to be offended somewhere all the time, no matter what side, like so constantly. I'm thankful I have some Richards in my department, it's more of it, but if it's just specific to this issue of the current racial and social justice issue, that may be a different thing. I don't know if Greg's issue with this and say it needs to go back to be broader or if the issue is that we don't want this position, because I can support one of those more than the other.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Tim. Jonathan, I'm looking at chat and I'm not sure whether I'm seeing a call to Call the Question.

Are you asking us to call it an end to the discussion and go straight to the vote? Michele, we have a Call the Question.

Keith Shapiro: Bonj, there's a choice here.

Chair Szczygiel: All right.

Keith Shapiro: The choice is which question are we calling? Are we calling this motion that's here or are we calling the original question?

Chair Szczygiel: Motion that I believe is in discussion is the motion to return the report to Committee.

Keith Shapiro: You can do either.

Chair Szczygiel: Do either. It doesn't—

Keith Shapiro: It's up to the person calling a question. Their calling a previous question.

Chair Szczygiel: Michele.

Michele Stine, College of Health and Human Development: My understanding was that since we were discussing motion that we had to put them into rest before we can go back to the original question.

Keith Shapiro: Yeah, Part of Robert's Rules is a little complicated on that. It does give two choices on that. You can, whenever you Call the Question, you have to decide which question you have. Because we've got two motions on the floor with one on top, but the original motion still is there. That can be called.

Chair Szczygiel: So, Michele, what is your intent? What would you like to see happen?

Michele Stine: I would like us to vote on the resolution.

Keith Shapiro: Now that doesn't get a debate and it requires a two-thirds vote.

Chair Szczygiel: Keith, I assume I need a second.

Keith Shapiro: Yeah, you need a second.

Mary Beth Williams: Williams, I'll second it, Science.

Chair Szczygiel: What has just been second is that we put an end to further discussion and simply call for a vote on the original resolution as presented. Is that correct, Keith?

Keith Shapiro: Yeah.

Chair Szczygiel: Anna, how are we doing?

Anna Butler: I'm getting it ready. This says Call the Question to end discussion on the return back to Committee motion and vote on original resolution; is that correct?

Chair Szczygiel: No, Anna, it moved on from there. My apologies. It got a little confusing here for a while. What is being proposed is a straightforward vote whether to accept the resolution or to not accept it; is that correct?

Keith Shapiro: No, we need to vote on closing this debate and returning to the original question.

Chair Szczygiel: Anna had it right?

Keith Shapiro: I think she did. I think the way she described it was close debate on this issue, on the sending back to Committee issue and return to the original motion that's on the floor. Again, it requires a two-thirds vote in order to go back.

Gregory C. Shearer: Point of order, Keith. Doesn't calling the question call to the floor the vote on the motion that's standing?

Keith Shapiro: No. We have to vote on calling the question because we're ending debate.

Gregory C. Shearer: But if we Call the Question, then we're up for a vote on the motion that's on the floor?

Keith Shapiro: No. If you Call the Question, we're up to vote on calling the question.

Gregory C. Shearer: I know that, but if we call question. Right.

Keith Shapiro: Well, the idea is that we're moving the previous question. You can move on either the motion that's on the floor or the original motion. The original motion is the resolution or the Positional Report, and then on top of that was the referred to Committee. When you Call the Question, whoever is calling the question can decide which one they want to pick. They can go all the way back to the original one and say, "I'm calling a question on that."

Chair Szczygiel: Well, that's what Michele indicated she wanted to do. So, we still have to vote to end the discussion?

Keith Shapiro: Yeah, you got to vote to end the debate. We have to agree that that's what we want to do is end the debate and go back to that original question. Because that's why you have the choice. You can end the question on referring to committee and say, we'll vote on that, end the debate on vote on refer to committee, or you can go back to the original one. Either way, it's a two-thirds vote.

But I think some people may decide that they would rather end the vote on referring to the Committee first and then take them in order and then go back and then have a vote on that, and if it doesn't pass, go back to the original one. It's up to people who actually want to do it. Doesn't ending the debate go back to the original motion, reject the motion? No, it could do either because we have a motion on the floor to refer to Committee. The person making the motion to close the debate can choose whether they want to close the debate and vote on closing the question, to close the debate so that we can go back and vote on refer to Committee right now, or we can just go back to the original motion and vote on that. We have two motions on the floor. The first one is the Report, the second is the refer to Committee.

Ira S. Saltz: How can we vote on a motion when there was a motion to table it? I would think we have to vote in the motion to table it.

Keith Shapiro: But that's not how Robert's gives it to us. We don't have to vote on the motion to table it if the person moving the previous question wants to go back to the original motion.

Ira S. Saltz: That actually sounds like circumventing democracy.

Keith Shapiro: It's in Robert's, you can vote against it.

Michele Stine: In the interest of simplifying this.

Keith Shapiro: That's why I was mentioning this.

Michele Stine: Then I Call the Question, let's vote on the motion to return to Committee.

Keith Shapiro: Thank you. Because I think that will make it every less. All I'm doing is reading what it says in the book.

Chair Szczygiel: Got to love that book, Keith, my God. Thank you, Anna.

Anna Butler: Can I read this for you, Keith, then you tell me if it's, okay?

Keith Shapiro: Yeah.

Anna Butler: Call the Question to end discussion on returning the report back to the Committee motion and return to the original Resolution.

Keith Shapiro: No. We're calling the question to end the debate.

Anna Butler: Please tell me exactly what it needs to say.

Keith Shapiro: Close debate on refer to Committee. That's this. That's all we're doing.

Anna Butler: Close the debate on refer to Committee.

Keith Shapiro: That's it. That's what this vote will do. It'll close the debate, and then we will vote on the refer to Committee next. There'll be two votes. This vote just closes the debate on it, and the next vote decides whether we're going to send it back to the Committee or not.

Chair Szczygiel: We're going to elect you as King, Keith. King of the Senate. I don't care what the Constitution says, you are the King.

Keith Shapiro: I stopped reading comic books and now I'm reading Robert's Rules.

Chair Szczygiel: Anna, how are you doing?

Anna Butler: I have the poll up to close debate on returning it to Committee.

Keith Shapiro: That's great.

Chair Szczygiel: That's great. If we could go to that vote. Yes, Keith is amazing. We should perform a lobotomy just when the time comes to see what's in there. Do we have a poll, Anna?

Anna Butler: We do. I still have a couple coming in.

Chair Szczygiel: People are voting? I'm sorry. I thought it would show up on the screen.

Anna Butler: Yes.

Keith Shapiro: Anyway, this one requires two-thirds because it ends debate.

Chair Szczygiel: Two-thirds of the Senators present. Do we have a senatorial count?

Keith Shapiro: It's two-thirds of the members voting.

Chair Szczygiel: Two-thirds of members voting?

Keith Shapiro: Yeah, so it'll be a little easier.

Anna Butler: It's definitely going to be an easy two-thirds. I have 127 Accept and 13 Reject.

Keith Shapiro: Good.

Chair Szczygiel: We've got 226 people in the room right now. I think the vote's slowing down or have they stopped, Anna?

Anna Butler: Yeah, they've pretty much stopped.

Chair Szczygiel: Very good. Thank you, Anna, for operating on the fly as you do often at these meetings. Now, it's been decided to end this discussion, and we return to the original motion on the floor, no—

Keith Shapiro: No, now we're going to vote on refer to Committee.

Chair Szczygiel: Refer to Committee.

Keith Shapiro: That'll be a majority.

Anna Butler: Motion to return the report back to the committee. Select A to return report back to the committee, and B to reject and do not report back to the Committee. Does that sound right?

Keith Shapiro: I think we know what it is. On this, an affirmative vote refers it to Committee.

Chair Szczygiel: Vote yes if you want it to go back to Committee.

Keith Shapiro: Yeah, and no if you don't. Yes, that's right.

Chair Szczygiel: So yes, if you want it to go back to Committee, no if you do not.

Anna Butler: The poll is open now.

Chair Szczygiel: I don't know if there's anyone in this meeting who has any influence on your pay scale, but my vote is that you get a little nudge there.

Anna Butler: Thank you, Bonj.

Chair Szczygiel: If I had the power. Clarification, if you want to send the resolution back to Committee, you would vote yes. If you think there's no need to send it back to Committee, you would vote no.

Anna Butler: This one's a little closer.

Chair Szczygiel: Keith, you said we need majority?

Keith Shapiro: It's a majority here.

Anna Butler: They're still trickling in. It looks like they've stopped. We have 59 Accept and 80 Reject. So, 80 said do not return report back to the Committee.

Keith Shapiro: Now we go back to the original motion, and resume debate.

Chair Szczygiel: Let us, not exactly start a new, but let's take everything that we've just learned and heard, and go forward, or do we have any additional other comments that have not already been presented that could take this conversation forward? Tim, your hand is up. Did you still want to have something to say or is this remnant?

Timothy R. Robicheaux: That's remnant, but I actually will just quickly say that it's just worth, again, maybe explaining what, we're callings now, a positional statement, "Positional Report" that these actually have very specific goals in mind, so if we were going to do something like a "Chicago Statement", I think that would be a different type of report. I think that may put at least some people's concerns. This is very specific to teaching of racial and social justice. It's not a statement that this is all we agree with. Just to clarify, and I believe that's what "Positional Statement" is intended to do is very specific, broader political thing. This does not mean we can't later have a different discussion of Faculty. No, I could've agreed

Chair Szczygiel: Keith, did you have a response to that?

Keith Shapiro: I'm not sure I do. I think he's right. I think the Positional Reports, they just do one thing, they express the position in the Senate. There's nothing else beyond that really with it.

Chair Szczygiel: Position of the Senate. Noah, welcome back. Thank you. I'm very sorry we took a long roundabout, but could you identify yourself?

Noah Robertson: Yeah, that's okay. Noah Robertson, Liberal Arts. I do want to speak in support of the motion to adopt this report for many reasons that others have already shared. I don't really want to turn

this into an echo chamber. But we reviewed and voted on this in Education Committee today and I got to read the original text of their report. This is just a question for people who are more so involved in authoring it. But I wanted to ask if you could share the reasoning behind your moving the statements specifically addressing PA House Bill Number 1532.

I wonder almost if this might be a moment for the Senate to deliberate on our advocacy role and continue the theme of interrogating our role of shared governance at Penn State. I was wondering if you could speak to this and if you think the plenum should deliberate on including the original first whereas statement, in addition to the newer one that was added in. Then just for context for everyone, the original first whereas statement read, "House Bill Number 1532 was proposed June 2021 to the Pennsylvania State legislature providing for restrictions on racist and sexist concepts and carries fines for noncompliance, the offended complainant would have standing to sue and if successful results in state appropriations being revoked."

Chair Szczygiel: Just for some context, I don't know how familiar you are with the process, but any report that comes onto the floor of this, if almost any, usually needs review and approval to go forward from the Senate Council. That was the point in time during a discussion at Council that there was objection to that reference.

Noah Robertson: Actually, along with bringing up those points, can I make a motion to include that original first whereas statement in the report?

Chair Szczygiel: I believe you just had. Do we have a second? Thank you, Noah. Noah has put into the chat the statement that was removed. It was modified, I don't know if I have that in front of me, to identify what it was replaced with. Paul, are you able to identify where?

Paul Frisch, Penn State Scranton: Yes. It is the second whereas. The current Positional Report states, "Whereas multiple states have already passed, are in the process of debating and high proposed legislation to curb and limit economic freedom within primary, secondary, and higher education institutions." It's the second point there. That's what replaced what Noah brought up.

Chair Szczygiel: We have a notion made by Noah to reinsert. Noah, are you suggesting that we replace?

Noah Robertson: Reinsert but not replace.

Chair Szczygiel: Reinsert but not replace. Do we have a second on that motion? So, speak.

Victor Brunsden: Second.

Chair Szczygiel: Second is made by Victor.

Victor Brunsden: That's right. Altoona.

Chair Szczygiel: Altoona. We need to vote on this motion. Do we need a discussion before we vote?

Raymond Gabriel Najjar Jr: Yes.

Chair Szczygiel: Does anyone have a specific comment to the motion that's on the floor?

John Gerard Champagne: Sorry. Can you hear me? My hand is up.

Chair Szczygiel: I can hear you. John, you've disappeared.

John Gerard Champagne: Champagne, Erie. And I don't know if this is going to cause more trouble. If we make it a friendly amendment, we don't have to do all of this voting, right? If we make it a friendly amendment, we just vote for the amendment. We don't have to vote the whole thing, or am I wrong?

Keith Shapiro: What do you mean? There is no friendly amendment. The amendment said an idea is an idea. A motion has been made to amend the document.

John Gerard Champagne: So, I'm too late basically.

Keith Shapiro: Anytime you change the document, you're amending it.

John Gerard Champagne: But I thought a friendly amendment just had to be accepted by the people presenting the motion. We don't all have to vote if it's a friendly amendment.

Keith Shapiro: Well, they have the option to be able to change the document themselves. But I think at this point it's on the floor as a motion.

John Gerard Champagne: Well, I'm really confused because you told me that I could change the pros where it needs to be changed. Now you're saying it's on the floor, the pros can't be changed.

Chair Szczygiel: Well, this is substantive, John. This is a major issue. It is not a minor editorial.

John Gerard Champagne: Thanks.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you.

Keith Shapiro: Also, you can amend an amendment.

Chair Szczygiel: Not to make things more complicated, we have a motion, it's been seconded. The motion is to include the original statement, original second whereas to add it to the resolution or positional statement. Do we have any comments just on that? Any discussion on that? Anna, you know where we're going?

Anna Butler: Yes, I do. I'd like someone to tell me exactly what this should say though, please.

Chair Szczygiel: The motion was to add the original text back into the positional statement. Yay or nay? Could someone just recopy it because it's all the way up and check. Could you recopy it and put that statement in, so that we can all see it clearly again? Thank you. That is the statement that is being requested that we put back in. Are there any comments about that, Denise, specific to this motion?

Denise Potosky, Penn State Great Valley: Sorry, wait. Hold on. Yes, Denise Potosky, Penn State Great Valley. I have a question about the overall document that may be helpful with regard to the specific question about House Bill 1532. But before I ask that general question, I would like to point out that I

don't know if this bill passed, but it hasn't come out of the Committee or whether it's going to pass. If we put this House bill in specifically at this time, it might date or limit the document going further. Because maybe we want a more general statement anticipating what the next House bill might be or how this makes its way through the Senate.

But my more general question about this document is pertained to its focus, and the fourth whereas as well. Because at the very beginning of the document, which I applaud, I think it's a great idea. But the very beginning of the document focuses on racial and social and environmental justice concerns. The House Bill 1532 specifically references racist and sexist concepts as being divisive, and the fourth whereas pulls out students do not have adequate knowledge of black and indigenous people of color and LGBTQ history. It seems to be increasingly focused on racial equity, but yet LGBTQ history is mentioned. But more generally sexist concepts, a social justice issue that is also very contemporary and of concern right now, seems to be dropped.

I wondered if by leaving the language as it is without House Bill 1532 specifically, and maybe focusing on that fourth, whereas. The Committee can clarify, is this mostly or primarily geared toward racial injustice? If that's the case, we can tailor our comments to that, or is it intended to be broadly defined in terms of our academic freedom.

President Barron: These people are nuts.

Denise Potosky: Right. With regard to racist, sexist, all sorts of inequity. If that's the case, then leaving out the House Bill from the third whereas and broadening the fourth whereas may be more appropriate. In other words, are we dealing with all issues of inequity, and we want to avoid censorship for all issues, or is this intended to be focused? Either way, it's probably a good idea, but am I making my point clear? In terms of the level of specificity that we want this document to have.

Chair Szczygiel: This is a document as I mentioned that is coming out of the African American Policy Forum. I think they have several Agenda. I don't want to speak for them, but the letter that they sent suggests that they had several large issue Agendas. One is the anti-critical race theory. Political activism that has been seen across the nation. They are certainly reacting to that very strongly if that helps Denise. Amy. When we are discussing the motion, please. Could you identify yourself?

Amy Linch, College of Liberal Arts: Amy Linch, College of Liberal Arts. With respect to the motion, I think that there needs to be debate and some discussion about why it was excluded. To Rose's point into a number of the points that are being made in the chat. Because I think we really need to consider the political implications of specifically identifying the bill, and whether or not we might actually undermine our own case by drawing negative attention or just by drawing attention to it. Right now, the bill is in Committee, it hasn't really gotten a lot of action, and by specifying it, we could give energy to it and inadvertently encourage it to be brought to a full debate within the General Assembly.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you Amy, and I'm going to take some Chair leeway and go down to recognizing Nick Jones because he was a voice at the council meeting who felt strongly about it and he might be able to respond, Amy, to your observations. Nick.

Provost Jones: Sorry, I missed some of the prior discussion because I was distracted with something.

Chair Szczygiel: Amy is wondering the rationale for removing the House Bill 1532 reference.

Provost Jones: I think President Barron also put something in chat and I would just reinforce what he said. That I think we felt that it seemed unlikely that this bill was going to get attraction, so reference to it was unnecessary. We have a lot of people in the Pennsylvania Legislature who are big supporters of Penn State and we do want to recognize that.

The piece that in the Senate Council, after the Senate Council meeting, I think we recommended being removed was the reference to the legislature in the resolution as opposed to in the preamble, but somebody must have made the decision to take both pieces out. I think from an institutional standpoint, I think I have preferences that not be that specific reference to the legislature given the circumstances surrounding this bill. I think as somebody said, maybe Denise said it actually may potentially render and otherwise important resolution non timely, because of the probably the limited runway associated with that Legislation.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Nick. Victor.

Victor Brunsden: Thank you, Bonj. Brunsden, Altoona. I think the fact that we are debating the addition of this particular language shows that it was improper for Senate Council to have voted to remove it in the first place. Whether you vote for the inclusion of this language or not is up to you. Although I would urge you to vote for its inclusion, Nick Jones protestations to the contrary. But it's clear that this is a matter of some concern, and there are a number of points of view on this. I'm glad that we're having this discussion on this specific point. Should it be this hard? Well, maybe it should. This is not an easy issue. Anyway, I would urge people to vote for adding this back in, and that's all I got.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Victor. Carrie, you're up next.

Caroline Davis Eckhardt, College of the Liberal Arts: Eckhardt, Liberal Arts. I'll be really brief because much of what I wanted to say has been already said. I too think that our statement is much stronger without the reference to the specific House Bill, which can not only have negative consequences, but it makes our statement more narrow and less timely. I would suggest that we vote against the amendment to put that back in. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Cary. Rose? Are you muted, Rose? Or we can't hear you?

Rosemary Jane Jolly, College of the Liberal Arts: Can you hear me now?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes.

Rosemary Jane Jolly: Okay. What I wanted to say just very briefly and quickly is that, and this speaks out in my experience in South Africa Apartheid Regime, I would never want us to have a statement of academic freedom that suggests that we take our ethics from a particular government. That is to say that the principles of academic freedom cannot be limited or suggested by a State Legislature. Sometimes they're with us, and this time they may be in the spirit of the document, but there could be another government who wouldn't be. I'm just trying to suggest that we should not suggest that we're doing this because a government is doing it. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Okay. Thank you, Rose. If I can paraphrase you, that's a comment to remove the reference?

Rosemary Jane Jolly: Correct.

Chair Szczygiel: Do not support it. Chris.

Eli Christopher Byrne: Thank you. Byrne, College of Science. I agree with the comments that it would be wiser to leave that out. There was earlier discussion about how maybe discrimination based on sex has been downplayed in favor of other types of discrimination. That may be originating because of the roots of this document.

I think a lot of these problems, and even the earlier discussion to send it back to Committee was because it wasn't general enough, and maybe all of this can be solved by making sure that the title of the document or whatever, simply, clearly that if this is a very focused document, to make a focus point, and it makes that focus point very well. Let's just make it clear that that's the focus of this document and then we can all approve it as opposed to hover on all these complaints about what it doesn't say. Let's just make a clear statement in the title or any other feasible way giving our editing limitations about what this is for so that we could pass it on its merits.

Chair Szczygiel: Let me just restate the resolution is in support of academic freedom and the rejection of attempts to interfere with the teaching of racial and social justice. Thank you, Chris. Kim.

Kimberly Blockett, Chair-Elect: Hi, I just wanted to make a point of clarification on Victor's remarks. The Senate Council did not vote to remove the language. The Senate Council voted that the Senate Council would not sponsor the report with the House Bill language included. The Committees and the folks who worked on the report voted as to what they would send to The Senate Floor.

Chair Szczygiel: Well, just for clarification, there was a vote in Council, and it was rejected, with that, the House Bill reference included.

Kimberly Blockett: Correct.

Chair Szczygiel: There was a vote to reject it based on its conclusion.

Kimberly Blockett: Okay. Then I was confused. I thought that vote was that Senate Council would not sponsor it.

Chair Szczygiel: They chose not to sponsor it anyway, even with the Amendment. The votes were not there to sponsor it.

Kimberly Blockett: Okay. I'm sorry about that.

Chair Szczygiel: No problem. Kofi, and probably the last comment before we go on and vote on this.

Kofi W. Adu: Kofi, Penn State Altoona. Reading the whereas two, I think it takes into account The House Bill 1532 because it's taken reference from all other states, including Pennsylvania. I think there is no need to have that there since it's already part of the second whereas. It's just that it's general, but we can infer that it includes that bill even if it comes to pass.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Kofi. Anna, how are we looking? Is your charge clear? Were you able to put together a vote for us?

Anna Butler: Yes, I have all.

Chair Szczygiel: Did I see somewhere that you're not able to show us the poll in this mode?

Anna Butler: Pardon me?

Chair Szczygiel: I'm asking the Senate staff; did someone tell me that Anna was unable to share her screen to show us?

Erin Eckley, Senate Office Staff: Bonj, I'm the one who usually puts up the PowerPoint presentation, and I can't do that because I can't see what the TallySpace ones look like unless they are pre-made.

Chair Szczygiel: I see.

Erin Eckley: When we are doing them on the fly like this, I don't have a screenshot.

Chair Szczygiel: All right.

Anna Butler: I can tell you what it looks like. The poll says, "Motion to add original text back into document. Select A to accept or B to reject. When you go in to vote on the poll, the choices are A accept, add text back, B reject, leave text out."

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Anna. Very clear.

Anna Butler: Is that okay?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, very clear. Appreciate it.

Anna Butler: Okay. I'm putting it out there right now.

Chair Szczygiel: The motion was to add the text that is highlighted on your screens to add it back into this Positional Report. If you agree with that, you vote yes to add it. If you disagree, that it should not belong there, then you would vote no.

Anna Butler: Votes are coming in. They've stopped now and I have 26 Accept and 113 Reject. They're saying delete the text out.

Chair Szczygiel: Yes. Correct. Thank you very much. Do we have any other comments before we go to accept or reject this report, this positional statement? This would be on new issues, please. We don't want to go back and rehash things that we've already talked about. John, could you identify yourself?

John Gerard Champagne: Champagne, Erie. Can I make some suggestions about the language and offer them as friendly amendments, is that allowable?

Keith Shapiro: I'm not sure what you mean by a friendly amendment. A friendly amendment is an amendment that's made on the floor that most people will accept. You can ask the original people who put the motion on the floor if they're willing to change it, but they don't have to agree.

John Gerard Champagne: Is anybody willing to let me change the bad syntax in this document and the punctuation errors?

Keith Shapiro: I would think that that would simply be if we're talking about simple editorial errors, then that would be an editorial amendment or change that can be done in the Senate Office. We've made rules to allow for that.

John Gerard Champagne: So, I don't—

Keith Shapiro: So long as it's not a substantive change to the document. You're changing semi-colons or you're changing maybe the order of words just to correct the grammar. That's a non-substantive change and that could be done as an editorial change.

Chair Szczygiel: Just a reminder, if everyone could mute. If you're not speaking, please mute your mics. Just all of a sudden, it got very loud there. I'm sorry to interrupt you, Keith.

Keith Shapiro: Yeah. That can be done as an editorial change. We don't have to vote on it.

John Gerard Champagne: If somebody would please send me the document, I would be more than happy to fix it.

Keith Shapiro: Sure.

Erin Eckley: I will do that right now.

Chair Szczygiel: Dawn.

Dawn Pfeifer Reitz: Hi, Reitz, Berks. I'd like to Call the Question on the original motion, please, or resolution.

Chair Szczygiel: Do we have a second?

Keith Shapiro: Before we do that, this is trying to save an extra vote, because it's 4:30.

Chair Szczygiel: Yeah.

Keith Shapiro: We're near the end of debate anyway. I think Bonj was just about ready to say, or am I right about this, was ready to say, are we ready to vote? Rather than Call the Question, I have to do a two-thirds vote.

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, thank you. Yes, I was, Keith, I was just going—

Keith Shapiro: If you're ready to do that and then those non-substantive changes that John wants to do, we can just do, and they can be done to the office and you can just call a vote.

Chair Szczygiel: All right, folks. Rose, I'm afraid we just have to move on, so I would ask that we just call the vote on this one and it is a straight-up or down to accept the resolution or to reject it. Accept it with John's minor editorial punctuation improvements. Okay, folks. Thank you, Erin. A to accept this positional statement or B to reject it.

Anna Butler: Eight people are voting. Vote trickling in. They seem to have stopped. I have 117 Accept and 23 Reject.

Chair Szczygiel: We have a decision. Thank you all very much for all of this very thoughtful commentary. Keith, is there any other hanging chads, etc, that needs to be cleaned up?

Keith: Absolutely not.

Chair Szczygiel: Okay. Great. Thank you all. This can be painful process but it's very important and It's a good exercise for us to go down this road.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Annual Budget Report – Appendix I

Chair Szczygiel: Moving on. I'm sorry. We are moving on into the Informational Reports. Regrettably, Provost Jones says he has to leave for another critical meeting, so he has asked to postpone his Budget Report until our next meeting in March. Erin, if you could be so kind to note that and Laura.

Erin Lynn Eckley: I will do that.

Annual Report on Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded to Undergraduates 2020-2021* – Appendix J

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. That was the first Informational Report. The second Informational Report is from the Senate Committee on Admissions Records, Scheduling and Student Aid, comes the "Annual Report on Faculty Senate Scholarships Awarded to Undergraduates 2020-2021." It is Appendix J, and this report is only posted on the web and does not have a presentation with it. Thank you all on a reserve for that good report.

One Penn State 2025 Guiding Principle Two Committee Update on Educational Communities – Appendix K

Chair Szczygiel: The next report is from the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs and Intra-University Relations entitled "One Penn State 2025 Guiding Principle Two Committee Update on Educational Communities." I have a message from the Chair of the Committee on Curricular Affairs, Mary Beth Williams. That again, in the interest of saving the time that they are willing to move to an Informational Report to a Web-only presentation. Mary Beth, is that your choice?

Mary Beth Williams: Yes. The PowerPoint slides are all in the agenda and we would welcome any input and comments that you have on that and questions of any kind. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Yeah. Thank you. Please do take a moment, there was a great deal of work and engagement and discussion about Educational Communities at our last meeting and it went on from there. It would be very helpful to give whatever feedback you possibly can muster for this important issue because we will continue to be engaged in Educational Communities.

Presentation on Data Digest (formerly known as Fact Book) – Appendix L

Chair Szczygiel: The next report is from the Senate Committees on Libraries, Information Systems and Technology, titled, "Presentation on Data Digest (formerly known as Fact Book)." It is included here as Appendix L. Fifteen minutes have been allotted for presentation and discussion. Ira Saltz, Chair of LIST, you have the floor.

Ira S. Saltz: Okay. Well, this will be presented by, I believe, Lisa Brooks is presenting this for us.

Chair Szczygiel: Lisa Brooks. Thank you. Okay. Lisa, are you with us still?

Lisa Brooks, Data and Research Analyst, Office of Planning Assessment and Institutional Research: I am, yes.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Go ahead. You've got the floor.

Karen S. Vance, Associate Vice Provost for Institutional Research: Ira, I think I was going to say a few words if that's okay. Karen Vance, Associate Vice Provost for Institutional Research to introduce the work, which is why Lisa is waiting. Just a second.

Chair Szczygiel: Okay.

Ira S. Saltz: Okay. Thank you, Karen. I wasn't sure if you were here.

Karen S. Vance: That's okay. Thank you for having us today. Thank you for reaching out to us regarding the Data Digest. This has been a work in progress over the past 18 months. Lisa Brooks has done a tremendous job in incorporating feedback from users over the past 18 months to pull into the Data Digest. Some of the information is a direct result of comments that have been made over the past few years in Faculty Senate in terms of wanting additional information made publicly available and made transparent. We hope you'll find the resource useful in your work. Lisa.

Lisa Brooks: Thank you, Karen. Thank you all for your time today. My name is Lisa Brooks. I'm a Data and Research Analyst with the Office of Planning Assessment and Institutional Research. Here you're going to see all of the reports that we have available in the Data Digest. The top four that are highlighted in red are reports that were in our original Fact Book and were converted to these interactive reports a year ago. The interactive, I'm sorry, the original Fact Book reports our student enrollment, degrees awarded, graduation and retention, and faculty and staff.

The Student Enrollment report displays enrollment trends over the last five years by a degree level, campus, demographic, and academic plan. In this and all other reports, users have the ability to filter data by a number of variables. Some examples in the Enrollment Report are filters and views for first generation status, tuition residency, international student country of origin, and full or part-time status.

Degrees Awarded shows trends in degrees awarded for undergraduate and graduate loan programs, and like the Enrollment Report, users have the ability to filter by various variables in the report and see the data in different views.

The Graduation and Retention Report displays graduation and retention rates for first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree seeking students and fall cohorts. Users can select the metric of interest, for example, one-year retention or six-year graduation rate. This report also, like the other reports, provides a variety of ways to filter the data.

Finally, the Faculty and Staff Report provides employee counts and also has the bill for Penn State Health and Penn College. Counts can be broken down by demographic, business area, and faculty tenure and rank. There are other reports in the Data Digest that I want to briefly touch on just so you know what information is available. The Undergraduate Admissions Report breaks out admin rate, yield, and application by campus. You can also view the data by several demographic variables such as degree type, first-generation status, race, ethnicity. The Alumni Earnings and Employment Report displays earnings for our alumni. The Faculty Salary Report displays faculty salaries by campus rank and other variables. The community surveys shares results for employee and student perspectives on inclusion and diversity. The peer comparisons are a series of reports developed for the Board of Trustees. It compares Penn State University Park with other AAU and Big 10 institutions. Finally, the Penn State Voters Report was designed to help University representatives advocate for a state funding. You can access the Data Digest online at datadigest.psu.edu.

A few of the reports are accessible only through a Penn State login, but generally, these are available to the public. Once you get to the website, there are three main sections. The first section will include information or updates on the reports. This year, there's a five-minute video covering the changes that were made to the former reports in this recent year. I highly recommend you view this video if you're really interested in digging into the data, as it does go over some important details about how to most effectively utilize the report filters and navigation. For those of you that are familiar with last year's version of the Digest and may not have seen this current iteration that came out in the fall, some notable updates to this fall's reports are a new navigation structure, additional variables, and data views that showed the intersection of demographic variables.

Now, the main section of the page has all of the reports and to access the report, you'll simply click on one of the report tiles. The last but very important piece is the user feedback form located at the bottom of the page. If you look through reports and you have any questions about the data you're seeing, please do feel free to contact us for clarification. Also, if you have suggestions for future improvement let us know. We do take these suggestions into account when making changes.

I'm going to walk you through a couple of screenshots just to show you how to navigate through the reports and what you might see in the reports. All of the reports have a navigation pane and essentially, you're clicking on these buttons to get the different pages in the reports which show you different views of the same data. Some of the reports will also have a sub navigation menu. On the left-hand side, you'll see a set of filters that allow users to filter data by year or term, and a bunch of different variables, demographics, campus, academic plan, etc. There's also a reset button, so if you have selected many filters, you can just click that one reset button to reset them all. At the top right, you'll see two buttons. On all of our reports, we have an Information button that will give you broad report information, data definitions, and a report update schedule.

On some of the reports, you'll also see that right Data Download button. If you'd like to get the data in CSV format, you can do that. Some of the views also have a Table View. This particular screenshot we're looking at has two bar charts that are cut off in the screenshot. If you were to click on the Table View, it would convert those bar charts to tables just to give you a different view of the data. That concludes our presentation on Data Digest. Thank you again for having us.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you very much, Lisa and Karen. Do we have any questions, observations? Nathan.

Nathan Tallman: Tallman, University Libraries. Thank you for all your work on evolving the Data Digest. This is all really great work and its really useful information to have. Last year in April, Senate passed an Advisory/Consultative Report requesting a community dashboard related to DEI initiatives at the University. I don't ever recall hearing what the response from administration was on that report. I'm wondering if this is something you're working on or on the horizon or being discussed or just wondering where that is in the process. Thank you very much.

Karen S. Vance: I can respond to that because I have a little bit of familiarity with the report, or the request for report that was put forward last April. We are happy to partner with the Committee on that work. I believe Educational Equity was also included in the text to be a part of that work. We'd be glad to partner with the Committee when approached.

Chair Szczygiel: Nathan, thank you for putting the link to that report. I don't know how you found it so fast, but I'm impressed. If that's helpful at all, Karen, if you need to be refreshed. Nathan any follow-up or?

Nathan Tallman: It sounds like perhaps there's a precursor step necessary to doing that work because I think the report recommends identifying a group to maintain the dashboard or to help do the work that Karen is saying they're willing to be a partner in. Perhaps Senate Council needs to take a look and figure out where that needs to go next. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Roger.

Roger Egolf: Yes. Previously, back in the Fact Book, faculty salary information was under the Stairs Road Report, and it was always listed by campus, etc. I noticed in the new one, they actually say it's by Tenure Home. But how does that really work if you say have a University Park Tenure Home, but you're at a campus such as I am. Am I included under the University College data or included under the Eberly College of Science data? I'm a little unclear about that.

Karen S. Vance: For the Stairs Road Report or for the Data Digest?

Roger Egolf: Well, for the new Data Digest. In the old days, you had to look into the Stairs Road Report within Fact Book in order to find breakdowns of salary data. Now there is a separate, I suppose you can still find that in other ways through the Budget Office. But when you are listing in the Data Digest about the faculty salaries, the link actually says by Tenure Home. Do you really mean that, or do you really mean by campus? Because if you have a University Park Tenure Home, but you're at a campus, where are you listed?

Karen S. Vance: That's a really good question because there's it actually comes out of SIMBA now, in terms of Business groupings. So it would depend on the faculty member and what their SIMBA business unit is.

Roger Egolf: A larger part is, depending how the data is, that throws the averages off too.

Karen S. Vance: Yes, it does. There are also splits as well that we have to work on. It's a convoluted and complicated process to be able to assign faculty to a home. Also, we have CIP Codes now and Workday are used to assign faculty to an area. Depending on the question, we can look at it in a number of different ways, which leads to oftentimes different numbers in different reports depending on how we operationalize the data. You're absolutely correct.

Roger Egolf: I just wondered if this was something that wasn't thought about and maybe needs to be thought about how it's being reported so people get the right impression on what the data means.

Karen S. Vance: Correct. Yes, it is something that's thought about. For each of our different reporting pieces, we spend a tremendous amount of time trying to accurately categorize faculty, if you will, based on home and we work closely with Kathy Bieschke's office to make sure that we're representing the information correctly or to the best ability possible.

Roger Egolf: Well, thank you. I just thought I'd raised the issue in case people don't realize that those issues can pop up.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Roger. Doug, I see your hand is up.

Douglas Bird, College of the Liberal Arts: Hi. Can you hear me?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, we can.

Douglas Bird: I'm Doug Bird, Liberal Arts at University Park, and I chair the Educational Equity and Campus Environment Committee for the Senate. Thank you so much for all that information. It was really helpful, really useful. I just wanted to say we, as a committee, this is one of our primary charges with regard to our annual mandated report, which will center on some hopes and aims from the Senate with regard to the DI dashboards. We're working on it, and we will definitely be reaching out here within the next few weeks. Thank you very much.

Chair Szczygiel: I don't see any other questions in the wings, so thank you very much, Lisa and Karen for your time and your patience and waiting it out this long. Although we have done worse as a Senate meeting, but it does require a little bit of sustenance on your part, so I very much appreciate you. We are able to move on to our next report.

STARS Report: Assessing Sustainability Progress and Opportunities at Penn State – Appendix M

Chair Szczygiel: I believe our last report is from the Senate Committee on University Planning titled, "STARS Report: Assessing Sustainability Progress and Opportunities at Penn State." It can be found in Appendix M. Fifteen minutes had been allotted for presentation, although we'll see how long the Chair, Jim Strauss, would like. Perhaps not all of the 15 minutes, but we'll find that out. Jim, you have the floor. Did we lose Jim?

Meghan Hoskins, Director of Operations and Partnerships, Penn State Sustainability Institute: I'm not sure if Jim is here, but Meghan Hoskins here from the Sustainability Institute, and I'll be giving the presentation.

Chair Szczygiel: Hello, Meghan. Thanks very much.

Meghan Hoskins: Absolutely. I don't know if Jim is here, he can feel free to chime in. I will share my screen though. For the sake of time, I will try to be brief. Thank you for having me. I do thank the University Planning Committee for sponsoring this report.

As I said, I'm Meghan Hoskins from the Sustainability Institute. I'm going to give you an overview of some of the recent sustainability assessments we've done over the past year or two. I just want to acknowledge the work of Mary Easterlies and David Cullmer who did a lot of the work gathering the data for these assessments.

Very quickly, just a brief introduction to sustainability, if anyone has not seen us talk before. These are the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals and at the Sustainability Institute, this is how we frame the conversation around sustainability. A lot of people, when they hear sustainability, they think the green stuff, so like recycling and turning the lights off. Sustainability for us is much broader than that.

We have three pillars of sustainability. One is environmental, so that includes things on here like considering life on land, life below water, clean water and sanitation, these things. But it also includes social aspects, considering no poverty and reducing inequalities, as well as economic, looking at things like decent work and economic growth, and sustainable cities and communities. That's an overview of sustainability.

At Penn State, sustainability has been embedded into the strategic plan in multiple ways. This is just highlighting some of those places where sustainability shows up in the institution's strategic point. As I said, I'm from the Sustainability Institute, and just a very brief introduction, we serve as the Office of our Chief Sustainability Officer, Paul Shrivastava. We're an office of just about 12 people trying to cover sustainability in all the core areas of the University for all of our campuses. We can't do this alone.

We've been working to recruit others to help us do this. We have Sustainability Councils now in almost every college and on almost every campus. If you're interested in being in touch with your councils, please feel free to reach out. This is why we do these assessments. We are tracking and encouraging progress and sustainability at the institution. We're also identifying opportunities for improvement.

Also looking at student enrollment, students are paying attention to what universities are doing when they're making decisions about where they're going to go for school. A recent Princeton Review showed that 75 percent of the high school students said that they would consider the environmental commitment of the University before making their decision.

All right, the first assessment I'm going to talk about is the Sustainability Tracking Assessment and Rating System, which is done by the Association for Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education. Sorry, it's mouthful. We've been doing this assessment since 2011 and as you can see on the bottom right, our score has been increasing since that time. We're now gold ranked and I'm going to show you results today from our December 2020 submission. You can see here what that submission covers. It is for

University Park only what I'm going to show. Barron's campus also did a separate report on their own campus in the same year.

These are the major categories that STARS is broken down into, academics, engagement, operations and planning and administration. This chart shows what our score or our score was in each of those areas on the blue bar. We are also comparing too on the red bars showing our peer Big 10 institutions that gave data to this assessment as well. The silver or gray bar is showing the institutions that got a platinum ranking. Platinum is the highest ranking, and this shows what's feasible to achieve. For example, in operations, you can see it looks like we have a lot of room for improvement, but the platinum-ranked institutions don't achieve full points either. It's very hard to achieve full points in that area.

All of the graphs I will show you on the next slides will have a similar coloring. First, we'll break it down for academics. It's broken down into research and curriculum and these charts just show how much of the overall ranking or score is in each of these areas. Academics is about 28 percent of the overall score. For research, we do very well every year. We get almost full points, or we get full points on this. In curriculum, we do have a couple of areas for improvement, but we also do quite well.

The academic courses, learning outcomes and Sustainability Literacy Assessment. The literacy assessment we have done before, so we did get full points in 2020, but we do need to continue to repeat that to be able to maintain that score. Otherwise, we also do quite well in this.

I'm going to go very quickly for the sake of time, but there is lot of data available online. David Cullmer is here and he's going to put in the chat the link to the full report, as well as another data dashboard that is available on the Sustainability website now that is focused on some of the credits in the STARS report. Operations is a big one. It's almost 35 percent of the overall score and this is showing how we do on those. On a couple of these areas, we actually score higher than some of the platinum institutions, like in grounds and water. We do well in some of the other ones and then we've highlighted a couple of the areas that are areas for improvement but are also quite challenging for large institutions like us.

Engagement is 20 percent of the overall score, and it's broken down into public engagement and campus engagement. The public engagement, we pretty much max this out. We do quite well in public engagement. The campus engagement, we have a couple of areas that could see some improvement and those are highlighted here in assessing sustainability culture, employee orientation, and our educators' programs.

Planning and administration is broken down into four parts, and it's about 16 percent of the overall score. The sustainability coordination and the diversity and affordability, we do quite well. The affordability we get dinged due to our high tuition. Investment in finance credits are ones that we definitely have opportunity for improvement on and most of our Big 10 peers as well, and even the platinum institutions. There's quite a bit of work going on in the Office of Investment Management though currently here at Penn State. We're hoping that some of these will increase in our next submission.

The other assessment I'll just briefly touch on is the Times Higher Education Impact ranking. This is structured around the 17 United Nations Sustainable Development Goals that I mentioned, and you can submit data for all 17 of the goals, but they need four for participation. One of those must be the 17 goals, which is partnerships. The results of our 2020 submission is shown here. This one is an annual submission. We did submit data in 2021. We submit every year with help from the Care Office. We were ranked fourth among US participants and third the previous year. This one is fairly new, there's actually

more institutions that are giving data every year. This one will probably continue to get more challenging over time.

This is a look at what SDGs that we submitted data for last year. Almost all of the SDGs includes seven points for research, and this is something that is publicly available. The Times Higher Education people go out and find these scores for us and then, the rest of the chart here is things that we submitted data for, just a little overview of all of the things that they're looking at. I won't go over all of that.

This is a brief overview of what potentially the Faculty Senate could do to get involved in some of these. Supporting data collection for the academic credits. I know that there is a lot of work going on around the University in some of these areas. I know the Curricular Affairs Committee is doing some work and so is the Student Committee, I forget the name, I apologize. I know that there was a report previously in this Plenary. There's a lot of student effort going on through the University Park Undergraduate Association with Erin and her cohort as well as the Student Sustainability Advisory Council with Divya and Bella and others doing work in the curricular area. I want to acknowledge all of the work that's going on and really appreciate that.

There are other things here mentioned, but I'll just wrap up and say, thank you very much for your time and interest in sustainability and happy to take any questions if you have any.

Meghan Hoskins: You are muted.

Chair Szczygiel: Well, I just gave the soliloquy of my life and you all missed it. I can't possibly repeat it. Thank you, Meghan, and David Cullmer, and Paul Shrivastava for everything that you do for the University, for us, for the students. Where would we be without the Sustainability Institute? It's so heartening to see your work becoming more and more critical to the core mission of this University. I really do want to thank you for hanging in there and spending time with us, and also for the support services that you provided for, in particular, the Student Sustainability Literacy Project that was presented earlier. Much appreciated. I see John has a hand raised.

John Gerard Champagne: Champagne, Erie.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. You got it.

John Gerard Champagne: My question is really a question and a comment. I was really impressed with everything that we heard today, and particularly the issue around curriculum. I think as faculty members, many of us know that we are going to be competing for an ever-diminishing student population. That one of the things we really need to do is develop majors for the 21st century. I'm thinking that it would be really great if we could be a leader nationally in a new sustainability major.

But the problem I see is that sustainability really cuts across disciplines. It is very hard at Penn State to start up any kind of interdisciplinary major. I'm wondering as faculty members, with our investment in curriculum, what can we do? What does the Senate do when it wants faculty to think about an interdisciplinary major?

Chair Szczygiel: I don't know, Meghan, if you're going to respond to that, because you got some experience and you recognize it's a huge, huge scope of endeavor. You've decided to break it up into

pieces and attack it. That's not exactly the same as a major, but it does speak to the challenges behind something like that. Is anyone out there? Brandi, your thoughts?

Brandi J. Robinson, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Hey, everyone. Robinson, Earth and Mineral Sciences. I've been fortunate enough to start working on this in Curricular Affairs and I teach in the Energy and Sustainability Policy Major offered through World Campus. I'm supportive of majors related to this, but I think I would challenge us all to think beyond that as well and recognize that we should be integrating sustainability related themes across our majors. We need people who are well-educated in this area to be operating in all the other spaces that we already educate in. I think that in addition to thinking about new majors, we should be re-imagining how we can put this into our existing ones.

Chair Szczygiel: Yeah. Thanks, Brandi. Paul, welcome.

Paul Shrivastava, Institutes of Energy and the Environment: Thank you, Bonj. Yeah, I just wanted to say that majors, of course, are important. It's the jurisdiction of individual colleges to think about those. We are very happy to support any college that wishes to develop one.

But if you look at the bigger trends across academia, many other universities are attempting to deal with this multi-disciplinary nature of the topic by creating entire schools of climate change and sustainability. Columbia University has declared a school that is a collaboration of five of their colleges. Stanford University has declared a similar college for climate and sustainability. I believe there are three or four other university that have done so in the last two years. That's another avenue for addressing the multidisciplinary nature of the topic.

Chair Szczygiel: All right, John, I think you have your charge. He just said yes. Well, thank you all. I see no other comments or questions for this group. Again, very much appreciated in such important work. I think we are ready to move on. 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: Can everyone see this?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, we sure can.

Anna Butler: The first one, the "Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, the Committee on Faculty Affairs" in Appendix D. It passed 137-2.

"Revision to Standing Rules, Article II, Committee on Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity" in Appendix E, it passed 127-2.

"Revisions to Standing Rules, Article III, Section 6, it's the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities" in Appendix F, it passed 126-2.

"The Editorial Separation of Existing Curricular Policies and Procedures" in Appendix G, passed 142-2.

The report on "Access to University-Wide Online Resources to Support Education" in Appendix H passed 128-15.

Then we came to the "Resolution in Support of Academic Freedom and Rejection of Attempts to Interfere with the Teaching of Racial and Social Justice" in Appendix C. There was a motion to end debate on returning report back to the committee. It passed 128-13.

There was a motion to return report back to the committee. It did not pass, and we did not send it back. That was 81 Reject, and 60 Accept.

There was a motion to add the original text then back into the document, which did not pass. The text was left out, the votes were 29 Accept, and 115 Reject.

Then the vote went back to the actual report, the resolution, and it passed 118-23.

Chair Szczygiel: Anna, thank you so much. You have summed up a very productive and long Senate meeting really well. Again, our genuine thanks to you and to all of the Senate Office staff who are flipping switches, and turning wheels, and pressing buttons behind the scenes back there.

Anna Butler: You're very welcome, Bonj.

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Szczygiel: Item L, New Legislative Business. I believe we have one matter. I'd like to acknowledge Senator Galen Grimes and Dr. Michelle Gordon from Greater Allegheny.

Letter from faculty at PSU Greater Allegheny on update of Code of Student Conduct – Appendix N

Galen A. Grimes, Penn State Greater Allegheny: This matter concerns student disruptions that we feel were not properly addressed by the Student Code of Conduct. I have asked Dr. Michelle Gordon, Professor of Business Administration, to address this issue. She has been spearheading this drive at the Greater Allegheny Campus. I think she can more elaborately present it to the Senate than I could. Michelle.

Michelle Gordon, Faculty Member, Penn State Greater Allegheny: Hello. Thank you for having me. Can you all hear me?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes.

Michelle Gordon: Okay, great. I came to this matter tangentially where a faculty member called me one evening, a tenured faculty member, and said, "I'm afraid to go to class tomorrow. I'm afraid to hold class because of a disruptive student." It quickly became apparent that she felt that the Student Conduct procedures were not working for her. Shortly thereafter, I was at a BSB meeting represented by 18 campuses and there were a lot of similar comments. We discussed this at our Faculty Senate meeting, and may I share my screen?

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, please.

Michelle Gordon: Okay. As you can see, the Greater Allegheny Faculty Senate has asked that our full Faculty Senate request that the Office of Student Conduct coordinate with them on a couple of matters.

First of all, there was some concern that maybe the Code of Conduct needs to be updated to address Zoom and online behavior and communication. Secondly, is the policy as up-to-date and as comprehensive as it could be? Third, and probably very importantly is the idea that as it stands now, a lot of faculty members, both at our campus and across the University, I've talked to a lot of people in the past couple of months about this, feel that faculty don't have agency in the process. That the Office of Student Conduct investigates an issue that's brought forward and comes back with a resolution, and the faculty member doesn't necessarily have a say in saying whether they feel comfortable with the resolution.

Finally, there is absolutely a possibility of sample bias here or sample error. I talked to a lot of people and had a lot of issues. But what we don't know is what are the total number of issues and how many of them were resolved to everybody's satisfaction? It could be at a University of our size that there were 500 incidents, and I've only heard about the couple dozen that people were unhappy about. It struck our Greater Allegheny Faculty Senate that there should be some reporting mechanism so that we get a sense of this. We provide a lot of other safety statistics at Penn State and couldn't this be some of them? With that, I will take your questions and comments.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Michelle. Josh.

Joshua Graham, Penn State Beaver: Graham, Penn State Beaver. I just had a question. There's absolutely this need to protect the faculty. But my concern looking at this is two-fold.

First, you definitely be looking at just one side of any disagreement if the only person who's involved is 1/2 the bereaved parties. Then the second thing is that there's also an inherent denial of the faculty, of the student in this matter, which is to say that the student is an adult unless they are 17. While the substance of that adulthood may still be formulative, they certainly are entitled to be treated as an adult. I would imagine that that would mean an equal representation during a situation like this, a disagreement like this. I will be very cognizant of whether or not this creates a bias towards a resolution that is almost as though we have one's hand on that scale of justice, so to speak.

Chair Szczygiel: Josh, I might be able to help there just by simply saying that the request is to begin a conversation. Your comments are heard and are well considered. But I don't think this is meant to be accusatory, but the numbers of incidence that is occurring make this certainly something that catches our attention. But thank you for your comment. Michelle, did you have anything to add to that?

Michelle Gordon: Simply that I agree that all parties should have a say. What seems to happen recently is that faculty feel like they don't have a say. If the Office of Student Conduct says, 'We don't believe that there's a concern here.' You still have a faculty member who is the most direct participant and says, 'I just don't feel comfortable with how this is occurring.' Right now, the faculty member does not have agency to say, 'I'm still not comfortable with this student being in my class or this student is continuing to be disruptive or this other students have indicated that they don't feel comfortable engaging in discussion because of this situation.'

I agree that all parties need to have agency. All I would say is that this is a mechanism to ensure that the faculty has agency in the situation, not to prohibit anybody else's agency.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks. Tim, I see your hand is up.

Timothy R. Robicheaux: Kaitlin had a hand up before me, got to go that order. Kaitlin.

Chair Szczygiel: How did you jump ahead? Kaitlin.

Kaitlin Farnan, Penn State Altoona: Thank you. Farnan, Altoona. I think just to provide some greater context to what Michelle mentioned. Some of the issues that I know this has been a pervasive issue that was also brought up at that meeting Michelle referenced at the start of her presentation, surrounded areas where the Student Code of Conduct fell short specifically with regard to communication outside of the classroom, specifically online communication between emails and between students and instructors. Where even Student Conduct individuals agreed that the Student Conduct was not appropriate, where it was not acceptable, but because it was not covered under the definition of classroom space, there was nothing that could be done under the Student Code of Conduct.

In one instance, I noticed that because I know, for instance, that professor was then referred at one instance to go to police services instead of Student Code of Conduct to see if it qualified under the legal definition of harassment because Student Code of Conduct couldn't do anything. This beg to the question of if there are gaps there where faculty are not feeling supported by the University, are not feeling that they have any grounds to even stand upon from a general perspective of having a voice in some of these procedures.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks, Kaitlin. Tim.

Timothy R. Robicheaux: Robicheaux, Liberal Arts. I have no general problem with the report other than just bringing up one thing. Because we're moving to a more restorative justice approach, it may be worth in these conversations asking if this type of transparency and reporting is appropriate under restorative justice approaches and there may be a reason why they're not doing it.

But just to note that they did just recently overhaul the Code of Conduct, but that was pre-COVID. I bet they didn't anticipate a lot of this, but I just want to mostly give, and she may get annoyed with me for doing this because now I'm really volunteering her, but Katie Larkin, who is the full title Senior Director for Office of Student Conduct is awesome. I met with her several times and I think she would be really great to work with on these issues. Because especially with electronic communication, some things have changed faster than we anticipated. But I also think that Katie is really good at navigating things and would be an awesome person for us to work with. I think this is great. I think that some of the context would be really important. I mostly want to endorse Katie, because she's going to have to work with us anyway because she does this. But I think she will be a good person to work with.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks, Tim. I see Melissa. You have your hand up.

Melissa Hardy, College of the Liberal Arts: Yeah. Just a brief comment and that is colleagues have talked to me here at University Park about feeling threatened in their classrooms because they're talking about somewhat controversial topics, in this case, it was gender. But that there was just what they felt was a very aggressive reaction. The response that I think that they got when they tried to report it was, "Did the student threaten you verbally? Did the student grab you?" I don't know if you'd call it amorphous feeling of discomfort and not feeling entirely safe. But there wasn't any particular action that they could point to and say, "There. They said they were going to do this."

I don't know what the answer is, but I've been hearing more and more from faculty of feeling as though somehow there needs to be some kind of process where at least they can register, I guess, I'm not sure what it is. I understand what Tim's saying about going down this certain road, but at this point, it doesn't seem like any circumstances, the faculty really have one.

Michelle Gordon: If I can comment. As I was exploring this issue, I talked to one administrator who said very clearly that the Office of Student Conduct has indicated that unless an overt threat is made, which is I think what you're alluding to, they don't consider it a conduct issue, they consider it an academic issue. I was surprised by that, especially because we have the Penn State Principles, which are not by the way addressed in the Student Conduct guidelines.

I also was surprised about this in that there's a lot of behavior that's not a direct threat, but it is also harmful to the classroom environment. As faculty members, we have a student who perhaps is engaging in some behavior that's not beneficial. Do we really have the ability to address it as an academic issue? "Well, you're being disruptive, so I'm going to lower your letter grade." I don't see how it's just an academic issue. To me, it's very much a behavioral issue which should be dealt with in Student Conduct. When that administrator indicated that they had gotten clear direction from the Student Conduct, that unless it's an overt threat, it's an academic issue, and I'm surprised by that.

Chair Szczygiel: Useful to point out also that we're not only talking about faculty but teaching graduate students as well. I often am hearing anecdotal stories about how they are perceived as being less powerful or more easier to attempt to manipulate in some ways. Seeing no other hands, any other questions, thoughts? The reason why this is listed under New Legislative Businesses is it didn't need to come forward as a motion because I'm on board. They don't have to ask our permission to get involved.

I would like to thank Dr. Gordon, Galen, and everyone else who contributed to this conversation. I have already indicated to these folks that I'm willing and happy to take this issue up with Student Affairs and the Office of Student Conduct. I'm ready to move on this now. I would like to begin with starting a conversation with Student Life, but would also like to broaden it beyond committee, that logical committee, and ask if there are any senators at this meeting, or if you know anyone else who might be interested in wanting to join in this conversation to please pass your name on to me. We'll see if we can get some folks together and, again, just start to dive in and have this conversation. Thank you very much, Melissa and Galen for bringing this to my attention.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Szczygiel: I'm sorry, Michelle. I think we have wrapped this up. Almost. We have one more really critical thing to do. Are there Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the University, anyone? I'm not seeing any. Before we proceed to the next and final, the most important motion of all, I want to just simply remind everyone that although we will not have a plenary meeting on February 22, it is a day that is set forth aside for continued Senate Committee meetings and an election forum that afternoon.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Szczygiel: Now, may I please have a motion to adjourn?

Galen A. Grimes: So, moved.

Chair Szczygiel: Was there a second in there?

Mary Beth Williams: I second.

Chair Szczygiel: More critically, might we possibly have a majority vote? All in favor of this motion say aye. Thank you for your enthusiasm. I think we got a majority vote there. Thank you all so much. We'll just wrap it up. Have a great evening.

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, 1:30 p.m.

The following Senators were noted as having attended the 1/25/2022 Senate Meeting.

- Abendroth, Catherine
- Acharya, Vinita
- Adu, Kofi
- Alexander, Chandran
- Amador Medina, Melba
- Aurand, Harold
- Austin, Kelly
- Ax-Fultz, Laura
- Baka, Jennifer
- Bansal, Saurabh
- Barron, Eric
- Bartolacci, Michael
- Belanger, Jonna
- Bieschke, Kathleen
- Bird, Douglas
- Birungi, Patricia
- Bishop-Pierce, Renee
- Blakney, Terry
- Blockett, Kimberly
- Blood, Ingrid
- Borromeo, Renee
- Bowley, Kevin
- Braman, Valerie
- Brown, Nathaniel
- Browne, Stephen
- Brunsden, Victor
- Byrne, Christopher
- Calore, Gary
- Chen, Wei-Fan
- Chetlen, Alison
- Cohen, Stephen
- Costanzo, Denise
- Davis, Dwight
- Drager, Kathryn
- Duffey, Michele
- Eckhardt, Caroline
- Egolf, Roger
- Engel, Renata
- Eppley, Karen
- Fairbank, James

- Fanburg-Smith, Julie
- Farnan, Kaitlin
- Farrar, Katelyn
- Fausnight, Tracy
- Fox, Derek
- Frederick, Samuel
- Fredricks, Susan
- Freiberg, Andrew
- Frisch, Paul
- Fuller, Edward
- Furfaro, Joyce
- Fusco, David
- Gallagher, Julie
- Gaudelius, Yvonne
- Gayah, Vikash
- Glantz, Edward
- Graham, Joshua
- Griffin, Christopher
- Grimes, Galen
- Gross, Charlene
- Grozinger, Christina
- Haddad, Owen
- Hardin, Marie
- Hardy, Melissa
- Harris, Jeff
- Hauck, Randy
- Hayford, Harold
- Hemerly, Nathan
- Higgins, Jeanmarie
- Holden, Lisa
- Huang, Tai-Yin
- Hufnagel, Pamela
- Iliev, Peter
- Jett, Dennis
- Jolly, Rosemary
- Jones, Nicholas
- Jordan, Matthew
- Karpa, Kelly
- Kass, Lawrence
- Kass, Rena
- Kennedy-Phillips, Lance
- Kenyon, William
- Kim, Agnes
- King, Elizabeth
- Kitko, Lisa

- Klug, Rebecca
- Kubat, Robert
- Kunes, Melissa
- Lang, Dena
- Le, Binh
- Lear, Matthew
- Ledford, Savanna
- Linch, Amy
- Linn, Suzanna
- Liu, Dajiang
- Love, Jeff
- Mahoney, Joseph
- Malcos, Jennelle
- Malysz, Jozef
- Mangel, Lisa
- Marko, Frantisek
- Mason, John
- Mathews, Jonathan
- Maximova, Siela
- McCoy, Heather
- McKinney Marvasti, Karyn
- Melton, Robert
- Messner, John
- Mets, Berend
- Michels, Margaret
- Mocioiu, Irina
- Mookerjee, Rajen
- Moore, Jacob
- Mulder, Kathleen
- Najjar, Raymond
- Nesbitt, Jennifer
- Noce, Kathleen
- Nousek, John
- Novotny, Eric
- Nurkhaidarov, Ermek
- Ofosu, Willie
- Ozment, Judith
- Page, B.Richard
- Palma, Julio
- Palmer, Timothy
- Parizek, Heather
- Perkins, Daniel
- Petrilla, Rosemarie
- Pfeifer Reitz, Dawn
- Pierce, Mari Beth

- Posey, Lisa
- Potosky, Denise
- Precht, Jay
- Purdy Drew, Kirstin
- Rhen, Linda
- Riccomini, Paul
- Richardson, Lewis
- Robertson, Noah
- Robicheaux, Timothy
- Robinson, Brandi
- Roy, Matthew
- Ruggiero, Francesca
- Rutherford Siegel, Susan
- Saltz, Ira
- Saunders, Brian
- Schaeffer, Lillian
- Schneider, Noelle
- Scott, Geoffrey
- Seymour, Elizabeth
- Shannon, Robert
- Shapiro, Keith
- Sharma, Amit
- Shea, Maura
- Shearer, Gregory
- Shen, Wen
- Shurgalla, Richard
- Signorella, Margaret
- Sigurdsson, Steinn
- Simmons, Cynthia
- Sinha, Alok
- Skladany, Martin
- Sloboda, Noel
- Slot, Johanna
- Smith, David
- Snyder, Stephen
- Springall, Rob
- Sproy Forté, Karin
- Stine, Michele
- Strauss, James
- Strickland, Martha
- Strupczewski, Matt
- Subramanian, Rajarajan
- Suliman, Samia
- Swinarski, Matthew
- Tallman, Nathan

- Tavangarian, Fariborz
- Taylor, Ann
- Taylor, Jonté
- Thomas, Emily
- Thomas, Gary
- Tyworth, Michael
- Urbina, Julio
- Van Hook, Stephen
- Vujan Mcclosky, Andrea
- Walker, Eric
- Warner, Alfred
- Watts, Alison
- Wede, Joshua
- Whitcomb, Tiffany
- Whitehurst, Marcus
- Williams, Mary Beth
- Williams, Nicole
- Wong, Jeffrey
- Wright, Suzanne
- Yagnik, Arpan
- Yamamoto, Namiko
- Yen, John
- Zacharia, Thomas
- Zhang, Qiming
- Zorn, Christopher

Elected 171
Students 13
Ex Officio 6
Appointed 9
Total 200

