



THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

THE SENATE RECORD

Volume 55-----March 15, 2022----Number 8

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 March 15, 2022	Pages ii-iii
II.	Minutes and Summaries of Remarks	Pages 1-59
III.	Appendices	
	a. Attendance	Pages 60-61

FINAL AGENDA MARCH 15, 2022

- A. [MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING](#) Page 2
Minutes of the January 25, 2022, in The Senate Record 55:7 Page 2
- B. [COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE](#) Page 2
[Senate Curriculum Report of February 15, 2022](#)
<http://Senate.psu.edu/curriculum/Senate-curriculum-reports/>
- C. [REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL](#) Meeting of February 15, 2022 Page 2
- D. [ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR](#) Pages 3-7

[Penn State's 2024 Self-Study Overview](#) Pages 4-7
- Guests:**
Lance C. Kennedy-Phillips, PhD, Vice Provost for Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research
David Callejo, PhD, Associate Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses
- E. [COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY](#) Pages 7-9
- F. [COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST](#) Pages 9-17
- G. [FORENSIC BUSINESS - NONE](#) Page 17
- H. [UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE](#) Page 17
- I. [LEGISLATIVE REPORTS \(the second report proposes additions of DEI principles to Committee Standing Rules\)](#) Pages 17-34

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules and Self-Study Committee

[Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6\(p\) Elected Senator Standing Committee – Appendix B](#) Pages 18-27

Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and Education

[Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II– Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 \(d\), Committee on Education – Addition of DEI Principles – Appendix C](#) Pages 27-28

Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and Intercollegiate Athletics

[Revision to Standing Rules, Article III – Other Functions of the Senate, Section 8 – Faculty Athletics Representatives – Appendix D](#) Pages 28

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules and Senate Self-Study Committee

[Proposed Preamble to the Senate Constitution entitled: A Statement On the Rule of the Faculty Senate at the Pennsylvania State University – Appendix E](#) Page 29
(to be presented at the 3/15 Plenary Meeting and voted on at the 4/26 Plenary Meeting)

Senate Committee on Education

[Revision to Policy 45-00 Faculty and Student Responsibilities Regarding Cancelled Class When a Campus is Closed – Appendix F](#) Page 29-33

J. [ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS – NONE](#) Page 34

K. [POSITIONAL REPORTS - NONE](#) Page 34

L. [INFORMATIONAL REPORTS](#) Pages 34-58

Senate Committee on University Planning

[Annual Budget Report – Appendix G](#) Pages 34-40
[15 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]

Senate Committee on Outreach

[Penn State Outreach: Urban Engagement – Appendix H](#) Pages 40-45
[15 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules

[Committees and Rules Nominations Report – Appendix I](#) Pages 45-47
[10 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]

Senate Elections Commission

[*Annual University Faculty Census Report – Appendix J](#) Page 47

Senate Council

[Senate Council Nominations Report – Appendix K](#) Pages 47-49
[10 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]

Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs: Standing Joint Committee on General Education Assessment

[Update on General Education Assessment – Appendix L](#) Pages 49-51
[15 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]

Senate Committee on University Planning

[Capital Budget Report – Appendix M](#) Pages 51-58

*Web-only reports.

- M. [NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS - NONE](#) Page 58
- N. [COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY](#) Pages 58-59
- O. [ADJOURNMENT](#) Page 60

The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, at 1:30 p.m. via Zoom Webinar with Bonj Szczygiel, Chair, presiding.

Bonj Szczygiel, College of Arts & Architecture: It is 1:30 PM, Tuesday, March 15th, 2022, and the Senate is now in session. Hi, everyone. Today we are meeting in a Zoom format. Surprise. Let me begin by going through some fairly familiar instructions by now.

Who can speak in a senate meeting? The privilege of the floor in the Senate meeting is given to only members of one of the following categories. Number one, elected or appointed student, faculty, or administrative senators. Second category is the senators elected to represent retired faculty. The third category are past chairs of the Faculty Senate.

The meetings are public and others can join and listen, but please do not try to ask a question unless you belong to one of those three categories. You can email Erin Eckley in the Senate Office if you would like to request to speak at a future meeting. I think we've placed Erin's e-address in the chat or we soon will be.

Our Zoom capacity is 1,000 people. We normally do not have to be concerned about reaching that level, but if you should have to miss a meeting, a record will be available within three weeks of the meeting. This meeting like all Senate plenaries, is being recorded. Please be mindful of your microphone, so we don't have background noise interfering with the meeting. If you are comfortable in so doing and able please do share your kind and engaged faces with us all.

Regarding the use of the chat function of Zoom, we're doing really well in this aspect. 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 report a technical problem. Please remember, chat posts are not anonymous, neither are they private. I ask that those who wish to engage, please do so, but with restraint and consideration for everyone attending this meeting.

If you're presenting a report when it is time for your report, 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. Likewise, her e-dress has also been placed in the chat.

How do you ask a question? Use the Raised Hand function until the Chair recognizes you. Begin by stating your last name and academic unit, for example, Szczygiel, Arts & Architecture. Please speak clearly and slowly as the audio is not always clear on Zoom calls.

In order to get an accurate vote, we are again using TallySpace. Today we will be posting that link in chat and—sweet. It is suggested you retrieve your nine-digit ID now, have it handy, folks, we all know what's going to happen. But please hold off before you log on to TallySpace until we're ready to vote, as it does have a two-hour session limit. You will need your Penn State ID to be able to log into the system and cast your vote. Please get those IDs handy.

Final note. As always, please be patient. Running a meeting like this is a lot like herding rabbits, and believe me, when I tell you that all of the Senate Office staff are now with us here behind the scenes, trying to make very sure that everything is working smoothly, so thank you to them. I want to welcome

everyone, and thank you for being here today. Your commitment to the Senate is frankly more important than ever. I do know it can be exhausting, but I also know it can be incredibly rewarding. Know that I see you, and know that I and all of the Senate leadership and the Senate Office value your time, your commitment, and your efforts.

We are here also to support you. Please don't hesitate to reach out to me or anyone in the Senate Office. I want to thank our resource people and guests for attending and engaging in the work of the Senate. It's really no fun just sitting and talking to ourselves. As always, I want to thank the Senate Office for their hard work without their support none of this could get accomplished. On to the Agenda.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Meeting of the January 25, 2022

Chair Szczygiel: Item A of our Agenda, Minutes of the Preceding Meeting. The minutes of the Senate plenaries are in two forms, a video recording of the meeting that's posted within a few days from today, and the formal Senate Record providing a full transcription of the proceedings of the meeting. The transcription process takes clearly a lot longer time to produce and if it's not available prior to the following meeting, proving the minutes may mean only the recording that is posted on the Senate website.

Today, we have both posted and available for review. We should note that since the Senate Record is required to be verbatim, corrections to the transcription can be made at any time by notifying the Senate Office if mistakes are found, anytime. Three years from now, if you're scrolling through the Senate Record and you discover a problem, please bring that to the attention of the Senate Office.

Having said that, are there any additions or corrections to the January 25th, 2022 meeting record at this time? If so please raise your hand. Your virtual hand, that is. Seeing none. The record is approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report of February 15, 2022

Chair Szczygiel: Next, Item B, Communications to the Senate, "The Senate Curriculum Report of February 15th, 2022," posted on the University Faculty website and listed on the Agenda as Appendix A.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Meeting of February 15, 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, Announcements by the Chair. I do have a few announcements. I will try to keep them brief. First, I just want to alert everyone, remind everyone that the Senate Committee on Student Life is preparing to award the annual John White Graduate Fellowship for the 2022, 2023 academic year.

This Fellowship recognizes outstanding undergraduate students who are graduating Summa Cum Laude and who plan to enroll in graduate study. Available funds are based on an endowment and, of course, funds are not efficient to award all deserving candidates. But you can donate to the John White Fellowship fund by using the donate link on the homepage of the University Faculty Senate website. You can even make it a gift in honor or in memory of someone. Thank you for your support.

Second, I would like to report the result of our special election if you recall held last month. John Champagne from Behrend Campus was elected as member of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee starting this spring. Thank you, John, for being really willing to stand for this important committee.

I also want to give you a few updates on two important Senate initiatives, both in conjunction with the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, and Vice Provost Kathy Bieschke. First is the improvements to AC-14, the section related to annual administrator feedback. This was the work, if you recall, undertaken by a small committee led by Assistant Vice Provost, Abby Diehl and involving University faculty Senators and faculty leadership. As you know, this revision to AC-14 was put forward to the Senate and approved in 2019, and presents an opportunity for faculty and staff to provide annual constructive feedback to their direct supervisors, and if they choose, those administrators with whom they closely work.

I want to emphasize this feedback is made anonymous to those being reviewed. You should receive an email with a link to the survey tomorrow, March 16th, Wednesday, and colleagues you'll be getting lots of reminders about this because the process is only as good as the number of people who participate. I urge you to please make time for this. It's important.

We have an exciting update on the "Teaching Assessment Framework Report" approved by this body at our September meeting. The report's recommendations were approved by President Barron. We have pulled together an Executive Oversight Group for a Joint Task Force on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness with our own Senator Josh Wede and Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Development, Ann Clements, serving as Co-Chairs. This Group will be looking to populate the Joint Task Force over the next few weeks. I know we all wish Josh, and Ann much luck in going forward.

Finally, somber note regarding the recent loss of some of our friends of the Senate. In February of this year, Mary Beth Clark passed away. A long-serving and highly engaged Senator from nursing and HHD. After eight years of Senate service, she remained one of our elected retirees for yet another four years.

Mary lived in Hershey with her husband of 47 years, an Associate Professor of Penn State School of Nursing for over 30 years. Mary led the program as the Coordinator at the Hershey Campus. She established and led the Neonatal Nurse Practitioner Program for 11 years and led numerous award-

winning research projects, including an initiative on Interprofessional Education that is, exploring the need for better communication in relations between nurses and doctors. I'll applaud that.

Also, in February at age 86, Rob Heinsohn died—a resident of State College. Rob was a Professor of Mechanical Engineering at Penn State for more than 34 years and retired in 1997 with emeritus status. Another long serving Senator and a very engaged—Rob was a senator for 18 years, starting in 1979, I'll let you do the math, and served as Secretary of the Faculty Senate from 94-95. He also served as an elected retired faculty senator from 2002-2006. His research focused on topics related to air quality and ventilation and co-authored a book on air pollution. A sympathy card has been sent to each of those families from the Senate Office.

Most recently, and tragically this past week, we lost a good friend of the Senate, Geoff Mamerow, age 43. Geoff was Assistant Vice Provost for Assessment within OPAIR. OPAIR is of course, the Office of Planning Assessment and Institutional Research, and supported faculty program coordinators, administrators, and this body to develop and execute plans to assess student learning. I know many of us in this room have either worked or interacted with Geoff and all have had a very similar refrain regarding this loss. You all have spoken to me about his kindness, his patience, good-nature, and willingness to go the extra mile to help his colleagues. It leaves many still reeling and a bit off-balance.

Geoff served on the Senate Committee for Curricular Affairs and Mary Beth Williams recently shared with me his love of music and talents with the guitar, thus explaining his previous—get this—Associate of Science degree in the Recording Arts from Full Sail University. Never heard of them. That is listed in his bio. Our condolences go out to Geoff's family and friends and all those who worked with him. For these profound losses and for so many others world-wide, I would ask that we simply have a moment of silence, please. Thank you.

Penn State's 2024 Self-Study Overview

Chair Szczygiel: Now, I would like to introduce Dr. Lance Kennedy-Phillips, Vice-Provost for Planning Assessment and Institutional Research, and Dr. David Callejo, Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses, who will be presenting an overview of Penn State's 2024 Self-Study. Gentlemen, the stage is yours.

Lance Kennedy-Phillips, Vice Provost: Dave, before we go—take a moment to say thank you, Bonj, for recognizing our very big loss of Geoff Mamerow and thank you to all of our friends on here who've reached out to members of our office over the last week or so and we do appreciate it, and it's a tragic lose for OPAIR. Thank you. Okay, Dave.

David Callejo, Associate Vice President and Senior Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Commonwealth Campuses: Thanks, Lance. Share my screen. Let me get the right one. You have the right screen shared?

Chair Szczygiel: Looks good to me.

David Callejo: All right. Perfect. Thank you everyone for giving us this time today. I'll try to be brief and leave time for questions. Once again, good afternoon and thank you for your time. We once again arrived at the critical juncture in our eight-year accreditation cycle when we come together as a university community to engage in a period of institutional self-reflection appraisal.

The University Self-Study. As Bonj said I'm David Callejo Perez, Associate Vice President and Senior Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Commonwealth Campuses, and I'm preparing the Self-Study with my colleague Lance Kennedy-Phillips, Vice-Provost for Planning Assessment and Institutional Research, and we'd like to take a couple of minutes to walk you through this process and the importance of your participation in it. As a representative body of Penn State's faculty, it's important that you are aware of the fundamental role that faculty members play in this reaffirmation of the accreditation process.

To get us started, I'd like to take a brief minute to go over overview of the next two-and-half years for Middle States Commission on Higher Education in the self-study accreditation process, and it's important to us as an institution of higher education. First and foremost, the self-study is a period of in-depth introspection and a significant opportunity not only to highlight Penn State's accomplishments, but to work toward continuous advancement of our processes and structures and determine where there may be opportunities for improvement and innovation. Ultimately, of course, it's time to effectively demonstrate the Middle States that we have earned reaffirmation of accreditation.

The focus of the self-study is to provide robust evidence and analysis of ongoing compliance with accreditation standards set forth by the Middle States Commission. The self-study process must also be deliberately inclusive and transparent and relies upon engagement of the entire university community. There's a lot of important work to do between now and then, and as a University Faculty Senate, you represent those educators that have a crucial role to play in this process. We thank you all for your leadership and commitment to this critical endeavor. Excuse me.

Before we dive into the details of the self-study, I like to first talk a little bit about the importance of accreditation, the reason behind the self-study. As a reminder, Penn State is accredited as one university geographically dispersed, meaning that all 24 campus locations are included in the accreditation process. Accreditation is grounded in specific values and beliefs about higher education, including the importance of the institutional mission and the vital role of academic freedom. Accreditation also importantly provide economy by participating in a voluntary self-regulatory which is an alternative to top-down federal and state oversight functions. The University's reaffirmation or accreditation is contingent upon the success of the self-study.

Accreditation is essential in maintaining our state and federal funding, and provides eligibility for everything from financial aid entitled for benefits to access to external funding. Accreditation also has a significant impact on our graduate's ability to attend graduate school and sit for many professional exams. While those are undoubtedly significant motivators themselves, it's also essential to keep in mind that accreditation generates private sector confidence. Accreditation speaks to the value of a Penn State education and helps to assure parents and students that paying the current price of higher education yields tangible effects.

Next, we'll take a closer look at the overall Middle States accreditation cycle. Within Middle States, member institutions engage in their self-study every eight years. They undergo a midpoint peer review every four years and submit an annual reporting each spring. The annual institutional updates require institutions to provide key data, including enrollment numbers, the financial standing of the institution, and measures of student achievement. Midpoint peer reviews are reviews of the past four years of accumulated data from those annual institutional updates and finally, the self-study evaluation.

It's important to mention that the whole of the Self-Study work is overseen by steering committee, which comprises seven working groups with a tri chair structure. They agree so each analyze compliance with

one of the seven standards for accreditation. As you can see, Middle States standards of accreditation are wide ranging and cover everything from mission and goals to support of the student experience and institutional effectiveness. Because of your role as faculty, your involvement across each of the seven standards is essential. One example is Laura Pauley, the Executive Director of the Senate, who serves as a tri-Chair of standards seven working group governance, leadership and administration. We will work with senator leadership to look at the role of faculty in ensuring our university is institutional quality compliance and continuous improvement through the self-study process.

As a faculty, your collective voice is essential to the self-study and you play an important role. Both Middle States and the University placed an emphasis on the importance of faculty involvement in the self-study process. Your input and feedback on issues like curricular design and effectiveness, assessment of academic performance, retention and graduation rates, quality of academic advising, and appropriateness of co-curricular activities are central to this process.

Additionally, your work with students and your engagement with research puts you in the best position to provide feedback on these issues. Your participation in the self-study can also ensure that faculty voices are heard and you can speak to enhancing conditions of academic life, such as those around academic freedom and tenure, faculty participation and institutional governance and faculty status and morale.

There are numerous other benefits of participation. For example, it provides excellent foreign service to the University. It's a rewarding opportunity to examine how well the University is meeting its mission and work towards improvement where needed. It's engagement in the process that facilitates a self-study's awareness among all faculty by keeping your breath so the process timeline unrelated activities.

On the next slide, we'll review the timeline of some of the high-level and self-study milestones. As you can see by the slide, we have a demanding timeline of the next two and a half years. But we're off to a strong start and with everyone's efforts, this is more than doable. We'll dig a little bit deeper into each year in a few slides.

In January, the self-study steering committee received its formal charge and began to work on a draft of the self-study design. A University-wide kick-off launched with a presentation to the Board of Trustees last month, followed by official institutional wide communications and we will continue to establish our working groups as we ramp up to spring. In April, the steering committee along with the standard working groups will submit the self-study draft to Middle States and prep for a visit from the Middle States liaison, which is on April 15th. In June, we'll look for the self-study design approval from Middle States and first chapter drafts of the self-study report will be due to the steering committee for feedback in December.

In 2023, second chapter drafts will be due from the working groups to the steering committee for feedback by March. There will also be an ongoing back-and-forth of reviews as we develop a draft of the self-study report going into April. Once completed, the steering committee will present the draft report to the University community and designated readers. Faculty involvement is crucial at this point.

You will be needed to serve as content experts and readers for the drafts, particularly for standards 2, 3, 4, ethics and integrity, design and delivery of the student experience in support of the student experience, respectively. Based on that feedback, the draft will be presented to the self-study evaluation team chair selected by Middle States and Penn State and at the end of 2023, we will have our on-site evaluation

team chair visit, make any revisions to the draft as recommended by the evaluation team chair and share the final self-study report with the University community.

Finally, in 2024, we will submit our final self-study report to Middle States in January and prepare for evaluation team visit in late February or early March. At this time, we'll receive the team report and prepare our institutional response. We'll then look at Middle States to provide its official action. Reaffirmation of accreditation in June, which we will then share with their constituents.

For those of you who are interested in participating in the self-study process, you can email selfstudy@psu.edu or fill out to get involve form on the self-study website. You can easily get there from the OPAIR homepage at opair.psu.edu, or it'll be in the PowerPoint so you can also look at the PowerPoint in the Agenda.

On behalf of Lance; Marie, who's here with us; and the entire team and the OPAIR team; and all those who volunteered and will continue to volunteer, we thank you for your time and we're happy to take any questions. I'll stop sharing now.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, David.

David Callejo: Thank you, Bonj.

Chair Szczygiel: Do we have any questions or comments from the floor? I'm a little surprised. I thought you're going to actively recruit like ask for names now, but you didn't do that so that's kind of you.

David Callejo: Yeah. We did not want to be accused of direct marketings.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Szczygiel: 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 brief comments with a 20 minute period for questions to both from the floor if there is interest. It is now my pleasure to recognize President Barron for his comments. Welcome.

Eric James Barron, President, Pennsylvania State University: Thank you very much. I appreciate it. I thought I know you have a full schedule. I thought two things might be of interest. One is, about two weeks ago, we had the Senate appropriations hearing, and over spring break we had the House appropriations hearings. My personal opinion is that Penn State did well in terms of the perspectives of the legislators. Senate part of the hearing was very smooth. The House was also very smooth. It's interesting to look at what the two groups asked about the most. One of the highlights was invent Penn State and role of land-grant mission and promoting economic development, same way we do AG extension.

Of course, we have in the request for the DCED budget \$2.35 million directed to support Penn State and Invent Penn State. We've had over 5,000 faculty staff and students go through the LaunchBoxes to get advice on their companies and a couple of hundred companies in the state of Pennsylvania and numerous other product development. It's been a real success story and it's grown significantly over the last couple years and as you know, we have a LaunchBox within 30 miles of 96 percent of the population of

Pennsylvania. I'll be doing the ribbon cuttings on the last couple of LaunchBox that's already there. But because of COVID, we didn't have the celebrations.

The legislators were keenly interested in and I would say very supportive of Penn State's effort in this space. DCED led their hearing by talking about what Penn State was doing and the quality of the program and why it stood out as worthy of additional support. In each case, they asked about food security and what we're doing to promote students beyond tuition, so this was an opportunity to highlight the study that we did and the recommendations we had that took us everywhere from food banks to swipe out hunger programs, to now foods scholarships and live on scholarships in our residence halls. There was discussion about role in going to end-to-end to speed the path of graduation.

Both chambers asked about THON and the success of THON, which had an all-time record of over 13 million, over 200 million in history, a pride point. We were asked in both chambers about our veterans programs. Of course, we have very strong veterans programs—in the houseHouse, particular interest in our Veterans Center and one-stop shopping. All of these are programs that are helping students be more successful or contributions from the University to the success of the state of Pennsylvania.

There were questions particularly about promoting diversity of the student population and what universities were doing in order to be able to promote increases. Both common app and test optional have made big differences over the last two years in terms of applications and the classes that we recruit. It was noted that there are requests match the governor. There's some people that believe the governor's being too generous, and all of the other state related asked for more than what the governor hadBoth Common App and test optional have made big differences over the last two years, in terms of applications and the classes that we recruit. It was noted that there are request—we match the Governor. There's some people that believe the Governor's being too generous, and all of the other state-related asked for more than what the Governor had. We were actually Neeli from that question as having perhaps a more thoughtful part of that. There was one, and that budget request is 5 percent increase, 5 percent for AG, 5 percent for our ENG budget plus at the Invent Penn State funds.

The only really challenging question that was presented and came from both sides of the aisle was, how in the world are you going to spend the money to build a stadium for football? Because the stadium survey has gone out to something like 80,000 people, with 18,000 already responding as of yesterday, which is remarkable response rate because they view it as incredibly expensive. But this also was an opportunity for the University to point out that our athletic program, unlike a lot of others, is completely self-supporting, and in fact, they Athletics Program provides money to the University - the University does not provide money to the athletic program. This was an opportunity to, once again, highlight the fact that we have our budget fenced in this category.

The other topic that I suspect that you might be interested in is the transition—Neeli Bendapudi is now in resident in State College along with her Chief of Staff, Michael Rich Smith. They were beginning their path to visit all Campuses today and a little bit of engine trouble has delayed that effort, but I know she's very much looking forward to that particular part of it.

Not sure that I mentioned to everyone in this group that there are a number of searches that are going on, like Vice-President of Outreach, for which we are doing this in a dual mode where Frank Guadagnino represents my office and Michael represents Neeli's office, so that we can have both president and president-elect well-informed. The timing—and it can be very smooth and no issues in terms of an

interview process and both of us doing it so that we can hire individuals and the same quality Penn State is accustomed to be able to move forward.

They're working on a very aggressive meeting schedule to make sure that they're meeting with all the leadership and many Board of Trustees members and elsewhere, and I personally believe this is luxury, I think I've said before, for Penn State to have this overlap, to have the opportunity to get to know so many individuals and to be able to, for instance, sit in on meetings like the President's Council or others and absorb all of the business that's going on before having the responsibility to make decisions. I'm feeling very good about the transition plan at this particular point. Obviously we're slightly under two months to go.

I will just stop there. Those are two of the probably the more important items of the moment, and pass the baton back to you, Bonj, so you can pass it to Nick.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Eric. That was a fairly an upbeat report and all good news.

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Szczygiel: On to Item F, Comments by the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University. It's now my pleasure to recognize Provost Jones for his comments.

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: Thank you, Bonj. I've got a list of things to go through, but I will make it quick. It looks like my car is ready to pick up from service, too, so that one'll have to wait. We have a number of searches underway in addition to the ones that Eric mentioned. Of course, an important one for this group is Executive Director for the University Faculty Senate that is in progress and should be coming to conclusion that fairly soon. Searching for a new CIO, that search committee will be doing Zoom interviews at the end of this week and reporting recommended finalists to me. On Friday, we have a list of finalists for the Chief Information Security Officer. First interview, preliminary interview, for me, he takes place this afternoon.

We have finished the search for Dean of Penn State Law in School of International Affairs and now working to finalize that, and hopefully we'll have an announcement in the weeks ahead. The College of Medicine Dean Search is well underway. Kathy Bieschke, Craig Newschaffer, and I will be visiting the College of Medicine this Friday to do a couple of town halls for faculty and staff. The position profile is completed. There's some T's to cross and I's to dot on it, but that will be posted and we will continue to work with the Search Committee and the Search Firm to advance that search.

I have been asked by Frank Guadagnino to put in a plug for annual compliance training. If you haven't received your email yet, you will be receiving it very soon. This is required annual training. It doesn't take too long to do, about 20 minutes maybe, but it is important that everybody does this and we get high participation rates. Please put that at the top of your to-do list and try to get that done as quickly as possible.

COVID, the first time in two years, I don't have a whole lot to report about COVID. I think you're all aware that on the Friday before spring break, in light of the evolving evolving guidance from CDC and our continuing low positivity rates at all campus locations, we relaxed the mask requirement for inside of buildings, with the exception of classrooms, research labs, and other learning spaces. That went into

place Monday a week ago, obviously spring break. There weren't many in the events in the latter category, but certainly it meant that people who were coming into their offices did not need to mask in the building.

The condition state of COVID in the Commonwealth continues to evolve in a positive direction, and so continue to look at both the remaining components of the mask requirement as well as testing strategy with a view to revisions to those in the weeks and months ahead. While everything is looking positive, certainly in Pennsylvania and in the United States, I think as many of you are aware, there are some troubling signs abroad in the Asia Pacific region where Omicron is still reading some havoc, but also in Europe with this latest B2 variant Omicron is resurging. We're keeping a very close eye on that.

We continue to monitor wastewater at University Park, and that has proven to be a very useful tool for us to predict increases in positivity in our population. Right now, we are at the limit of detection in the wastewater catchments that we are observing. At this point, no concern. We didn't want to take further action until we had time to look at data in the post spring break week with everybody having gone away and then returning from many points far afield, we wanted to make sure that positivity rates remained low before considering any further action in masking and testing. Again, that's probably about the shortest COVID report you've had for me for two years, which is a good thing.

Ukraine. We did issue a statement a couple of weeks ago after the invasion of Ukraine by Russia started, as I'm sure most of you have seen. Many of you may not be aware that we actually have a long-standing relationship with a Ukrainian university, through the College of Agricultural Sciences. Rick Roush and Deanna Behring in Agricultural Sciences are working closely with Roger Brindley, the Vice-Provost for Penn State Global, to put together a committee of folks. I think that is either in place or forming as we speak, to make recommendations about how the University can respond in a positive and constructive and a supportive way to our Ukrainian colleagues.

It's very complicated, as you can imagine. Ukraine is a war zone, obviously. Many of you may recall that we mounted an effort during the Afghanistan withdrawal to support Afghan scholars and students. That is still churning along, progress is slow because it is very complex to navigate through these situations, and the Ukrainian one is complex as well, but we've got lots of people around the University who are going to be engaged in this effort to figure out what our best way forward should be.

A related aspect is, while the physical conflict is taking place in Ukraine, heightened concerns exist globally around information security and cyber warfare that could result as a consequence of the conflict. The Office of Information Security is paying a lot of attention right now to our security posture and following what the Feds referred to as more of a shields up posture for us just to be vigilant against potential cyber threats. We are deploying an agent that scans systems for security vulnerabilities.

OIS is working with your Directors of Information Technology to get that implemented and run and identify, and then remediate any vulnerabilities that are found. We are looking at our email security posture. As you know, the most frequent threat vector for us is email that particularly fishes and related penetrations that bring in dangerous payloads. We're set currently at the minimum level of security and we're giving consideration to whether or not that needs to be revised.

Then finally, really just a general concern about the openness of many parts of many of our machines to the broader Internet that leave potential holes for us. These are open ports that most of us don't need to have open, but they can present vulnerabilities that can be exploited by cyber terrorists and others.

We're taking a look at that too to see if there are some recommendations that we can make there. There are older operating systems around that and no longer supported. For example, some of you may remember a few years ago, we did a lot of work around old Windows NT machines, now it's up to Windows 7, is no longer supported by Microsoft, so there are potential vulnerabilities here. We're working with owners of those machines to either upgrade their operating systems, replace their equipment, or disconnect access from the Internet to avoid any troubles.

Final topic I'll mention, they will be going out, I think probably tomorrow, an announcement about the compensation modernization initiative. This was an effort that was launched about a year ago to look at our compensation categories for staff and ultimately the levels of compensation offered within those job classifications. It is a big comprehensive income complicated project, progresses has not been as fast as we would like, and this project has to be extended. We were hoping to have it completed by the summer.

That is not going to happen, so it is being extended to the end of the year. Final topic I'll mention, there will be going out, I think probably tomorrow, an announcement about the compensation modernization initiative. This was an effort that was launched about a year ago to look at our compensation categories for staff and ultimately the levels of compensation offered within those job classifications. It is a big comprehensive income complicated project, progresses has not been as fast as we would like, and this project has to be extended. We were hoping to have it completed by the summer. That is not going to happen, so it is being extended to the end of the year.

One of the requests that we had made of units through this time period was that A, you did not change job classifications for individuals, so we placed a freeze on modifying JRW's, and second, placed a moratorium on making salary adjustments.

We realized that this has produced a lot of angst for people in order to ensure that staff are appropriately compensated, and with the extension now of the project for another six months so that we can have a successful completion, we realized that that was just no longer tenable and so we are relaxing the letter constraint, not the former. There's really no point in putting a lot of effort into rewriting job classifications that are all going to be rewritten anyway, but we are going to be affording units working with their HRSPs, the ability to make salary adjustments as needed to staff.

That's an important constraint that is going to be relaxed and hopefully give everybody a little bit more flexibility to manage some of the challenges that we know that restriction had brought. Bonj, I will stop there. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Provost Jones. To ask questions, use the raise hand function, which you can see at the bottom of your screen. A reminder, the floor, questions are only available and open to Senators, and again, we will limit this Q&A to 20 minutes. If anyone has a question out there, please feel free to virtually raise your hand. These are questions for either President Barron or Provost Jones. Richard.

Richard Page, College of the Liberal Arts: My video is not working. Sorry about that. This is Richard Page, Liberal Arts. Another question for Provost Jones was wondering if you could speak to their support for our Ukrainian and Russian colleagues at both in the faculty staff as well as students. In our college, we have quite a few and I don't know if there were any particular resources that are available for them that may not normally be available.

Provost Jones: Richard, I would just say two weeks ago when the conflict first occurred, we worked with Office of Global Programs and we reached out to Russian and Ukrainian faculty experts in the staff

and students, and basically offered our support as necessary. I don't know Roger Brindley is on. If he is, he might be permitted to speak and give a little bit more detail, but we have reached out and were aware that depending on how long that conflict continues, they could be challenges that start to arise as we go into the summer. When people had plans to do different things to move and so on, and their ability to do that, maybe challenge. We're trying to make be sensitive to that and make sure that we have resources in place to support those folks.

Richard Page: Thank you.

Provost Jones: It doesn't look like Roger's there, so that that'll have to be the detail of that. But Roger Brindley and his team are doing a great job, I think of staying on top of this, and the committee may help make some other recommendations as well.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Susan.

Susan Fredricks, Penn State Brandywine: Hi, Susan Fredricks, Penn State Brandywine. For President Barron, or Vice Provost Jones, do you either one of you have or is there a schedule available for the new president and the touring dates or when they will be visiting other campuses? Is there anything public that we might be able to see or so we can make adjustments and plans? Thank you.

President Barron: I know that there is a schedule, but not all are scheduled yet. I know Frank is on the Zoom. I don't know whether he wishes to comment about whether or not they will be announcing those or it will just be announced on the campuses as they occur.

Frank Thomas Guadagnino, Vice President For Administration: We haven't announced the full tour scheduled because it is a bit in flux as schedules get arranged on the various campuses, and leaving the campus announcements to the chancellors and local leaders. But if anybody's interested just send me an email, it's FTG to and I can get to the current version of it.

President Barron: Do you know whether Neeli is going to go to the LaunchBox opening Brandywine?

Frank Thomas Guadagnino: Hold on one second, let me look at the list.

Susan Fredricks: Will the new president be able to go to all campuses by the end of the semester?

President Barron: That is the plan.

Frank Thomas Guadagnino: That's the plan.

President Barron: I got to do it before assuming responsibility at every campus within a 30-day period and discussions with nearly about a transition. I told her how incredibly valuable it was to meet the faculty, staff, and students and the advisory board and many local officials at each campus as well as seeing the physical plan, and so our discussion, she wanted to make a point to do that as well. I don't think anybody can appreciate the breadth of this university without visiting all of the campuses so.

Susan Fredricks, Penn State Brandywine: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Are there any other questions for the President or the Provost? Kaitlin?

Kaitlin Farnan, Penn State Altoona: Yes. I'm Farnan from Altoona. I received an email from a faculty member at my campus who was concerned with the news that there was considering relaxing the masking mandate further this semester. The concern raised was that some faculty members still have at

risk people they're caring for and children, so there was wondering what considerations will be made for those individuals as the masking mandates are relaxed, considering if you might relax them within classrooms.

President Barron: This is all under discussion this week that we prefer to wait and see what the data is. Posts spring break, there are a large number of people that would like to see it relaxed and a number of people that want to make sure that there are still accommodations. What I've asked is that we have the week to see what the data with posts spring break is and then we will take into account all of that information and come up with a plan for how to finish off the semester.

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: Kaitlin, I might add also. I think it's probably clear but we're not going to tell people not to wear masks. We just going to say, if we were to move in any direction as we did in buildings, we will go to masking optional. But we are sensitive to the concern that some may still have in classrooms or research laboratories.

For example, I've been pretty close contact with my colleagues at other Big Ten institutions, and I think what we're seeing other places do and we would certainly consider here is if there is a faculty member who is immunocompromised or has a child under five or someone immunocompromised at home, that they can simply make a statement in class that they are going to continue to wear a mask and without revealing personal details.

Say they are personal preference is that people who are in that class continue to wear masks, provide detail if he or she is comfortable in doing so. My sense is, just based on what we have observed throughout the pandemic, is that they really has been great cooperation across the community with all of the guidance that we have put out.

Obviously some exceptions here and there but we're optimistic that if a faculty member requests that people mask up in the classes that the students will largely cooperate. There's language that I've seen at other institutions that phrases this quite well, I think, and we will certainly be happy to provide that language will reform of it that is appropriate for us.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Kim.

Kim Blockett, Penn State Brandywine: Thank you. This question is to Provost Jones and I've been asked to ask this question from another Senator, so I need to make that clear. The question is, are there plans to address the faculty salary shortfall given the inflation increases?

Provost Jones: As we prepare plan for the for next year's budget, we are doing our best to ensure that there is a general salary increase program plus some additional funds requested in the budget, so that we can make equity and market adjustments. I'll be candid, it is difficult for us to imagine that we could get to the reported inflation rates or to 7%. We are not going to be in a position where we can do salary increases of that magnitude, but we are acutely aware of the upward pressure on salaries or downward pressures on people's purchasing abilities. It is certainly something that we're going to do our very best to address to the extent possible in next year's budget.

Chair Szczygiel: I see Kevin.

Kevin Andrew Bowley, Penn State Earth and Mineral Sciences: Bowley, EMS. I was just following up on the question regarding plans if we do relax the masking mandates to an optional setting. Is there a plan from the University to reopen the update period, now that the equation has changed for faculty

members who felt more secure or safe in the classroom with everyone fully masked and it being required with that home risks in their family? I'm just curious if that's part of the planning as opposed to relying on our students to take care of us and the way that we've tried to take care of them on that front, which I think many will be respectful, but it's still reduces the level of security that would be this decisions on certain semester. Thank you.

Provost Jones: Yvonne is on. I'm assuming Kevin, you're speaking to opting out of in-person instruction or switching to remote instruction. It's very difficult to do that in the middle of a semester when a course has been posted as being an in-person course, Yvonne, or Kathy, or Renata. I see Renata and Kathy. Yvonne, you maybe there, is there anything that you would like to add, Kathy?

Kathleen Bieschke, Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs: We're not planning to open a new work adjustment process, but certainly faculty who feel particularly at risk could contact the affirmative action office to see if they would qualify for an accommodation if the unit could accommodate that. We have not received many requests to go above the 24 percent, but we would have to track those types of requests if that's what was needed. We do need to fulfill the obligations that we've made to our students to deliver instruction at that level of in-person, 76 percent, I guess, 24.9 percent remote, you know what I mean?

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Kathy. Kofi.

Kofi Adu, Penn State Altoona: Kofi, Penn State Altoona. My question is for the President, Barron. With all that is going on in terms of academic freedom and all the noise that's in the system in terms of even in areas where people are burning books. During your discussion with the Senate and then the House, does any of these—anything came up that relates to academic freedom?

President Barron: Thank you for that question. I feel very strongly about this particular point and I often discover because I track many of them myself, that when I see complaints in the literature, in the media at either end of the spectrum, I have a tendency to go exploring myself, often finding it that what's being said is somehow distorted. I thought it was quite possible that in the House and the Senate there would be questions on this particular issue and there were none.

Chair Szczygiel: I think we can take that as a good note maybe. Approvally but let's hope so. Great. Well, I wait to see if there's anyone else with a question. Can I ask either of you to comment on or clarify the rescission plans as they stand now? There's talk of it being continued for three, six years out. Can you clarify what the budget is going to be looking like? What you would anticipate right now?

President Barron: Well, I can; obviously, I'm the least important person to be able to discuss this question, make a comment. We don't like the rescissions at all. We got a couple of choices here. Quite simply, we can change the population and characteristics of the students we're recruiting, we can raise tuition, or we can have the state increase the support we have. Or we can have philanthropy do things that it doesn't in terms of supporting endeavors that it doesn't normally do.

This is one of the reasons why arguing for increases in state support when they had the money and they currently do have resources coming into their budget becomes extremely important. Twelve million dollars is significant in terms of efforts, and we have a constant drumbeat of control costs through tuition and our return comments are the tuition changes every student a couple of hundred dollars.

But if we were to invest more in the students that are need-based of which we have 17,000 far more than any other institution in this state, and we can do things like Levon grants, that is one year free housing if you go all four years, or the Provost Awards, or the open doors scholarships, where we're talking about thousands of dollars for these students, that's what makes a difference getting them to the finish line.

Our argument is we should have at least inflationary increases in tuition, perhaps not when inflation is at a level it is today, but we should've had inflationary increases in tuition and inflationary increases in state support so that we could manage these issues. Because if you have a recession with an opportunity to invest, that's one thing. But to have a rescission because you're sub inflation, the state support for this institution in today's dollars is less than it was 10 years ago.

The students that are graduating this year are paying less in real dollars than they were when they came in the door, is extremely difficult to operate an institution when those levers are being controlled at that rate. This is why we're working so hard on every single one of these fronts to increase the resources that we have. I'm happy that Nick may comments there, but the last thing that I would want to do is keep rescission going.

Provost Jones: I can put a little bit of color on that issue. We have had rescissions the last several years, as you're all aware. We had hoped that this fiscal year was the last year in which recessions would be imposed. I'll talk about what we did this year in the budget presentation later. Unfortunately, COVID in particular, along with other pressures, has had an impact on institutional budget and financial planning. I think the University Planning Committee, I'm looking at Jim in the middle of my screen got a presentation this morning from Mary Lou Ortiz about financial impacts of COVID.

There is a—Nick, what I would characterize as a negative bubble that is moving through the system and it'll take about one class for it to pop out the other end. That negative bubble in part requires us to plan for next year's budget to have another rescission. The budget is not approved until July, it's March. We got a long way between now and July and lots and lots of numbers to be looking at.

But we're anticipating needing a rescission next fiscal year. But in terms of them continuing beyond that, I didn't think that we would have to do one this year. Plan for one for next fiscal year. I'm disappointed that we do, but I remain optimistic that in the out years we will be able to get away from recessions, and be able to continue to make the investments that Eric was describing.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks. Jim. I see your hand is up. Do you have something to respond quickly regarding the budget?

Jim Strauss, Eberly College of Science: Yes. Speaking for the Planning Committee and giving props to the Provost's budget presentation later on in this meeting, it's really important for faculty senators to take a hard look at the reality of the budget, particularly the Education in general portions that basically fund the educational enterprise that my mind really is a big part of Penn State. The harsh reality of that budget in terms of how it is organized, is the revenue that essentially funds us, the faculty. That means our salaries, that means our benefits, health care, etc., comes really from two sources that comes from tuition dollars that flow in with all of our matriculating students. But we know that that seems to be approximately best-case scenario, a fixed pool, realistic scenario up slowly declining pool based on the demography of Pennsylvania and the northeastern portion of the US. That's not likely to really increase.

As the Provost and President have pointed out, students and their families really want tuition to be kept as low as possible. Our state's not in the best economic situation, longer-term; maybe we've got a little bit

more money this year or last year, but we know that state appropriations have basically been flat for a decade. I guess I will say, unless we start to approach budgeting differently. Unfortunately, recessions and other cost-cutting measures are going to be a way of life maybe in the near term future.

The irony in all of this is that we have a background of record alumni donations coming into this university. But the irony is those monies are directed at any number of different very good things like scholarship for students, buildings, those kinds of things. It's all good. But you almost have a scenario where you've got record amounts of money coming in for donations that's great, but we can't apply those monies to help very stressed part of our budget, which is education in general.

I'm not looking for a solution from the folks in the room, but I would encourage our faculty to really take a hard look at today's budget presentation so you can see those realities. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you very much.

President Barron: You know, that if Bunch, if you don't mind that advice to take a hard look is certainly important, but I want to make sure that there is a very clear and I would read it as a compliment to the faculty, given the incredible demographic changes in this state that have things like PASSHE schools down significantly more than double digits in terms of their population.

If we add University Park flat, our Commonwealth Campuses, and the World Campuses together, the enrollment numbers for Penn State are only different by three-tenths of a percentage point. We do a lot of things to make sure that our campuses are strong, but faculties step-up and they teach classes in a variety of ways. I have a lot of legislators who will sit there and say so you're suffering these demographic trends. In fact, as a sum and we operate as one university that isn't the case.

The issue is having that number of students basically paying at a sub-inflation trend. The state appropriation in the same category, with costs going up between \$50, \$80 million a year, including what would be a modest raise. Second of all, it is remarkable in a lot of ways that we are raising money at a record rate. I think that's something to be incredibly proud of is that our alumni and friends are doing things, are sending a signal by their feat in terms of what it is they're committed to \$750 million.

The goal is students' scholarships. The scholarships that we're giving are tending heavily towards the need-based students. These are the dollars that get people to the finish line and helped this University live its mission, and I don't know what in the world that we would do without that level.

Some of the money, smaller amount, is transformative experiences for students because we know how those experiences in and out of the classroom have a profound impact on our students. Another, about a third of it, are working on programs that are near and dear to our faculty in terms of advancing laboratories and advancing scholarship. So, all of these dollars go directly to mission.

Unfortunately, they don't stop you from—because they are earmarked for particular purposes, they don't stop you from saying, no one says, here's money increase the budget of your department. It is for the cream to add to that particular part of it. The state of Pennsylvania ranks 47th this year in funding for higher education. I was just looking at what that chat said, and in terms of flagships of every state, they support, our tuition levels are in the bottom half in terms of the growth over the last decade.

That just gives you a little bit of a ballpark. I can't really do land grant to land grant to land grant, but I can tell you that we don't we don't look that good in the support that comes from the state at all. In much of this support and other states and other land grants is hidden in the fact that the state also supports the

construction of buildings. We get some money from the Governor, but either philanthropy or tuition dollar builds buildings.

We have to decide to spend the money to build a building or renovate a building, whereas many of our peers to state also supports to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars their construction programs. It's double whammy there in terms of what the level of support is.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Kofi, we are significantly over time, do you have a quick question?

Kofi Adu: Yes. My question is about if we look at the cuts that are being made, mostly when we have denied staff or see a faculty that retired, we don't feel those positions in order to make adjustments. But if you look at the staff and the faculty, we don't see the same thing. Also in terms of the administrative level, are these similar cuts being made at the administrative level in order for us all to be able to whether the budgets that we are going through.

President Barron: The cuts go everywhere.

Provost Jones: Yeah. I would agree with Eric, Kofi, and say that roughly two-thirds of our spend is on people. When we impose a 3% rescission, that is imposed across the board in all areas from the top of the University down. Everybody feels it and everybody is under the same types of pressures that you're describing.

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Thank you, everyone for your questions and for your responses. I appreciate that. Thank you, both President Barron and Provost Jones for joining us again, and it is time to move on.

FORENSIC BUSINESS — NONE

Chair Szczygiel: We look at our Agenda the next item is Forensic Business. There is no Forensic Business today.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS — NONE

Chair Szczygiel: Agenda Item H, Unfinished Business - the same.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Szczygiel: Next, we have Item I, Legislative Reports, and we have five Legislative Reports to be considered. This is one everyone, you're going to have to grab your Penn State ID and we're going to do a present vote, which will help the Senate Staff with attendance and to make sure everyone has access to TallySpace. It's going to put up the present vote. Select A to record you are present at today's meeting and then click save my vote. We'll just give you a few seconds to do that. Anna, when you see some vote flows come in, let us know when you think it's okay for us to move on.

Anna Butler, Senate Office Staff: Okay, I will. I think we're okay to move on. I'll leave this out. People can continue to put their attendance in.

Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(p) Elected Senator Standing Committee

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Anna. Our first Legislative Report is from the Senate Committee on Committee and Rules and the Self-Study Senate Committee. It is a Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(p) Elected Senator Standing Committee. It can be found in Appendix B. Presenting this report today are Annie Taylor from CC&R Chair, Julio Palma, Michele Duffey, Martha Strickland, and wrapping up, Victor Brunsden, from the Senate Self-Study. Folks, it's over to you.

Ann Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Thank you, Bonj. I am happy to stand here in support of this legislation. I would like to actually turn this over to Julio Palma and other members of the Senate Self-Study Committee so that they can briefly orient you to this report, and then engage you in a discussion. Julio?

Julio Palma, Penn State Fayette: Thank you. I'm going to go ahead and share my screen. Thank you, everyone. Yes, we're here to present this proposal. I would like to share that this is what we have been doing for the last few months in the Self-Study Committee, and here are the members of the Self-Study Committee. Also, this is coming from the Committee on Committees and Rules. We had the feedback from these two committees. But also we hear you, we have forums. We have different discussions in caucus and we gather all that feedback. Thastilnk everybody who participated in the forums and provided feedback for this proposal. Martha?

Martha Strickland, Penn State Harrisburg: As we listen to all of you in the last two years actually, we've come up with several challenges that continue to emerge. One is efficiency of the Senate. One area of that efficiency is how to best be able to access the voices of all senators in a meaningful and efficient way, besides during the plenary session, when there is a lot of work that needs to be done and not much time. We also talked a lot and heard a lot through every listening, as well as forum groups concerning communication, and who's hearing what communication, what's happening, who knows what, whose voice is being heard? That came out loud and clear. Thirdly, the challenge was transparency.

Many of us don't know what is being decided, how it's being decided, when it's being decided. Maybe we don't know how to have a voice in that. We have looked at these three challenges. If you go to the next screen, Julio. We said, "Let's look at our Senate then, and let's see what we can start to do to address some of these." As you've heard, we've had several reports already.

This is one of the ways we've looked at addressing this. When we see the University Faculty Senate, we see that there's a composition of the Faculty Senate. Maybe some of you don't know this, of ex officio senators, of appointed senators, and elected senators.

When we're looking at elected senators, we are looking at faculty, students, retired, senators. We're looking, by the way, at administrative deans that have been elected. This composition is really important to pay attention to. As elected senators, we have the job of being representative of our constituents. We have to have representation, we really have to collaborate together. That's the point, that's our job on the

Senate. We are here as advocates. How do we get that job done? We're proposing that a way to do this and to address these challenges is through the Elected Senators Standing Committee.

Michele Lee Duffey, Collge of Health and Human Development: You might ask, why do we need a Standing Committee, at this point? Such a committee will codify a continued existence and in reality a consistency. We will have a space for open discussion so we can generate ideas, which can then be distributed back to some of our other current Standing Committees, where those ideas can be vetted further. The committee allows our elected representatives to work through problems that might need further discussion. As Martha noted, we have limited time during plenary meetings.

This gives us more of that space. Then there's transparency. As a formal Standing Committee, we will have a record of the meeting, the Agenda, and the minutes. The presence of the Agenda and minutes alone are key to providing this transparency. It's something we don't currently have in forums that we've been using effectively for this purpose. Julio, perhaps you can expand on this.

Julio Palma: As we said in the past, we have had sometimes listening sessions, forums, even in the caucus meetings, but those aren't formal mechanisms. We need an official mechanism that actually allows us to gather, to have an open discussion, and talk about issues that concerns all the Senate. More specifically, the functions of this Standing Committee will be advisory and informational to the whole Senate.

We will be able to identify issues so they can be sent to the committees. The committees can work on that while we have the representation of ex officio, appointed, and also the elected senators. In those committees, we could provide positional reports to express consensus.

Sometimes, we come to the plenaries, and we have no clear idea, if there is a consensus, even if there is no consensus. I think it's important to make emphasis in the fact that this committee, it will not have the authority to provide Legislative Reports. It would not have authority to provide Advisory and Consultative Reports to the President, but it will have the authority to provide these Positional Reports and Forensic Reports. At the end, what we want is that opportunity, that official mechanism, to challenge, to discuss, to deliberate, and if it's appropriate, to have a vote, to better represent the units. Victor?

Victor Brunsden, Penn State Altoona: I would like people to focus on some of the benefits that this provides. This allows us to do some things that we have not been able to do as an institution. The Senate is a good place for getting work done, but we have no mechanisms for our elected members to get together and generate ideas. We've had several situations in the last couple of years, where we've needed to do that. We've had to create ad hoc forums to do so.

The existence of this committee would allow us to do that. The plenary meetings are business meetings. That's what we're doing now. We are about to vote on this proposal. We don't have the bandwidth to be able to engage in blue-sky thinking and perhaps kicking around ideas. Being a Standing Committee means that it continues. There are agendas, there are minutes. It is ironic that the Senate, which is one of the only two internal institutions to this university that touch every academic unit, has no mechanism for its elected members to actually discuss things, without it being in a plenary meeting.

This actually provides a venue and a structured way for that to happen. This does not take away any of the other functions of committees, etc. In fact, this lengthens the pipeline, if you like. We are not cutting anything out. This is actually adding something. With that, I think I can turn it over to the thank-yous.

Julio Palma: Thank you, everyone. I'll leave it to the Chair to go to discussion and questions. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, everyone, for the excellent report. We have the presenters, as well as the members from the Self-Study Committee, ready to respond to any questions or concerns or thoughts. Please, if you would like to express anything, raise your hands, recognize yourself and your unit. David Smith.

David Smith, Office of Undergraduate Education: David Smith, Division of Undergraduate Studies. Thank you for the report. I think it is a really good idea in many ways. The idea of having space for these blue sky conversations is really important that's where we can generate good ideas for moving things forward.

As an ex officio member of Senate with voting rights in certain areas, I've really tried personally to be fully engaged with Senate and to be a really good collaborator and colleague to see things move forward that really will benefit the University as a whole, to really keep our eye focused on how students experience the University and how we really try to advance equity as a critical part of our efforts.

The advising community is part of what I bring to this forum, to the Senate. I represent the advising community. I'm not elected in that capacity, but I am ex officio by the fact of my role here as the Associate Dean of Advising and Executive Director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies. The advising community is a really important part of how we fulfill the educational mission of the institution. It's a very important part of how we fulfill the policies that the Senate votes on and how we articulate the curriculum to our students and help them navigate the complexities that we've created.

I feel that not having a voice in that forum where we're doing blue sky thinking is unfortunate. I just wanted to voice that and say that I think this is a lost opportunity to bring a wider range of voices into this conversation. Martha indicated that this was really a way to allow voices of all Senators. I hope that we might find a way to minimally include some of the appointed or ex officio Senators in this blue sky conversation. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, David. Renata.

Renata Engel, Office of the Vice Provost for Online Education: Thank you. I join David in thanking you for the presentation and to the work on this. I'm an appointed Senator and I've also, I think in my time at Penn State been an elected Senator probably ex officio, and certainly a resource at different types of positions that I've had. What I wanted to do today was to think of the ways that I have worked in all of those roles and what my experience has been.

What I see is that we get better solutions when we have all of the voices of the senators in the room and particularly, I think when we think of a blue sky thinking and those things. Now, this legislation could be as it is, the right solution, but actually it really almost didn't include the voices to actually see if this is the best solution by way of its construct.

I look at this and I think we as senators then will vote on something today that will structurally create a body that will exclude a number of the voices that have contributed in the past two written reports and discussions. Now it's true that those things do have another avenue, plenary sessions, etc, that could come up, but not in crafting the original position or the perspective or those discussions which I think are really important. I just ask that people think about, as we're voting on this important legislation that we think

about our own past experiences and what we think of as the values of the voices that we have around the University that contribute to our work in the Senate. I'll conclude my remarks there.

I guess I should've said at the beginning, Engel, World Campus. Bonj before you remind me to do that, I said it at the end.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Renata. Julio.

Julio Palma: Palma, Fayette. I don't know how the dynamics is. But I want to address these concerns which are a very valid concerns. But remember, this committee is not taking anything away from the committees. We have 14 Standing Committees where we have different expertise, where we have ex officio appointed members there. In these standing committee, it's very important thinking also about the minority position, for example.

In the plenary, it is very difficult for the minority position to raise their case, so these Standing Committees can do that when it comes to the elected Senators. Just like in any committee, if we're discussing something about, for example, advising, as David pointed out, we can bring his expertise, is not something that we cannot do, we do that in all the committees.

This will be another committee where we will be practicing those good practices, excuse the redundancy there, but doing those practices. Then again, we cannot write legislature. Those things will go back to committees, for example, if it's something that is important for Curricular Affairs or for Faculty Affairs or list, they go back to the committee, so they work on that. Anyway, I wanted to address that. Again, we're not taking anything away, any of the expertise. On the contrary, we are providing that space for open discussion.

Chair Szczygiel: Okay. Thank you, Julio. John.

John Gerard Champagne, Penn State Erie: Champagne, Penn State Erie, the Behrend College. I wanted to speak in favor of this. As a new Senator, and some of you have heard this already, I attended a meeting of the Commonwealth Caucus and after the meeting, I immediately wrote to Frank and said, "How do we maintain this discussion?" Frank said, "You come to next month's meeting." ... Is it soundtrack when I'm speaking?

Chair Szczygiel: Could we mute Rick.

John Gerard Champagne: Thank you. Truthfully, it troubles me that we don't have this means of communicating with one another. I am frequently astonished by the fact that faculty at this university do not have the capability to contact one another unless they're going to produce their own email list of faculty. I don't understand why we don't have a Listserv that allows faculty to communicate. It strikes me as highly undemocratic.

Additionally, there are plenty of meetings from which elected Senators are Neeli. Like regular meetings of deans, for example. This is not new to have these bodies where people would get together, who are of that group. We are elected Senators, we need to have a space to talk, just as the deans have their own space to talk, just as advisors have their own spaces to talk. Thanks.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, John. Josh.

Joshua Wede, College of the Liberal Arts: Wede, College of Liberal Arts. I also want to speak in a strong support of this legislation. What Senator Engel and Smith were saying, I think the elected Senators

have a very particular role. There needs to be a mechanism in place for this elected Senators to fulfill their duties. I think this creates that mechanism in a transparent as way as possible. I commend the two groups that put this together for their hard work and making this something that is as transparent as it can possibly be.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Josh. Carey.

Caroline Eckhardt, College of the Liberal Arts: Sorry. I seem to find myself on both sides of this. On the one hand, I really see the value of opportunities for senators to talk about issues around our minds and not only in the plenary meetings or committee meetings where we run out of time. There's some weariness there towards the end and some things don't get said.

On the other hand, I thought we were beginning to use the forums that way over the past year or so. That was interesting as an experiment because after a while, I think we already hit the density of being more than sufficient on the forums because attendance was not always that great. So I found myself thinking, if we imagine this as a Plenary meeting of up to 200 senators will quickly dwindle to the small group who have a lot of time who are going to keep coming.

We'll have become a shadow group in the Senate, so the total time and investment worries me. I think it would work best if it were used actually rather rarely, not on an ongoing basis, because I don't think it would truly function to be a group for everybody. The second reason why I come into the same feeling that I would hope it would be used only very rarely, is I think we need to be very careful not to undercut our own emphasis on the value of shared governance.

This would establish a mechanism for the Senate approximately 200 elected members, but not it's approximately, I don't know the number, maybe 20 or 30 appointed ex officio members, they come together and to meet. This group could also have the authority to start creating subcommittees. In other words, there could be a lot of activity going on that would not be in the spirit of shared governance.

We ourselves in other contexts, such as the upcoming other Legislative Report today, which would add a preamble to the Senate constitution that talks very strongly about the value of the Senate and also shared governance will be undercutting our own emphasis on shared governance. If we very often have this other group where we said we don't want the ex officio or appointed senators at the same table as ourselves. It's hard to say a lot of that and then later say, but we want to be at the same table and maybe a way in the middle would be to say, we'll have this mechanism, but we're going to use that only rarely.

An ongoing basis, we still want shared governance, we still want obviously says at the table. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Carey. Michele.

Michele Stine, College of Health and Human Development: Thank you. Our ex officio and resource members and appointed Senators play an incredibly important role in the functioning of the Senate and we value their voices in our Standing Committees and not the plenary and certainly I completely agree with what Renata said about bringing that broadened vision to our conversations.

This is just a way of being able to refine ideas before we get to that point, this is a mechanism, and I agree with what Senator Eckhardt has said, and I just realized that I missed that—Stine, HHD, Bonj. I agree with what Senator Eckhardt is saying is that this should not be something that happens routinely.

This is a mechanism for us to refine ideas and make that efficient conversation and efficient communication happen as a way of representing our constituents that will not replace anything that is happening in the Senate. All of those conversations that we talked about will happen in our Standing committees will happen at the plenary. This very conversation is proof that those voices will still be heard and will still be important and will still be sought out. I don't see this as a threat to those voices.

I think that this is an expansion of that and an efficient mechanism to bring refined ideas to be hammered out and to bring those other perspectives. I think the committee has done an amazing job as many others instead, we can and have done this on an ad hoc basis, but that really doesn't feel satisfying.

It's not as aboveboard as it could be. There's a record. This takes great pains to be transparent to have a record, to have an agenda. I think that those things are important, that this is a mechanism for us to fulfill the duties we are elected to fulfill. Thanks.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks, Michele. Yvonne.

Yvonne Gaudelius, Office of Undergraduate Education: Thanks, Bonj. Gaudelius, appointed senator, Undergraduate Education. I want to pick up on something that Carey was talking about but I'm going to put this in the chat. This is the proposed preamble to the Senate Constitution that's going to be discussed later today as a Legislative Report and I think quite simply it states that the senators, whether appointed or elected, have the right to authentic participation in the shared governance of our institution.

I really worry about something, that in a structural way, excludes certain voices, certain perspectives promoting conversation and as you heard me talk about those who are in education this morning. Forgive me. This is a repeat of that conversation. I think one of the things I really welcome about academia is the multitude of perspectives, the multitude of voices. I think we arrive at stronger solutions that way we challenge each other and I think those are benefits to my point of view.

It adds a richness to the conversation and again, structurally excluding certain voices. I think David's point is a very good one so for example, the advising community that is structurally excluded. Inviting David to a meeting or two to bring those voices in doesn't change the fact that structural exclusion, and if this is blue-sky thinking, gosh, can't we do this together? We know what we want and I'll stop there. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Yvonne. Victor, are you ready or do you want to skip over you?

Victor Brunsden, Penn State Altoona: No, thank you, Bonj. Brunsden, Altoona. Thank you, Yvonne, thank you David. Yes we have some issues with representation. As an institution within Penn State, the University Faculty Senate does not have a way to have some employees whose work lives are affected by our decisions, actually have a voice in the decisions that are made.

I totally agree with David and he does an amazing job of representing the advising community. I honestly think that I would adjust as an institution to maybe rethink this and how we handle this. This is not supposed to fix that. This is supposed to fix a very different problem, the appointed senators and to address Yvonne's point, I agree we have a right to authentic participation yet the appointed senators have venues in which they can meet without the input from the elected Senators and we value your ability to do that and then your input in committee meetings, none of that changes.

But you also have your venues. Now, those are administrative but the faculty representatives of the University Faculty Senate have no other venue that is available to you so this is as much an equity issue

as it is anything else. We need a space in which we can meet, kick around stuff, and we're very carefully limited that venue. It is not undercut shared governments, in fact, this is a mechanism to increase the ability for faculty to share in the governance of this university.

By having a Standing Committee, that means that it has continuing existence. It means that we have to keep records. It means that we have to actually make sure that we dot our I's and cross our T's so that it's not just individual faculty members contacting each other through email, which of course they're still free to do. So I understand why you are concerned, but this does not change any of the other dynamics that we have in the University and it creates something for those of us who are elected representing units to have that we do not currently have.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Victor. Kathy.

Kathy Bieschke: I'm just going to speak against the resolution for many of the reasons that have been expressed already. But I think this whole conversation is a great manifestation of what happens when people talk and there's not input from both all perspectives. There's not an openness to having a conversation about how to solve this problem another way, by then creating a structural, long-lasting entity that will be difficult to change moving forward and I've said this in other venues, but I do worry about the long-term implications of this for shared governance.

I worry that it will create more divisiveness and that it's one thing to know when you're talking about advising they ask David Smith to come. But there are lots of ways in which administrators may have something to share in the midst of a conversation that you don't know about until the conversation is taking place so I do worry about this. I don't want to undermine the desire to have other conversations without administrators present, I just wish we could look at a wider range of options for how that could happen.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Kathy. Ira.

Ira Saltz, Penn State Shenango: Yes. I think Victor stole most of what I was going to say, so thank you Victor. Sorry about that. I guess I have one advantage here being tenured and already promoted to the highest level and perhaps getting close to retirement.

I think a big reason why this has come up is because many faculty have not felt like we're being heard. It's precisely this, that there are venues in which many of our appointed Senators and others who have indeed helped state a policy to a great extent, they have their venues. We haven't had ours, and not only that, we feel like many of those venues that you have, we should be there.

There are important decisions being made that greatly impact faculty, and for which faculty may have great ideas, but they're not getting heard because we're not being represented there. I think a lot of this has grown out of that. Also, we have seen in some informal and even formalized surveys that there are a number of faculty who are concerned about expressing their point of views in a form in which there are administrators or others who may disagree with what they have to say, and they get concerned about their job security.

They're not secure as many of us are. I think that this is a forum in which there can be greater participation by those who would otherwise fear speaking their minds.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Ira. Appreciate these comments. I'm going to keep the conversation going. I really do want to hear as many voices as possible. Kim, briefly though.

Kimberly Blockett, Penn State Brandywine: Very briefly. I'm simply reading again for the second time in this meeting, something that another Senator has asked me to read. I think it's to the point. What I'm hearing in this meeting is very concerning, and I have to say that some of the points from higher-level administrators, sounds very paternalistic to think that elected Senators cannot meet or should not meet without their input.

I have often not spoken at meetings because I do not feel comfortable saying what I have to say with higher-level administrators present. I very much am in favor of this and would ask that administrators make more of an effort to understand why we need this and why we need to be able to have a space in which we can speak freely without any fear of misunderstanding or reprisal from those who are in positions of power. That was the statement and that's it.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you Kim. Renee.

Renee Borromeo, Penn State Mont Alto: Borromeo, Mont Alto. I'll be very brief as well. Brevity is one of the things that I could talk about. I agree with everything that's been said, and I do also support the formation of this committee. But these meetings have gotten very long.

I think one of the reasons is that we hash out a lot of things till every Senator gets a position to say something it gets very long. I think if we as elected Senators had a venue to discuss things that would formulate the ideas better before we came to the plenary sessions and we might be able to move things along a little more quickly. That's about—I don't want to make it any longer. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Very much appreciate the conciseness. David.

David Smith: Sorry I'll speak again. David Smith, Division of Undergraduate Studies. I completely get what everyone is saying. As somebody that's in-between, I'm not faculty here at Penn State, nor am I really high administrative. I have the administrative role, but I do sit in and serve a different space.

Trust is really the key piece in this. I guess what concerns me is just how do we not create things that are creating us and them? We want this to be a collaborative effort. I guess one thought that comes to my mind is, could we create an amendment or a motion in this to add a line to the legislation that might say that the elected Senators could then elect a representative from the ex officio or appointed group to be part of these conversations.

Some way to just really say up front that we're not trying to create structures that are based on us and them and that we're really trying as a body to create trust and to model the ways that shared governance really should work. I'll leave it at that.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks David, Denise.

Denise Potosky: Yes. Thank you. Denise Potosky from Penn State, Great Valley. I was elected to senator. I'm finishing just my first year on the Senate. Our meetings began last summer and I spent a lot of time trying to figure out how to best represent the faculty who elected me.

The agendas for our meetings are hundreds of pages long, our January meeting was 200 pages long. I wait for the moments in each plenary session to try to bring forward the things that my constituents have asked me to. But it's very difficult because I find that I report back to my campus, but I still haven't fully figured out how I'm supposed to report forward. That is to bring things from my campus to the Senate.

I've sent Bonj numerous emails throughout the year with specific issues that have come up. I look at this new forum or a new place as a sandbox, not a place to make decisions, but a place to bring items that may need Senate decisions forward from our campuses. So I support this measure. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Denise. I'm going to recognize Greg and then William, and then I think we will call it up for vote. Greg.

Greg Shearer, College of Health and Human Development: Thanks, Bonj, Greg Shearer, College of Health and Human Development. I just wanted to provide just an affirmation from somebody who often gives a contrary voice in the Faculty Senate, that I think this is a great idea. First of all, the comments that people have been making, that Tenure makes a difference. It really does make a difference.

It helps me speak out but I also think that, administrators who aren't even dealing with issues like Tenure, they do think about these issues in a different way without the protections of tenure. That's point number one. Point number two is, again, as I feel like a lot of things I say when we say it in the forum of this plenary session, it's very difficult to contextualize what you're saying.

It very often comes across in a somewhat contrarian viewpoint. I think that if there was a different forum in which we could have these conversations, there would be a lot more of an understanding interchange.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Greg. William. You.

William Kenyon, College of Arts & Architecture: Thank you, Bonj. Kenyon, Arts & Architecture. I think one of the other ways to view this is not an us and them division in the Senate, but we have already a number of groups that caucus together as a way to arrive at some consensus and then bring that consensus forward.

We have those by college, by geographic location, and this is just another way to allow a group to get together. I know this will have a few more rights in terms of creating reports than we tend to have attributed to the caucuses but it's not as divisive, I think, as a lot of people are afraid of. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, William. I'm going to recognize Nick Jones just because he hasn't had a chance to speak on this issue, and then I think we're going to have to close the discussion. Nick.

Provost Jones: Thanks, Bonj. Actually, what may surprise you is I'm going to echo many of the things that Carey said in her remarks a little bit earlier. I appreciated her perspectives and her concerns to the extent that my vote can have an influence, I will vote against the motion. I do have a lot of concerns to the point that Yvonne raised earlier that this is a constitutionally defined shared governance entity that, by design, by charter, consists of both elected and appointed senators.

When we slip into a mode where we start separating the group into subgroups based on those adjectives, I fear that we are on a slippery slope and we start to lose some of what makes the Senate a great institution, which is that it represents both the elected representatives of the faculty and the key leaders that are appointed by the administration. This is going to be meetings of 180 people with twenty of the 200 excluded. from attending. Some of the arguments about not having enough time in plenary, I can accept all of those, and believe me, I hear it—looks like we're getting close to the line for the budget presentation.

Again, I may have to defer until April because of schedule. But if there are going to be additional meetings for 180, I worry a little bit about what is gained from excluding from this shared governance

body the minority of twenty, and I just have concerns about the path that this can set us on. I respect all of the perspectives that have been shared, and understand and certainly, appreciate the concerns, and would hope that we could work together to address those concerns rather than take this half. Thank you, Bonj.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Nick. It is now time to vote, friends. Anna, can we please start the poll?

Anna Butler: I will.

Chair Szczygiel: Senators, you should be used to this logging in business now, if you still need to log in, you may cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept the motion, press A, to reject, press B. Please let us know if anyone is having problems logging in.

In order to go forward with this motion, press A, to reject the motion, press B. Now, as usual in our Zoom meetings to speed things up, we will wait until the end to see all the results of our voting actions. But I just want to pause to make sure once again, Anna is seeing the votes come in before we move on.

Anna Butler: Yes, I am seeing many votes come in, Bonj.

Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II– Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (d), Committee on Education – Addition of DEI Principles

Chair Szczygiel: All right. Let's move forward then while people are still voting. Next, we have a report from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules and Education titled, " Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II– Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 (d), Committee on Education – Addition of DEI Principles," and can be found in Appendix C. Here to reintroduce the report is Annie Taylor, Chair of CC&R, and Shelli Stine, Chair of the Education Committee.

Ann Taylor: Thanks, Bonj. I will let Shelli speak to any specific questions. I just want to say that CC&R really scrutinizes these reports and we were very appreciative of how specific they were in identifying how diversity, equity, and inclusion would be incorporated into their work. It's pretty straightforward as you can see in the report. Shelli, do you have anything you'd like to add?

Michele Stine: I think at this point we're pretty familiar with how these work. The committee felt very passionately that this should not just be language in our charge, but that there should be something deliverable, and so there is language in here about reviewing policies that really holds us accountable to actually folding diversity, equity, and inclusion into the work that we're doing at the committee.

Chair Szczygiel: That's great. Thank you, Shelli and Annie. Are there any questions or comments? Please raise your virtual hands. Seeing none. It's now time to vote. Anna, are we ready to vote? Start your poll. Senators, you may cast your vote on TallySpace. To accept this motion, press A, to reject, press B. Then, of course, save your vote.

Anna Butler: I'm getting many votes, Bonj.

Revision to Standing Rules, Article III – Other Functions of the Senate, Section 8 – Faculty Athletics Representatives

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Anna. Our third Legislative Report is from the Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and Intercollegiate Athletics, titled, "Revision to Standing Rules, Article III – Other Functions of the Senate, Section 8 – Faculty Athletics Representatives," and can be found in Appendix D. Here to present this report is Annie Taylor and Daniel Perkins, Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee.

Ann Taylor: Once again, I will just introduce the legislation. I learned a great deal working with Daniel's Committee on this. Really just necessary cleanup of existing legislation so that it was more clear exactly how FARs are selected and what the actual practice is and to open up that practice a bit more. Daniel, would you like to expand on that?

Daniel Perkins, College of Agricultural Sciences: No, just to say thank you and thanks to Annie and her team, they're really good at, I would say pinch-hitting, to use the sports metaphor there a little bit because we certainly had a little bit of cleanup that needed to be done.

Basically, the gist of it is for our Commonwealth Campuses and the election of the faculty athletic representative, they were being hamstrung, quite frankly, with the requirement that it be tenured; a person who's tenured either associated or full, and what we came up with based on conversations with our colleagues at the Commonwealth Campuses was that it would be someone who had at least a standing appointment of five years or more. It really allowed for the opportunity for other faculty to engage in that very important role of the Faculty Athletics Representatives.

It did not impact the way that the Faculty Athletics Representatives for a University Park is selected.

Chair Szczygiel: Erin, I don't know. Can we scroll up to the affected language? I think it's a little bit further down. Hopefully, you've all had a chance to read that over. Thank you, Danny.

I know you and your committee spent a lot of time working on this even over the summer, so those efforts are much appreciated. Are there any questions for Daniel about this report? It's a sign of a clear report. I'm seeing no questions. I think it is now time to vote. Thank you, Danny and Annie. Anna, can we please start yet another poll.

Anna Butler: Yes, I will.

Chair Szczygiel: A to accept, B to reject.

Anna Butler: I'm receiving many votes.

Proposed Preamble to the Senate Constitution entitled: A Statement On the Rule of the Faculty Senate at the Pennsylvania State University

Chair Szczygiel: Moving forward. Next, the last Legislative Report is from the Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and the Senate Self-study Committee titled, "Proposed Preamble to the Senate Constitution entitled: A Statement On the Rule of the Faculty Senate at the Pennsylvania State University". It may be found in Appendix E. Standing for questions are Ann Taylor and Keith Shapiro, Chair of the Senate Self-Study Committee.

Ann Taylor: I am again, very proud to present this to you, but it's really the initial hard work of the Senate Self-Study Committee, to which CC&R was always happy to weigh in on everything. We have

great discussions about this legislation that you now see before you. But Keith, you probably have more, you'd like to say.

Keith Shapiro, Parliamentarian: I'd like to say that this adds an aspirations component to our document, which we didn't really have before. It was pretty dry. This is presented today and it will be voted on in the April 26th meeting. But at that time we can have a little bit of discussion on the floor about it. I would encourage everybody to read it and be ready for that discussion when we get to April 26th. Ann, how does that sound?

Ann Taylor: It's perfect.

Chair Szczygiel: As Keith mentioned, since it's a change to our Senate Constitution, it's presented today and will be voted on at the April meeting. This amendment to the constitution requires a two-thirds vote of those senators present at the April Plenary. Be sure to attend. Such amendments shall not be in effect until they have been approved by the President. Thank you very much.

Revision to Policy 45-00 Faculty and Student Responsibilities Regarding Cancelled Class When a Campus is Closed

Chair Szczygiel: Our last Legislative Report is from the Senate Committee on Education titled, "Revision to Policy 45-00 Faculty and Student Responsibilities Regarding Cancelled Class When a Campus is Closed", and can be found in Appendix F. Due to present this report is Michele Stine, Chair of Education.

Michele Stine: Thanks, Bonj. I do want to point out that the first time that this report, this legislation was presented was the March 2020 meeting. I take no responsibility for what happens after this. That legislation that was proposed and we voted on and enacted in March of 2020, was meant to protect both students and faculty in the event of a campus closure due to some short-term emergencies such as weather emergency, a weather closure so that we weren't immediately moving classes online and requiring students to be in synchronous courses.

We have been doing that for two years now. With that experience behind us, we decided to refine this policy with feedback from faculty at the campuses and feedback from students. We have to find this policy a little bit to allow for the possibility or make it clear that the possibility exists for a synchronous remote courses in the event of a campus closure, providing that students are not required to participate synchronously. Making some allowances for students who may not be able to participate synchronously for a variety of reasons, childcare, illness, loss of power, loss of Internet.

Again, this is just a refinement of really what was always allowed in the policy, but wasn't clear. The only change is really making it clear that faculty can use that synchronous remote option provided that students have some other way to participate if they're not able to participate synchronously.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Michele. Thank you to the faculty members from my believe, Brandywine or Great Valley, who brought this to our attention. I'm going to say Great Valley. Are there any questions for Michele? Mary Beth?

Mary Beth Williams, College of Science: Thanks Bonj. Williams, College of Science. I don't have a question. I just want to say I'm strongly in favor of this faculty that I work with in the college of science

have been contacting me a lot about this. This is a really beneficial change. Thank you for making this update.

Michele Stine: We've heard from faculty from many colleges and from many campuses.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you Mary Beth. Ali?

Ali Watts, Graduate and Professional Student Association: Ali Watts, Graduate and Professional Students. I also strongly support this. My only question, I think is it whether it would be valuable to encourage at least the possibility of recording as an equity issue of students are not able to attend, to be encouraging faculty to record and post after class?

Michele Stine: That is one of the mechanisms for allowing student participation. If you're holding that synchronous, promote that recording that so that students can listen to it later.

Ali Watts: I read this in here as watching recordings of other things because that frequently happens, not of the class. It's occurring synchronous on that day. I don't know if there's, perhaps, a way to make that more clear.

Michele Stine: I think that's something that we can certainly encourage be clarified in the implementation. But the intent was to encourage that if classes held synchronously, students have to have some other mechanism for participating and the obvious way to do that would be recording the class so that students can follow up later.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Agnes.

Agnes Kim, Penn State Scranton: Agnes Kim from Scranton. I want to continue in vain of equity here and push it a little further. I do have a couple of concerns about the synchronous.

I know it says the Professor should record so that students who are unable to attend synchronously can still benefit from what the students who were able to join. Good, but it doesn't replace 100 percent being in class as we know, because if you're doing synchronously, one of the purposes is you want the interaction because otherwise why wouldn't you just record your lecture, puts it on Canvas, and everybody watches it this in a way would be more equitable.

I worry that this does create inequity and anxiety probably amongst students who would fairly think, well, I'm at a disadvantage because I'm having a network outage in my area or I have to go and shovel snow and so I can't participate, but I really want to. I would lean towards not, a synchronous is great, recording lectures is great. But the interactive synchronous way, I think even if you try to alleviate some of those still creates anxiety and inequity.

Michele Stine: Thank you, Agnes, That's a very good point. Faculty want to be able to do that synchronously for variety of reasons. Many of them have to do with time-saving and that their students have that time carved out for class. This is an attempt at making and allowing for some instructor flexibility. This is not mandating in any way that faculty make their classes synchronous. This is simply allowing for an option, and clarifying that if you do take that option, you do need to allow for flexibility, you need to allow for other ways for your students to be able to make up that material.

Again, and this is in the event of a campus closure. This is not something that would be regular practice on an ongoing basis necessarily, but something that might happen relatively and frequently at Penn State, and allowing for some flexibility for what instructors can do with their classes.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks, Michele. Jenn?

Jennifer Baka, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Hi? Thanks. Baka, EMS. Thanks for this report. I do have concerns as a junior faculty member with young children that you were making this now an opt-out type of policy that now the norm might become that you're expected to hold class via Zoom when campus is closed, and oftentimes, at least here in State College, and I assume it's probably the same at our Commonwealth branches, that if the University is closed then schools and childcare are also closed.

It is really hard to juggle trying to teach or attend meetings while also having to do your childcare. I'm just concerned that this is a slippery slope that because Zoom became the de facto mode of teaching during COVID that now we're going to have the Zoom creep, if you will, that now there's never really a way to fully have the University or campus closed because we have this Zoom option. I think it's a pretty slippery slope that I want us to consider here.

Michele Stine: I am completely sympathetic to that perspective of having children at home myself. When campus is closed, my kid is home, too. For that reason, I rarely do choose that synchronous option.

This is something we would certainly want to keep an eye on. As we have seen already, this policy has been revised two years after it was passed, and if it does seem like that is creating the situation where faculty feel like they're pressured to have Zoom classes or students feel like they're pressured to participate synchronously, even in the policy explicitly forbids requiring students to participate something. We can address this in the future.

I absolutely agree. This is something we want to keep an eye on and if this is creating inadvertent consequences, we need to fix that.

Ira Saltz: Hi, there? Yes, Saltz, Shenango. I guess I really wanted to just echo what Jenn just said in the previous speaker. I think it is putting many students at a disadvantage. I know it's Shenango.

Most of our students probably have family obligations, if there's bad weather, the schools are closed, daycares are closed. Although it's being reported or they have other ways to do it, I think it is a inferior alternative to being there live when there is a synchronous delivery. I really feel like I recommend that we vote no on this.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you Ira. John?

John Gerard Champagne: Champagne, Erie. I wanted to follow up on what Jenn and I were both saying because I feel like we've already started to slide down that slippery slope. At the beginning of the semester, when faculty opted to teach via Zoom because of health concerns, there were administrators who came forward and said, well, what are you going to do when you get sick if you use your 24.9 percent?

I thought, I am now supposed to teach while I'm sick via Zoom? What happened to work-life balance and all those things that were the Faculty Benefits committee talking about now? It's inclement weather, it's an active nature. I think none of us truthfully, to me, it's a little bit self-important to think that your class must go on rain shine, snowstorm, et cetera. Nobody's education is going to be destroyed by a class canceled because of inclement weather. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you.

Michele Stine: I agree 100 percent John.

Chair Szczygiel: Sorry, Shelli. I didn't know you're going to respond.

Michele Stine: I agree a 100% that a canceled class in this semester is not tragic. This is simply giving faculty and option that I have canceled class when the campus was closed because I did not expect my students to be able to participate when campus have been closed at our reform. No, I completely agreed that it is not a tragedy to cancel class.

Chair Szczygiel: Denise, maybe you can give us another perspective.

Denise Potosky: I can. Denise Potosky, Penn State, Great Valley. This policy was created that said, we may not offer classes remotely in 2020. Penn State Great Valley operates on seven-week terms. That means Spring 1 is January and February. Spring 2 is March and April. For years. I've been there for years, when inclement weather happened and the campus closed, personally, I prefer to cancel class, but our students have arranged daycare that our classes are all in the evening.

Yes, their children may be home with them, but they would have been anyway. Very often, if I had power, I would do a class remotely even if I did want to. However, when this policy was passed and read to our faculty and our students became aware that this option was taken away, it created lots of problems on our campus because if there's a snowstorm in week six of seven, there is no makeup class.

Most of our courses are not lecture-based, so there's really nothing to record. We have all these students expecting they satisfy this time, this evening for class and we don't know how to make up our hours. I was one of the ones who brought this forward saying, well, you know what, could it just be may offer remotely as opposed to must not offer remotely for those faculty in those classes of students that really need some other options because there is no make-up time and there is no real realistic lecture to record.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Denise. I'll recognize John, and then Joyce, and then I think we need to bring this discussion to a close, John?

John Yen, College of Information Sciences and Technology: Thank you. I just wanted to make amendment to add the word can between the faculty and provide. To reflect the spirit of this as an option not a requirement.

Chair Szczygiel: The current, is this where you were talking about John? Because the current wording is made which would imply.

John Yen: I was referring to the sentence above.

Chair Szczygiel: Sentence above.

John Yen: Yes. A little bit about before "provide a synchronous online instruction."

Chair Szczygiel: The word "may" has been added. If you look above the strike throughs. It reads now faculty may provide asynchronous. Do you still want to suggest we change? Yen, can you?

John Yen: I see. I got it. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Joyce.

Joyce Furfaro, College of the Liberal Arts: As I understand, and correct me if I'm wrong, the current policy is that faculty may provide asynchronous lecture. What's the difference between saying that they also have the option to do the synchronous lecture as long as that lecture is provided as a recording as well? Because again, the lecture is already able to record a lecture and have that as an asynchronous way of delivering that lecture.

Why can't they also provide it synchronously for students who wanted to be there in person who wanted to interact, live with the professor would be able to do that as long as they also have it as a recorded lecture? I don't see what the issue is with the slippery slope. If it's not really making anything different about this accepted the fact that they can, instead of doing it asynchronously, they can also, if they want to it synchronously.

I support this and I don't understand why people have an issue with this. I just wanted to thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Joyce. Surely, I don't know.

Joyce Furfaro: Furfaro, Liberal Arts.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you very much. I appreciate it. I didn't know if you want to give some context to that. Then, of course, Joyce was our final. We do need to move on folks we've spent a lot of time on this, so it's worthwhile.

Michele Stine: I'll just sum up by saying that, as Joyce has pointed out, this is simply adding another option that faculty may offer a synchronous instruction as long as there is another option for students by Willie Mays, simply cancel the class.

As Denise was saying, this came out of discussions with faculty at other campuses who know their students. To Iris point, you know that your students will not be able to do this, then you will not be doing this. If I know that my students cannot get online, I'm not going to hold synchronous class.

This just allows that flexibility for me to make the choice that's best for my students.

Chair Szczygiel: Stephen and Julio, sorry, but we're going to move ahead now to vote in the interest of time. Anna, are we able to start the poll, please?

Anna Butler: Yes, the poll is started.

Chair Szczygiel: Senators, please cast your vote to accept the motion press A, to reject press B. Be sure to save your vote. In the interest of time while the votes are being tallied, let's move on.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS - NONE

Chair Szczygiel: I see Item J, we have Advisory/Consultative Reports. There are none.

POSITIONAL REPORTS - NONE

Chair Szczygiel: Item K, Positional Reports. There are no Positional Reports.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Annual Budget Report

Chair Szczygiel: Which brings us to Informational Reports. We have seven Informational Reports for our Agenda today. The first sponsored by the Senate Committee on University Planning, Provost Jones, if he is still around, will present the Annual Budget Report found in Appendix G. Do we still have the Provost?

Provost Jones: Yeah. I'm here. I canceled my next meeting.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. The floor is yours.

Provost Jones: —Thank you very much, Destiny. I'm going to just take a few minutes to run you through a few slides to share details about the University's approved operating budget for the 21-22 fiscal year. That's the year that we are in actually three-quarters of the way through, after the presentation, happy to take any questions or comments that you may have. Next slide, please. This figure shows the total institutional revenue.

The left pie chart shows a \$7.7 billion total annual operating budget. The right vertical bar shows a breakdown of the education in general funds, budget, revenue categories. This was the one that Jim referred to earlier. You can see that the total area is about \$2.6 billion, or 34 percent of the University's total. Penn State Health in green, is increasingly the largest slice of the pie, increasing from 42 percent of the total in the previous fiscal year to almost 45 percent this fiscal year that represents primarily clinical income. The restricted funds in orange at 12 percent represents mainly sponsored researcher farms, but also gift an endowment income.

Auxiliary enterprises in yellow, at almost seven percent is auxiliary and business services and athletics. Agricultural, general, and fed funds in red. At a little over one percent is the E&G appropriation plus federal funds supporting research and extension activities. Penn College in navy blue, 1.5 percent. That's tuition fees and appropriation for the wholly owned subsidiary of Penn College. Then as discussed, the education in general funds budget at 34 percent in the teal blue. The largest component, as Eric indicated in his remarks earlier of E&G, is tuition and fees at 76 percent, nearly \$2 billion coming in from tuition. State appropriation at 9.2 percent.

We've seen a pretty substantial decline in their percentage over the past two decades. The other 15 percent includes research grants, investment income, and other miscellaneous sources. Next slide, please. This slide shows the total uses how University revenue was spent.

Again, the clinical income in green, this continues to increase as the revenues do. I won't go through all of the categories. But you can see that this is structured very similarly to the revenue, and there's about a \$0.1 billion difference between the two. We'll talk about that later. I'll show details later in the presentation about the planning assumption for revenue uses by category within the E&G budget. Next slide. Here we have some details regarding the 2021-'22 planning assumptions for revenue sources by category within the approved '21-'22 E&G Budget.

Noteworthy on the slide, I won't read the whole thing. Tuition at \$41.9 million increase assumed, return to normal in personal instructional delivery, and included increases of 2 1/2 percent for Pennsylvania resident undergraduates and 2.75 percent for non-PA resident undergraduates as well as for graduate students. There has been no increase in the state appropriation for the past three years. The planning assumptions assume no increase in F&A return and investment income. I will note the final bullet that this represents the final year of the College of Medicine of subsidy. Next slide, please.

This slide, the approved '21-'22 appropriation breakdown is shown here compared to '20-'21, and the numbers are the same year-to-year representing a zero percent increase. The total appropriation of just under \$339 million for this fiscal year includes general support line of \$242 million, just under 55 million, four Ag Research and Extension, 15.1 million for Penn State Health and the College of Medicine, and 26.7 million for Penn College. The '21-'22 appropriation request to the Commonwealth in September of 2021 assumed a six percent appropriation increase, which was not approved, and a two percent tuition increase to support the 2019-2023 capital plan.

The approved 2021-'22 operating budget included no appropriation increase, tuition increases for both Pennsylvania resident and non-resident students, and targeted cost savings. Next slide. This chart shows the monetary values for undergraduate tuition rates for the past decade with all rates shown in constant 2021 dollars. The top line in yellow is University Park lower-division non-resident, shows slight increases over time, but a decrease this year. The second line from the top in red is the Commonwealth Campus lower-division non-resident, largely consistent over time, slightly down past three years.

Third line from the top in dark blue is University Park lower-division resident of Pennsylvania, we are at the lowest amount in the past decade in 2021 dollars. Then the bottom line in teal blue shows the Commonwealth Campus lower-division resident rate for Pennsylvania students, that is also the lowest amount in 2021 dollars over the past decades.

The flatness of these curves over time, relative flatness, highlights the importance of access and affordability of Penn State education across all of our campuses for all students, but especially for Pennsylvania residents. Next slide, please. Slide seven, you can see the approved tuition and fee amounts for this year with the aggregate increases for our undergraduates across all campuses. Noteworthy, again, is undergraduate aggregate increase for '21-'22 of 2 1/2 percent for Pennsylvania resident students and 2.75 percent for non-PA students.

The dollar amounts there are shown in the middle columns of both the PA and the non-PA section. Next slide, please. We have 49,000 recipients of Federal Student Aid and 14,000 recipients of State Student Aid, totaling about \$660 million in financial aid. All but \$43.7 million of the aid shown is federal. We have about 22,000 recipients of aid from private and external funds and third parties, which totals about \$285 million, and we have 42,000 recipients of institutional aid, which totals about 322 million; this aid comes from various awards, programs, and grants as listed on the slide. Next slide, please. This slide focuses on some of the efforts that have been taken to control our expenditures and enhance revenues.

Centrally managed savings plus three consecutive years of unit-level savings are supported by efforts to reduce procurement and IT spend. Revenue enhancement and growth from World Campus, Professional Master's programs, and Commonwealth Campuses have been important. You'll note that as we discussed a little earlier, we have had three years of rescission, there will be an additional year where we do a budget rescission, but I am optimistic that in the years beyond that, rescission hopefully, will be behind us for the foreseeable future. Next slide, please. Planning assumptions.

There's a lot on the slide, you've had an opportunity to review in advance, just some of the highlights are two percent GSI, as you know, after no GSI the previous year, point out an 18 percent insurance coverages costing us an additional almost five million dollars, this is the world we live in, unfortunately, and we are generally seeing substantial increases in insurance rates every year.

There is a \$10 million increase in aid to need-based students. We are continuing to make strategic investments across the University, despite the uniquely challenging budget environment we're in, and there is a plan for two percent across the board rescission which generated a total of \$22 million. The additional one percent rescission was imposed mid-year based on a decline in the Fall 2021 student enrollments compared to Fall of 2020, the decline was a little higher than anticipated.

We knew that we had to keep that one percent rescission in our back pocket, and unfortunately, we needed to implement it. Next slide, please. This table shows education, in general, centrally managed budget changes, including some of the ones that I have mentioned in previous slides. Revenue assumptions related to the state appropriation are flat in '21-'22 and tuition included nominal increases, as we've discussed. The section titled "Non-Discretionary Costs" includes cost-savings and expense adjustments. Funds available for discretionary expenses in areas including salary increases and related benefits, facilities maintenance, facilities capital plan, priority and strategic investments, and student aids.

We divide these in this way because the non-discretionary cost increases, we really have no control over, they exist by agreement or prior commitment and have to be funded. Everything in the discretionary section is variable and open to change. Next slide, please. This is a zoom-in on the education and general funds revenue budget. This is a pie chart version of the bar chart that was shown on the earlier slide.

Again, it is worth emphasizing tuition and fees is the largest amount at 76 percent of the E&G revenue at approximately two billion dollars, state appropriation at 9.2 percent, and the other category including F&A investment income and other miscellaneous sources at 15 percent. Next slide, please. Sorry I went out of order. This is the E&G expense budget and it shows how the education and general funds are spent across the institution.

As Jim Strauss noted earlier in his comments, this funds Penn State's academic mission and all of the infrastructure necessary to support it. This year, 65 percent of the budget is dedicated to student and instructional and research support, which includes instruction, research, academic support, students services, and student aid. This represents a slight increase over last year, where we were at 64.6 percent.

The other categories in the pie chart by functional category, are instruction research, other public service, academic support, institutional support, student services, student aid, physical plant operations, and compensation and employee benefits. Next slide, please. This is an eye chart. I know we have made this presentation available so that you can go through this at your leisure.

But this summary slide roles everything up and includes data for the 2021 budget and the projected year in budget on the left side of the chart. Looking at sources, you'll see comparable totals from year-to-year for centrally managed and unit managed sources, as well as the total E&G.

Looking at uses, you will see comparable totals year-to-year for centrally managed and unit managed uses as well as total E&G. In the beige area at the bottom of the chart, you will see 2021-22 budget as a projected deficit of \$166.4 million, and this will be covered by funds that we have in reserves. This is consequences of many things, not the least of which is COVID.

Next slide, please. That is it. I'm happy now to drop the presentation and take any questions. I know that was a lot of material to cover very quickly and I apologize, but I hope you all have a chance to review the presentation in detail. Happy to take questions now or certainly any others that you may have by email.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Nick and I feel the need to apologize. I know this report has been put off for a few meetings in a row, I'm glad we were able to fit it in this year and I apologize for that. Danny.

Daniel Perkins: Dr. Jones, thank you so much for that. Just a quick question. I know we've tried it in the past, I'm not sure how fruitful it has gotten. I just feel given the alumni's commitment to provide for private dollars, I wonder why we can't figure out how to arm them to go to their Senators, their State Legislators, and make it clear it's unacceptable as the land-grant institution we rank in the bottom, I would argue probably the bottom 10 of land-grant institutions in terms of dollars for this institution. I feel we aren't using our alumni in a way that could move this along. I'm not saying it would be easy, I'm clear on that. Do we have any thoughts on that?

Provost Jones: Yeah. No, absolutely, and we are worse than being in the bottom 10. Danny, it's lower than that. Zach leads an active team in government and community affairs. We are constantly in Harrisburg. We're constantly working with our alumni to lobby Harrisburg on our behalf our students are down there. It's all on all the time trying to convince our elected representatives of the importance of Penn State to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

We generate \$11 billion in economic impact every year more than that, that was a few years ago, so we're probably up around \$13 or \$14 billion now, as you heard from the President earlier. Eric is a frequent visitor to Harrisburg, we are always down there bending ears about the importance of Penn State to the Commonwealth. We've had some success I think that most of you are aware that the Governor has recommended a 5 percent increase in our appropriation for this year and it has to still get through the Senate and the House, but that would be the first increase in several years.

But it still doesn't come close to catching us up to where we need to be. I can assure you that we pull out all stops and we mobilize all resources. One of the most effective advocates I've ever seen in Harrisburg was a young woman, a teenager, who was actually a graduate of our Four H programs. An alumni of sorts and boy, was she effective in speaking to the legislators about the impact that Penn State had on her through the Four H program she'd participated in.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks Danny. Mary Beth.

Mary Beth Williams: Thanks Bonj. Williams, College of Science. Provost Jones, thank you so much for sharing these details. I think this is really important for us to understand how the budget works. Curricular Affairs as you know, reviews course and program proposals. In every meeting, every month we see and discuss concerns about the intersections of university structures and budgets with curriculum.

We very commonly see faculty concerns about how curricular changes could change enrollments and thus departmental and college funding, and concerns about internal competition among and between colleges. Curricular Affairs we'd like to welcome you to come meet with us to talk about what we're hearing and seeing these observations and concerns. If possible, even invite you to meet with us during our committee retreat in May which you, thank you, recently approved funding for, if you will be able to be there that would be great.

Provost Jones: I'd be happy to engage in a conversation. I think that many of you aware that over the past several years we have really transformed the budget approach that we use at Penn State to make it, I would say more contemporary like we brought it into the 20th century. Yes, I know it's the 21st century, but we put it into the 20th and out beyond.

Our budgeting is based on academic unit and all units, but particularly for academic units, and an assessment of the uses or the needs for funds, and then identifying the sources necessary to support them. That's a different approach from what we had before where we had a very incremental model that I would say was much more challenged in its ability to respond to emerging and evolving needs.

We're in the early days of this new budget structure. I think it's going to be very effective for the University. Hopefully, we'll be able to address specifically some of the concerns that you are raising.

Mary Beth Williams: Okay. Thank you. Will be great to talk about.

Chair Szczygiel: Thanks, Mary Beth. I'm going to jump over to Margaret. You could identify yourself and give your location.

Margaret Michels, College of the Liberal Arts: Yes, Margaret Michels, Liberal Arts Penn, University Park. I appreciate all the information that was offered and I'm just wondering from your perspective, Dean, Provost, what is the most important thing for us to focus on?

Provost Jones: In the budget space? Yes.

Margaret Michels: Yes.

Provost Jones: Danny identified one. We will continue to make a strong case to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for support of the Pennsylvania State University through appropriation. We would love to see the appropriation go up or it would be great to see that percentage backup into double digits. Again, that's a heavy lift.

There are many competing priorities, but we will keep working at. The big opportunity obviously is the biggest slice of the pie, which is the tuition revenue. We say tuition and fees, but for our purposes, it really is the tuition. I think the President mentioned this earlier in his remarks.

There's two ways to increase our total tuition revenue. One is to increase the tuition rate and there's a lot of backward pressure against it. People don't want to see Penn State's tuition go up, so there's a lot of resistance to increasing tuition. The other way to increase the total tuition revenue is to increase the number of students who matriculate to Penn State.

At University Park, we are relatively well subscribed and I'm looking for a reaction from Mary Beth on this too, because she knows that. When I say well subscribed, I know it's sometimes hard to find classrooms to fit all of our well-subscribed students into. University Park is relatively full, but I think we have lots of opportunities at our campus locations and we are currently doing a full court press to try to generate additional enrollments for campuses where there is infrastructure, but capacity to fully leverage it and so that, I think, represents a great opportunity for us.

World Campus continues to be an opportunity for additional revenue growth and many colleges are also developing professional master's programs which are additional sources of revenue. With all eyes combined, we can increase the E&G revenues and then be able to fund more of the initiatives that are near and dear to all of your hearts.

Margaret Michels, Penn University Park: If I can quickly follow up. What is the impact of the recombination of the universities under the —SHE system in terms of our Commonwealth Campuses, the state systems of higher education?

Provost Jones: PASSHE?

Margaret Michels, Penn University Park: Yeah.

Provost Jones: There's a lot out there in the media about PASSHE and how PASSHE competes with Penn State, or actually generally it's Penn State competes with PASSHE. Most of the analyses we've looked at suggests that we operate as two complementary, we're obviously independent, but we operate as complementary systems. We don't really raid PASSHE for students and PASSHE doesn't really raid us on the margins. There's a bit of transfer back and forth, but we co-exist.

I would say that it is important to us at Penn State that we have a healthy State System of Higher Education and where we remain optimistic that with the changes that are being made to PASSHE that it will become a more robust, stronger system and continue to be a great complement and partner to us in Pennsylvania.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Margaret and Provost Jones for your response. Nathan, I'm going to have to make you our last question for the Provost.

Nathan Tallman, University Libraries and Scholarly Communications: Thanks, Bonj. Tallman, Libraries. Provost Jones, we seem to assign budget priority to new buildings over building maintenance and I'm wondering why this is. Doesn't it become a self-fulfilling prophecy at some point where we've deferred maintenance so much that it's actually cheaper to build new. I just wonder why we don't put more into maintenance. Thanks.

Provost Jones: That's a complicated question. We don't fund new buildings out of the operating budget. We do fund the debt service on new buildings out of the operating budget, so every time we build a new building, if we borrow money to do it or do major renovation on a facility where we borrow the debt service for an E&G building is coming out of the E&G operating budget. It is always a trade-off.

We have a big deferred maintenance backlog. We don't have enough money, honestly, to put into the budget to address all of that deferred maintenance, like right now. I know later in this meeting, Bill Sitzabee will be talking about capital projects. He may speak to this a little bit as well, but it's always a little bit of a trade-off when we invest in a major renovation or in a new facility.

One of the considerations is how much deferred maintenance do we retire by doing it? Obviously, if you've got a building, it has a large deferred maintenance backlog, it may be actually prudent to focus a major renovation on that building under the umbrella of the capital program than it is just to continue to try to maintain it because we never catch up. We struggle a little bit because a good number of our buildings were built during the 1960s, so they're 50, 60 years old.

That also, unfortunately, was an era when buildings were built differently from how we build them now, meaning not always well and so many of the challenges that are associated with that older construction are coming home to roost now, which is why we see the deferred maintenance backlog continuing to increase and our investments in major innovation or building replacement are designed to make sure we have modern facilities, but also to address that maintenance backlog, so it's always a complex calculus that is done to decide how best to proceed. Does that help, Nathan?

Nathan Tallman, University Libraries: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Yes. Thank you very much, Provost Jones, for your presentation. Luke, I'm sorry, we're going to have to scoot along. We are looking at six more information reports.

Penn State Outreach: Urban Engagement

Chair Szczygiel: The next report is from the Senate Committees on Outreach and titled, Penn State Outreach: Urban Engagement,” and you can find this in Appendix H. Fifteen minutes are allotted for this presentation and Vice-Chair Aurand, you have the floor to introduce this report.

Harold Aurand, Penn State Schuylkill: Aurand, Schuylkill. The Outreach Committee is really happy to introduce this report. We believe that Urban Outreach and Urban Engagement is one of the hidden gems of the University, not enough people know about it. Pam Driftmier, who's the Executive Director, Professional and Community Engagement that resides under Outreach. She's going to actually give the report and I'll allow her to introduce the rest of the team.

Pamela Driftmier, Penn State Outreach: Thank you so much. We are so glad to be here to have this opportunity to share about Penn State's urban centers. Joining me today is Tom Bartnik, Director of Penn State Center Pittsburgh, Shivaani Selvaraj, Director of Penn State Center Philadelphia, and Richard Smith, who's our Director of Community Engagement. Professional and community engagement resides within Outreach and consists of seven units with diverse missions.

The one thing in common is that these units serve as connectors between our communities and the University. They foster engagement. I'd like to begin with a brief overview of the history of our urban center. Both the college of Agricultural Sciences and Outreach envisioned a Penn State presence in our urban communities, starting with Pittsburgh. It was a full and equal partnership that was brought to fruition through collaboration and a shared vision. Initially, a virtual center was established with plans for a larger central complex to accommodate programs, services, and staff.

We also hope to secure additional academic partners. Its purpose was to focus on issues specific to the metropolitan area where Penn State faculty could work to help solve key issues. It would serve as a focal point for applied research focusing on site and issue-specific challenges throughout Pittsburgh. Next, the Center in Philadelphia had a similar start, extension in the College of Arts & Architecture established a partnership that included a robust portfolio of internships.

Outreach joined the two and established the Penn State Center Philadelphia in 2014. In 2016, we conducted a needs assessment that led to a focus on foods and nutrition programming, support of community gardeners, gardens and urban growers and a focus on improving K-12 education and overall literacy. A partnership with community schools where students, parents, school workers, and community was established and they had voice. Ultimately, Outreach assumed responsibility for both centers.

Next, and from that, our centers began to focus. We wanted to guide Penn State students to career development, community engagement, experiential learning. We wanted to collaborate with our wonderful, amazing faculty and to engage communities in mutual learning, discovery and positive social impact, we want to explore and expand opportunities and resources for alternative and non-traditional community education and engagement.

We also wanted to ensure that community engagement is collaborative, inclusive, and addressing community needs and we want to investigate opportunities for joint efforts or assistance between both Pittsburgh and Philadelphia. For while their focus may be specific to those communities, we believe we can learn a lot in how we work together. With that, I'd like to turn this over to Tom Bartnik for a further look at our Penn State Center in Pittsburgh.

Tom Bartnik, Director, Penn State Center Pittsburgh: Thanks, Pam. Penn State Center, Pittsburgh connects the Pittsburgh region with the University's faculty, staff, and students to support sustainable and equitable communities through research, local outreach, student and community engagement, and unique educational opportunities.

Good afternoon. I'm Tom Bartnik, the director of Penn State's Center Pittsburgh. Ensuring some of the examples of what we do across the diversity of our engagement activities, I think you'll see a common thread across our work is grounded in two things: relationships and possibilities. The Pittsburgh Center is located near downtown in the Energy Innovation Center.

Penn State was instrumental in the development of the EIC and moved in as the anchor tenant in May 2015. We use the 180,000 square foot LEED Platinum renovation of the 91-year-old historic Connelly trade schools as a lesson in sustainability by offering educational tours and presentations, which include Penn State faculty, students and staff, local workforce development programs, and the US State Department's International Leaders Program. Pre-COVID, in collaboration with WPSU, we co-hosted the Pittsburgh premiere screening of the film, *Managing Risk in a Changing Climate* with a panel discussion led by Paul Shrivastava. Along with Penn State Sustainability Institute, we held the National Sustainability Curriculum Consortium conference, securing Covestro as a local sponsor and Kim Kipin-McDonald as keynote speaker.

Our collaboration with the Student Engagement Network and the Beaver, Fayette, Greater Allegheny, and New Kensington campuses resulted in the first Pittsburgh Regional Student Engagement Expo with plans to hold it as an annual event. As part of an inspirational week, we worked with Pittsburgh – Matanzas Sister Cities Partnership, and others on a special exhibit with nine contemporary artists from Cuba, Mexico, and Puerto Rico called "Poetics in Diversity."

In addition to being a community event, the artist met with our city high school students and we arranged for Penn State Arts and Design students from University Park. They have a special roundtable discussion with the artists the day before the exhibit closed.

Some programs spend longer periods of time in development. But the looming EPA consent to create the Pittsburgh Centers spearhead and several Green Infrastructure demonstration projects, including the ecocentric rain garden, which included both community participation in education. This work led to the PWSA bringing us on as the instructors for the seventh city part of the program for the National Green Infrastructures Certification Program. Three years later, we continue providing the 35-hour training program to design professionals, contractors, and public works personnel.

We adapted the program during COVID to accommodate hybrid sessions. Sorry, I'll just skip that. Certainly, Semester Pittsburgh Program is built on a relationship with community partners and a strong team at University Park, including the Departments of Geography and RPTM, the Sustainability Institute, and the conferences and institutes.

Grounded in the principles of urban sustainability, City Semester Pittsburgh places University Park students and community-based internships with all students taking our Earth 412, Urban Sustainability course as a cohort. In addition to local guest speakers, the students particularly enjoy the field trips that include some of the greenest buildings in Pennsylvania.

In the case of Phipps Center for Sustainable Landscapes, it's one of the greenest buildings in the world. When the pandemic forced the programs to go remote, we convinced our community partners to provide tours via Zoom. Once they did it, they all decided to use virtual tours as a tool for their education and outreach to others. The relationships are a team, cultivates at the local level are the foundation for the mutually beneficial experiences for our students and community partners.

Over the course of seven semesters, City Semester Pittsburgh provided over two dozen community partners with 49 students across 19 different majors and a growing number of students who are also pursuing the interdisciplinary Sustainability Leadership minor. During COVID, we've worked with our research team led by professors Ted Davis, and Tasha Miles, an EMS featuring community collaboration at Pittsburgh Air Quality Research with our community partner, the Breathe Project.

Professor Travis Flohr leads a multi-disciplinary team from Landscape Architecture, Public Policy, Plant Sciences, and Community Environmental Development to connect policies to actions for creating just, biodiverse, and climate-resilient urban forests. With support from our community partner Tree Pittsburgh, they were just awarded an IEE seed grant to begin their work this summer.

With our help, Landforce, a non-profit employment training organization, secured an EPA, environmental workforce development grant for which we will be providing green infrastructure training for up to 20 of their trainings this summer. Finally, during the pandemic, we continue to strengthen our relationships at both Penn State and the community level and with the promises of the new normal on the other side of the pandemic, we look forward to the many more possibilities that lie ahead.

Thank you. I'd like to turn things over to my colleague in Philadelphia, Shivaani Selvaraj.

Shivaani Selvaraj, Penn State Center Philadelphia: Thank you, Tom. Hello, everyone. We know that you've been sitting through a very long meeting, so I am going to try to be brief. We are pleased to be a resource to our university partners who are interested in Urban Research in teaching and learning experiences. At the Penn State Center in Philadelphia, we're committed to working with structurally Neeli communities. I'm going to try to hit some highlights of our work and let you know how you can work with us if you're interested. Tom, you can go ahead.

The center focuses on community-driven engagement. We prioritize being responsive to emerging issues in the city and to building long-term relationships with various communities and community leaders. Sometimes this creates a dynamic in our work.

We've day-to-day routines and content can change very rapidly, but we can also track evolution of research initiatives, leadership development, and policies over time. My stories are always going to start with community impacts and we attract very committed faculty and students who are interested in this. This slide and the next are going to track a really brief outline of a story in one area of work that began in 2016. This image is from a People Suffer forum around immigrant rights at a local church. It is a panel that's involving religious leaders, academics, lawyers, families who were living in churches and sanctuary at the time. We helped to plan this event with restaurant industry leaders and in attendance were Penn

State students, alumni, faculty among 200 plus other community folks. Ultimately, we helped to organize several of these large public dinners during a couple of years and had several student interns.

You can go ahead, Tom. Thank you. From the basis of those relationships that we built over those couple of years and during COVID, we were able to organize those People Suffer partners, and new partners to create this food insecurity project using restaurant space to provide free meals to community members. This is in 2020. I'll just say that when a community project is compelling, it is very easy to attract people.

Two hundred plus community members came forward to do work. We involved faculty, grad students, undergrad students, and over the trajectory of The People Suffers to The People's Kitchen and Beyond The People's Kitchen, we've worked with people out of Liberal Arts, Education, Communications, HHD, Agriculture, the Law School, and of course, the campuses that are close to me. In terms of The People's Kitchen, just to give you a feel for what that was, the model was built by hiring out of workshops and restaurant workers to produce the meals.

Many of the restaurant workers are immigrants who also received meals and we have been working with that population for the last two years in community-based leadership development practices. Just two weeks ago, in fact, this group was central and passing citywide legislation for emergency paid sick leave for the city of Philadelphia. An undergrad communication and training was also immensely helpful in this process. One of the images here is from a church on garden that was growing ingredients for The People's Kitchen, as well as other food insecure projects.

At this point, The People's Kitchen exists. It launched, it has its own infrastructure, it's its own entity at this point. We're now continuing to do work with something that we're now calling The People's Growing Project that incorporates some of the similar community leadership development processes, community education. We're now exploring issues of climate change, land use, and gentrification in the city and also looking for new faculty and students as partners in this new phase.

You can go ahead. Thank you. One of the things that has evolved over the last couple of years also is that people are coming forward who are interested in how we do our work. We've been approached by funders, community leaders, faculty, and grad students from Penn State and beyond Penn State.

At this point, we're trying to build our infrastructure and capacity for especially helping to train people on how to do a participatory research and use other participatory methods. This image is from a parallel story from also the last six years of work of conducting Participatory Action Research in the sphere of public education, I'm not going to go into that story. But it's equally compelling and impactful.

Ultimately, I'll just say that we are highly committed to participatory methods because it's just the best practice of community-university relationships. It allows us to incubate evidence-based solutions, practices, policies, initiatives, etc. Next slide. Was there one more time before this? Yes, thank you. How you might be involved if you're interested in trying something in Philadelphia related to research, teaching, or learning, we provide a limited number of seed grants for up to a \$5,000.

Faculty have used these grants to secure additional funding, awards and other acknowledgments and sometimes perhaps to go down some new adventures with us in a longitudinal wave. The portfolio of initiatives is really interesting and very diverse and it ranges from starting a community garden at a high school or conducting health fairs in low-income communities, or conducting research around opioid issues or gig economy workers, etc.

It's very open to your creativity, all disciplines and methods of research that are applied to community change are welcome. Then I think I have one more slide, that just is about students. We get steady requests from students to work with us. Although we have less formal ways of working with them than times city semester model, we simply just don't have the capacity for it and we're more weighted to working with community members and faculty more in depth.

But we do frequently have students, in social justice internships and at times it has made sense for us to create cohort experiences for them. For the most part, it has been most efficient to work with faculty who are program coordinators to create cohort experiences and we have a relationship to a few minors in that way. Every semester we basically impact about 75-100 students and involve them in some of our work. Just to conclude, our experience has been to start with strengthening our community driven processes and from there build compelling opportunities for students and faculty.

We're here for any questions, if you have any. Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: I am so invigorated by that presentation. Thank you so much. I will speak just personally, I come from the School of Design, A Stuckeman School here at University Park in landscape architecture. I am familiar with some of your work, Tom, certainly my colleague does work in Pittsburgh.

We are running so late in our time together we can't entertain questions but I would really encourage if there's any way, I'm just invigorated, that was such an uplifting presentation. Thank you so much.

Is there any way that maybe Pam, faculty could reach Tom and Shivaani through you or if you could put some connecting information because I suspect there are faculty who want to talk to you specifically about engaging their classes and their students with your work. It's so wonderful to be reminded that we are connected to cities and that cities we are revitalizing them and revitalizing our own souls while we do it. If anyone just has a very, very quick question. Tom, I'm sorry did I cut you off?

Tom Bartnik: No. I was just going to say, my email address is available. Feel free to email me at anytime I have faculty doing it all the time.

Chair Szczygiel: That's perfect. We can get that from Pam. Is that correct? Just contact Pam Driftmier. Amit, you got cut off before, I'm going to allow you one question here and then we're going to roll.

Amit Sharma, College of Health and Human Development: I'm going to make a very quick comment. Shivaani, thank you. She does incredible work, engaging students, everything, it's a fantastic experience.

Chair Szczygiel: Yeah.

Amit Sharma: Thanks Shivaani.

Chair Szczygiel: Very good. Very good.

Amit Sharma: Thank you, Bonj.

Pamela Ann Driftmeir: I put my e-mail address in the chat.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you so much. Everyone you can contact Pam Driftmier and she will be able to make critical connections. Thank you and I'm sorry, you waited so long to get to us, but I'm so grateful that you presented. Thank you, Pam, for your patience as well. This has been really worth it. Thank you all.

Committees and Rules Nominations Report

Chair Szczygiel: The next report we have is from the Senate Committee on Committee and Rules. It “Committees and Rules Nominations Report.” It is found in Appendix I, the Chair of the Nominations Subcommittee of the Committees and Rules Chair will present the names of those who have accepted nomination to one of the three extra senatorial committees faculty rights and responsibilities, standing joint committee on Tenure and the University of P&T Committee.

I am going to very quickly just give a shout out to this group because we have never seen such a democratic, inclusive, transparent process of getting nominations from all across the University. I have never seen such a robust listing as what this Group has done. It was the effort of a Subcommittee and I would shout out your names, but I would then be lynched.

I just want to say thank you from my heart of hearts for this very impressive pool of qualified candidates and thank you publicly. Senators may make additional nominations from the floor if you have first received permission from the person you would like to nominate. If so, please raise your hand and we will promote you to speak. Beth, will you please present the slate of nominees for the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

Beth Seymour, Immediate Past Chair: Thank you, Chair Szczygiel. Yes and I will give a quick shout out to the subcommittee so thank you. Rose Petrillo, Beth King, Eric Novotny, Judy Osment, and Victor Brunsden. They worked very hard to reform the structure.

I also want to give a shout out to the Senate Office so thank you very much for your support. As well Vice-Provost Bieschke and her office for also helping to collaborate. These are three very important extra-senatorial university-wide committees and we've received fabulous nominations. Let's start. The nominations for Faculty Rights and Responsibilities are presented to you in Appendix I.

Last year, the membership of FR&R was changed to require 8 faculty and 4 deans. The faculty members must include at least three non-tenure line faculty and three tenure-line faculty.

Also, the faculty members must include at least three UP faculty and three non-UP faculty. With the Senate, we've made it quite interestingly convoluted, but to re-balance locations only UP faculty are being considered for election in this particular election. Let's begin with the faculty. We need to elect 2 faculty members and 2 alternates. Chair Szczygiel.

Chair Szczygiel: If you have a nomination, please raise your virtual hand and we will promote you to speak. Seeing none? Let's move on.

Beth Seymour: Excellent. We need to elect 1 Dean or Chancellor as a member of FR&R and 2 alternates as well.

Chair Szczygiel: Again, if there was a nomination from the floor, please raise your hand. I see none, Beth.

Beth Seymour: Excellent. Let's move on. For the next up again, same Appendix is the next Committee for the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. We need to elect 3 members, each serving a 2 year term.

Chair Szczygiel: The same routine, folks, are there any nominations from the floor? I see none. Let's move on to the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure.

Beth Seymour: Excellent. Our last committee is the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure. We will elect 1 member and 1 alternate.

Chair Szczygiel: Any nominations? Thank you. Is there a motion to close the nominations and improve the entire slate of nominees? Raise your hand and we will promote you. Or just say, I we have Carl Frisch and Victor Brunsden. Ping Wang. Is there a second?

Keith Shapiro: Second.

Chair Szczygiel: Moved and seconded that we approve the entire slate of nominees. We will vote to approve with Tallyspace. Erin, display the there it is. Thank you very much to accept the motion. Press A to reject B. The Nomination Slate must come to a close before we move on so we're just going to pause for a bit while Anna tallies the results.

Anna Butler: The poll is running and people are voting.

Chair Szczygiel: Anna, how are we looking?

Anna Butler: People are still voting.

Chair Szczygiel: Keith, what is our margin of error here?

Keith Shapiro: Our margin of error?

Chair Szczygiel: What percentage of votes do we need to?

Keith Shapiro: Majority vote.

Chair Szczygiel: Majority vote.

Anna Butler: It's like the voting has stopped now and I have a 115 Accept.

Chair Szczygiel: That gives us a majority. Thank you, Anna very much. The motion passes. The slate of nominees for these committees has been approved and the slate is closed. Thank you, Beth and thanks to the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules. It is my understanding elections will be open on or around April 1 to conclude April 15. Keep an eye out for that announcement.

***Annual University Faculty Census Report**

Chair Szczygiel: Next Informational report from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules comes from the report, Annual University Faculty Census Report, found in Appendix J. The report is only posted on the website and will not have a presentation.

Senate Council Nominations Report

Chair Szczygiel: The next Informational report, "Senate Council Nominations Report," seen in Appendix K is from the Senate Council Nominating Committee, who reports nominations for Chair-Elect and Secretary of the Senate and the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President and the Academic Trustee. These are all significant nominations.

Senators may make additional nominations from the floor if again, they have secured prior approval from those, they wish to nominate. That Seymour Chair of the Senate Council Nominating Committee and Immediate Past Chair of the Senate will present the nominations.

Beth Seymour: Thank you again. As a reminder to our new members, the Senate uses the Hare voting system, which ranks voter selection to ensure that each candidate receives a minimum number of votes to win an election.

Elected Senators will rank order their preferred candidates selecting first, second, or third choices. Where five candidates are seeking a single office if no individual secures an outright majority, the individual with the least number of votes is eliminated.

Anyone who voted for the Neeli candidate will have his or her second-choice votes added to the remaining candidates tally. The process of eliminating the bottom candidate is repeated until one candidate secures an outright majority of votes.

This is important to ensure that candidates are elected with broad electoral support. Please be certain to indicate rank preference for each office in the event your favored candidate is eliminated during the course of the balloting. We have three nominees for Chair-Elect of the Senate listed in Appendix K and all nominees have given permission to have their names placed on the ballot.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you Beth. Are there any additional nominees from the floor and I see Ping your hand is raised?

Ping Wang, Penn State Schuylkill: No. I'm sorry. I forgot to put down. I don't even know how to put it down.

Chair Szczygiel: I'm sorry. Did I not see your hand raised for a previous vote Ping?

Ping Wang: I did. I raised my hand.

Chair Szczygiel: Was that to nominate someone from the floor?

Ping Wang: No. It was motion to approve the nominee.

Chair Szczygiel: Okay. I'm sorry. I'm drawing a lot of attention to you aren't I, I apologize.

Ping Wang: I'm sorry.

Chair Szczygiel: No. Any additional nominations from the floor? Raise your virtual hand. Ping has shown us how to do it. Keith?

Keith Shapiro: Yes, Bonj. I'm sorry. I just checked my Robert's Rules and in order to close nominations, we needed two-thirds vote, so I'm sorry about that. On our previous vote if we could go back and just ask Anna, did we get a two-thirds on that?

Anna Butler: Yes. It was 118-0.

Keith Shapiro: Well, then we have it. Thank you. Sorry.

Chair Szczygiel: No, we appreciate preciseness, Keith. Keith, unless you're willing to nominate someone. There goes. There you go. Got it. Now we're good to go. I see no other hands raised. Seeing none let's move on to Secretary. Beth.

Beth Seymour: For the office of Secretary of the Senate, we have three nominees listed in Appendix K, and all nominees have given permission to have their names placed on the ballot.

Chair Szczygiel: Are there any additional nominations from the floor? Please raise your virtual hand.

Chair Szczygiel: Seeing none. Let's move on to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. Beth.

Beth Seymour: Perfect. For the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, we have four nominees. One will be elected for a three-year term expiring in 2024. The nominees are listed in Appendix K, and they've given permission to have their names placed on the ballot. Just as a point, this Committee has to be balanced with Commonwealth Campus members in University Park members are non-UP members and UP members and so this particular years is a non-UP group.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Beth, that's helpful. Are there any nominations from the floor wherever the FAC? Seeing none. Is there a motion to close nominations and approve the entire slate of nominees for this category?

Victor Brunsden: So, Moved. Brunsden, Altoona.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you. Is there a second?

Caroline Eckhardt: Eckhardt, Liberal Arts.

Chair Szczygiel: Let's proceed to TallySpace for a vote.

Anna Butler: Poll is up.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Anna. To accept the motion, press A to reject B.

Anna Butler: Votes are coming in.

Chair Szczygiel: Anna whenever we get around to two-thirds vote.

Anna Butler: Yes. We have 116 Accept and 0 Reject.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you very much. The motion passes. The slate of nominees has been approved, and the slate is closed. Thank you, Beth and the Senate Council Nominating Committee. Everyone be sure to be on the lookout for those election voting opportunities.

Update on General Education Assessment

Chair Szczygiel: The next report is from the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs and the Standing Joint Committee on General Education Assessment, titled "Update on General Education Assessment," found in Appendix L. Fifteen minutes has been allotted for presentation and discussion. Chair Williams, you have the floor to introduce this report.

Mary Beth Williams: Thank you, Bonj. This report comes solely from the Joint Standing Committee on General Education Learning Outcomes Assessment which was established by Faculty Senate in 2016 and is comprised of faculty Senators on Curricular Affairs.

As well as a number of colleagues in the office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research. Before I hand the microphone in the Office of General Education. Maggie, I'm so sorry. Before I hit the

microphone over to Maggie. I just want to acknowledge that my co-chair on this committee, coauthor of this report, co-conspirator for Learning Outcomes Assessment, Geoff Mamerow.

As you heard earlier he is not with us today. He is sorely missed by all of us, and we just want to acknowledge his work with us on this report. Thank you. Maggie.

Maggie Slattery, Assistant Dean for General Education and Director: Thank you, Mary Beth. Yes. I am passionate about general education. But not usually emotional. This is a little bit harder than sometimes. This report follows a report that was presented to Senate in January of 2020, and you know what happened in February and March of 2020.

This is a little bit delayed but we were excited to have a lot of data for you. As Mary Beth commented this Committee exists because of Senate legislation that followed the Gen Ed Task Force. The work of the Gen Ed Task Force and our goal is a robust but nimble program.

This report includes the data with three recommendations for Curricular Affairs and some highlights for future study and work. I encourage you to read the report if you haven't and follow up with questions and emails to you. That Mary Beth, and myself. I know that Curricular Affairs will be acting on some of this very soon.

Mary Beth Williams: We will also just say, we're going to give you the two cent version because it's 5:05.

Maggie Slattery: That is true.

Mary Beth Williams: We know that you can read the report. We're going to give you the overview here.

Maggie Slattery: There are slides. But I don't necessarily need them. The first recommendation is around general education recertification. We went through our first round of that. We needed to align courses with the new learning objectives and domain criteria that has been accomplished.

But future processes need to be refined and aligned with our goals, and so our recommendation is that process be external to normal Curricular workflow and support the development of educational communities, and line with one Penn State 2025 contributes developing the culture of collaboration amongst faculty who teach the same or related courses, and help faculty recognize the contribution of each course to the overall general education curriculum.

The second recommendation is on the Integrative Studies component of General Education, which was added in 2015. We had two pathways linked courses and inter-domain courses. What has panned out is that there are just insufficient number of courses for the linked pathway to be viable. This is costing the University money. But more importantly confusion for students.

It leaves some students in the lurch, and so the recommendation is to phase out the linked course pathway. There was discussion about that and Curricular Affairs today. We recognize that there are some groups that spend a lot of time and effort into creating courses, so Curricular Affairs will work with them to find alternate pathways to help students meet that requirement.

Then the last key recommendation is reiterating the need to support opportunities for faculty in collaborative discussions and participation in learning assessment. This can maintain and strengthen student learning and General Education. The one other highlight I'd like to foreshadow future reports is

one thing we're noticing is that there is a high degree of similarity and student course taking patterns. There's a big tables for you to look at.

The exact reason for this, there's some lack of flexibility and courses, some super courses which is something that the task force explicitly wanted to avoid. For lots of reasons, limited offerings at some campuses, so examining that is our future endeavor.

Mary Beth Williams: Thanks, Maggie. I'll just wrap up by saying Senate did a really something that we don't do elsewhere. That is we established the need for Learning Outcomes Assessment and the regular examination of data to review our curriculum.

This group works very hard to collect data and to work with faculty to be able to do that. We appreciate all of your engagement, our colleagues' engagement in the learning outcomes assessment process. We want it to be a dynamic process and not wait every 20 years to update General Education.

These recommendations are going to be before Curricular Affairs to consider. We would bring any possible changes, of course, to the Senate floor for your consideration. In the meantime. We would welcome your input your comments, or even your engagement on learning outcomes assessment committee. Via email, you're welcome to contact me or Maggie as we work together continuously on this process.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, Mary Beth, and Maggie, so much. This is one of those reports. While people are considering whether they have questions or not.

This is just one of those reports that once you dive into it as I have done. I think we realized that there are very few of us who are not directly, or indirectly impacted by General Education offerings. This is just such an enlightened report. I think you so much for it.

I read the thing through, and I'm suggesting that you all do that as well. It's just filled with really great, and important information and opportunities as you mentioned such as the Educational Community. I think that's fantastic. Thank you. Are there any questions from the floor? Seeing none again, our sincere thanks to you both.

Maggie Slattery: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Then, our last report. Bill if you're still here, it's a bit of a miracle I think. Did you pull off a miracle, Bill?

William Sitzabee Jr., Vice President & Chief Facilities Officer: Well, I'm probably going to be in trouble. But that's all right.

Capital Budget Report

Chair Szczygiel: Okay. Our last report is from the Senate Committee on University Planning titled, "Capital Budget Report," Appendix M—blame us, Bill. Fifteen minutes have been allotted for presentation and discussion. Chair Marko, you have the floor to introduce this report.

Frantisek Marko: I yield to the Chair Strauss.

Chair Szczygiel: Strauss is not here, to my understanding.

Jim Strauss: He appeared.

Chair Szczygiel: He is here.

Jim Strauss: Yeah, I actually taught my class and I came back, if you can believe that. But Bill has put together a wonderful report on Capital Budget spending, which basically funds new buildings and refurbishments of the old buildings. Take it away, Bill, thank you very much for staying late.

Chair Szczygiel: Jim, could you please remind everyone where Bill hails from and what his job is?

Jim Strauss: Now you put me on the spot.

William Sitzabee Jr: I'm Dr. Bill Sitzabee. I'm the Vice-President of Facilities Management and Planning and oversee the Office of Physical Plant and Environmental Health and Safety. I'll just jump right into it, Bonj. Nathan, I don't know if you're on the call, but I know that Provost had answered a question for you.

But the short answer is that the majority of our Capital Plan is actually replacement or repair work, and even though we have a fair number of new facilities, the majority of them are all replacing buildings that will be demolished upon completion of the facility. Perfect example is the new Engineering Buildings.

West 1 and 2 will replace the Engineering Units in Hammond and those will be demolished. Likewise with Liberal Arts and Oswald and several others. It is part of our strategy and I would say the overwhelming majority of new facilities follows that course. I don't know who's got the slides, who brings them up.

Erin Lynn Eckley: I can do that, but you'll have to give me just a moment.

William Sitzabee Jr: This presentation I actually gave to the Board of Trustees back in November, maybe a couple of minor updates since then. We can go to the first slide, which shows the initial plan and actual education in general borrowing for the Capital Plan. As you can see on the bottom line is that the plan was reduced by \$143 million in total. If you recall, because some of this is repeat information, the plan started with a total of \$750 million of borrowing over five-year period. This was relying on an average of a two percent increase in tuition to cover the debt service for that plan.

As you know, the University has held tuition flat for many of the, I think, five of the last six years, so that we were not able to do that. We had to lower the Capital Plan and then make some rearrangements. In Fiscal Year 2021, which is the update here, we reduced the borrowing from 610 million to 499 million, or just shy of 500, due to contractions in the capital claim caused by the pandemic.

Then we reduced borrowing further from 499 down to 437 due to an additional \$40 million of capital funding that we received from the State of Pennsylvania. I also want to point out that major maintenance was reduced due to a series of shortfalls in the operating budget. That will require us to lower the overall budget by three million per year. If you recall, the initial plan was to increase the major maintenance-based budget three million dollars year-over-year throughout the course of the plan.

The total impact would be a \$24 million reduction. The good news is that we built into the initial plan assuming that we would receive a \$40 million allotment from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Over the past four years, we received more than that with two allotments of 70 million and one of 90. You can see on the bottom line there where it says Commonwealth capital increased the budget from the plan to 340 million total.

If you go to the next slide, as I stated earlier, the Capital Plan was built on the notion of receiving a baseline allocation of 40 million from the Commonwealth capital or DGS funding as we call it. Increases to this allocation have been used as an offset to the reduction in the available amount of education in general borrowing. The E&G borrowing was reduced during the first two years of the Capital Plan due to both COVID-19 pandemic and tuition being frozen at the time.

We initially deferred projects such as the Nursing Science Building Renovation and the PAW Center Renovation of Penn State DuBois because of COVID. However, with the additional DGS funds, we were able to put those projects back on the plan. This year we received \$90 million of DGS funding, 50 more than the baseline.

The right side of the slide shows how we allocated the funding. With the funding going to various System Upgrade projects at University Park in Hershey. Most significantly was the allocation of \$40 million of DGS funds to the Liberal Arts Research and Teaching Building, now named the Susan Welch Liberal Arts Building, which will offset 40 million of borrowing total.

This strategy will enable us to allocate additional funds to the Susan Welch Building in the future if we get additional funds from the State. If we go to the next slide. Since the last Capital Plan update to the Board of Trustees, there were several funding related changes to individual projects.

The largest change, which I mentioned a moment ago, was the shift in \$40 million of state funding to the Liberal Arts Project with the thinking that additional funding could also be vectored there should the University receive more. If that's the case, then we would offset the borrowing and not increase the project costs.

Several other projects have slightly increased in regards to their overall costs due to the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, the pausing construction due to COVID forced us to use winter methods on the water reclamation facility and in turn increased the cost of the facility project.

The combined heat and power system in the West Campus Steam Plant both increased slightly due to escalation costs due to COVID. The Breazeale Nuclear Reactor was on the plan but was pulled from the plan due to the COVID pandemic, but we were able to put it back on the plan with funding coming directly from the College of Engineering.

As I mentioned earlier, the PAW Center at Penn State DuBois approved by the Board of Trustees a year ago July was also initially deferred due to COVID pandemic, but subsequently, we re-added it to the Capital Plan and we're able to move that forward. Finally, in order to reduce the debt service for the Fiscal Year of 2021, the Smith Building Renovation at Penn State Altoona has been deferred.

I know I'm moving through these pretty quickly, but wanted to make sure we cover that. In the next slide, this summarizes the numerous projects and programs that had been reduced or deferred due to some of the factors that I mentioned earlier, primarily the pandemic, also holding the tuition flat, including several other ways to re-vector the funding.

The logic behind this list was primarily due to the type of funding and when it was. A great deal of the projects were when we were planning to borrow the money and when we could forfeit the cash to cover some of the losses of COVID. I know Nick Jones had showed you some of that loss earlier in a previous meeting. The biggest impact was the Sackett Building.

We had initially planned to design the Sackett Building, but actually execute the construction in the next Capital Plan phasing so it doesn't impact the timing should we come forward with another Capital Plan to pick that up. As Nathan had mentioned earlier, the major maintenance took a big hit in total and then a few other buildings had got pushed aside.

You'll notice the System Upgrades, just to give you some clarity there, that's a group of programs. Those are things like roofs, windows, masonry work, elevators, where we do holistic work across the board. We were able to pick up a lot of that back by using DGS funds on some of those.

At that point, we can call it there a Capital Plan Update. And I know there's project updates or there's some additional slides and I could go through those quickly if you would like.

Chair Szczygiel: Yes, please.

William Sitzabee Jr: If we skip over to the Major Project Status, construction of both the College of Engineering Research and Teaching Space projects and the Palmer Art Museum have begun in earnest. The replacement of the Henning Building now known as the Animal, Veterinary and Biomedical Science Building is complete and open for business.

Also substantial completion on the Water Reclamation Facility is anticipated this August after a brief pause from the pandemic. I'll give you a chance to look at that slide briefly. If you go to the next slide, the Willard Building Renovation in addition, along with the enabling projects for the West campus expansion, the West Parking Deck, the West Campus Road Extension, were all completed last May.

Both the replacements for the James Building known as the Penn State Innovation Hub and the Combined Heat and Power System at the West campus steam plant are also complete. And finally, the West Campus Chiller Plant Expansion nears completion as well. If we go to the next slide at the Commonwealth Campuses, the Beaver Athletic Center and Wellness Center Innovation at Penn State Berks nears completion. While projects at both Penn State Behrend and DuBois are now underway.

The Ostermayer Lab Renovation of Penn State Greater Allegheny is now complete, and I would have to say, it's a tremendous impact on the campus with their ability to deliver class instruction there. Next slide, also projects at Penn State Lehigh Valley, Penn State Mont Alto, and Penn State Shenango are complete as well with the ribbon cutting for the Penn State Mont Alto Allied Health Building coming up here in May. So market impact on the campus there.

We go to the next slide. Phase 2A of the East Halls construction renovation was completed in November of 2020. Phase 1 of the Last Football building is underway now and the reallocation of the steam plant for the Applied Research Laboratory was completed in July 2020. I would also add that recently under construction, a little bit outdated from the presentation, is we kicked off the Garfield Water Tunnel Project just the last couple of weeks over on North Atherton Street.

Some projects in design so if we move over to the design phase, I'll give you a quick update there. We anticipate that construction on several projects including the Physics Building and Osman Laboratory Renovation they kicked off either late this summer or early fall. The Susan Waltz Liberal Arts Research and Teaching Building is scheduled to kickoff also late this summer.

The Deike Building Renovation has been put on pause for a brief moment while we try to figure out some funding aspects. That project came in way over budget so we're trying to re-scope that. The Chemical and Radiation Accumulation Facility, it will get geared up to start this fall that's currently under

design. Moving over to the next slide at the Commonwealth Campuses, the schedule for the projects at both Penn State Abington and Penn State Harrisburg have yet to be determined as we're working through some of the regulatory requirements.

I'm happy to report the update from that is that we're moving forward with the Abington project. It seems as if we've got those regulatory issues figured out. We plan to use TGS funding for the Harrisburg project so we're working through that process right now. We anticipate the construction of the classroom building and renovation of Penn State Scranton, which will provide a definitive on-campus identity for the ever-growing Nursing Program and the general classroom building renovation of Penn State Beaver to both start in 2022 late fall.

Finally, construction on the Boot Student Union renovation an addition at Penn State New Kensington is anticipated to start in February of 2023, little under a year from now. Going to the next slide, phase 2B of the East Halls renovation has begun and phase 2C, is looking to get launched here this spring. If you recall, both of those projects were paused due to the pandemic and if you go back to the budget impacts from COVID, you can see that's where we took a major hit from a financial perspective.

Both of those who have been put back on the plan and moving forward and we're finalizing some of the design with those now. But we do anticipate Paula calls taking a pause into the next capital plan. The next slide, the Applied Research Laboratory has two projects that are currently in design.

I just mentioned the Garfield Water Tunnel has actually moved out of design and into construction. We kicked that off and then the Applied Research Laboratory itself is still in design for their new facility.

Both the costs and schedule of replacements for the ARL are dependent on the master plan discussion but we have moved forward with the Garfield Water Tunnel. Finally, construction on the comparative medicine facility expansion and monetization at the College of Medicine is moving forward in design as well.

Then I'll just give you one last slide here. It's a digital roll-up of some programs that I had mentioned. This slide shows the roll-up of 22 projects totaling approximately \$99 million at University Park, and nine projects totaling \$43 million at the Commonwealth Campuses.

These represent a series of smaller projects in the \$5 million to \$7 million range. The systems upgrade in campuses keep up initiatives that focus on things such as masonry, plumbing roofs, elevators, and so on. I did mention the major maintenance while the operating budget expense is considered on our strategic capital plan, it is a operating budget program and we're moving forward with the base budget of 33 million on major maintenance total per year, and that was supposed to be moved up to 50. That was our target for the whole program.

The Energy Savings Program is noted on there. This is not a funding source, but really a funding program. We have a series of projects that move forward with a payback period and the savings in the energy and utility costs are what really fund those projects.

I had reported to the Board that we had wrapped up the SIMBA project that was on the list. With that, I knew I blew through a lot of that information really quick. I'm happy to take some questions.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you Bill. Honestly, it boggles the mind to think about everything that's going on. Lisa, I see your hand up, but I'm really dying to ask you this question. If you could? If you were in charge

of the budget, what would you like to see happening? Do you think that were balanced in our approach to maintenance and development?

William Sitzabee Jr: It is a major challenge, and right after this presentation to the Board, I had also given an update on the state of the physical plant. The bottom line is that our backlog of maintenance is growing. We're at about \$1.7 billion of backlog total. It does average about a three or four percent growth per year and we'd like to see that either flat or declining.

It is a significant issue because that represents the quality of the facilities of that backlog number. It's a 10-year numbers, so it's true backlog of work that should have been done, that hasn't been done, and then a forecast of what work is needed in the next ten years. I don't have those numbers in front of me directly. But I would say about half of it, 6- 800 million of that was in a truly backlogged version so that's worked where things really are falling apart, needs to be addressed.

Then you have that forecasting of work that we know will come due. So mechanical systems wear out, we know that they're going to wear at a certain period of time. The bottom line is that when I presented it to the Board, the strategy has to look at managing the operating budget and the capital budget together so if we spend less on capital, we have to spend more on maintenance.

There's reasons why you would do both. Recapitalization allows you to modernize buildings and bring them up to a year 2021- 22 standard. Long answer to your question but bottom line is yes, we have to pay attention to the physical plant and fund it.

Chair Szczygiel: I hear frustration there, Lisa.

Lisa Posey, Smeal College of Business: Hi. Thanks, Bill. Your report are always really interesting and really well-presented. I hope I didn't miss it, but I have a curiosity about what's happening with the Hammond building?

William Sitzabee Jr: Yes, The plan is, and the timing has shifted a little bit, as we're building West 1 and West 2, we will move folks out of the Engineering Units and out of the Hammond building into the two new facilities. At that point, we're set up to do demolition work on the Engineering Units.

The plan was to move the folks out of Sackett into Hammond and use that as swing space so we could renovate Sackett building. Then once Sackett was renovated, we would demolish Hammond. Due to the uncertainty of what we're doing with Sackett, the University, we're going to have to make a decision whether we move forward with demolishing Hammond or if we want to hold on and swing space for Sackett because it saves millions and millions of dollars if we don't have to swing them somewhere else and so we have to figure out the timing on what the Sackett project looks like.

Lisa Posey: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Susan.

Susan Fredricks, Penn State Brandywine: Hi, Susan Fredricks, Penn State Brandywine. With COVID, we uncovered some issues with our air quality and some building issues. Are there any plans that Capital Budget to address any of these new issues that arose because of COVID and circulation issues?

William Sitzabee Jr: Well, I would say that's a complicated answer because at the end of the day, a lot of the issues that drives concerns with the COVID is also directly related to the backlog. The number one

thing that ASHRAE recommends is that we have our systems operating as designed. When you have systems that are failing or falling apart, that's the first concern.

Now, we did spend a lot of effort over a year ago in the summertime when everybody was off campus actually doing a heavy blitz of maintenance all across all of our facilities to include Commonwealth. We do have them operating, but in terms of the system upgrades and the general replacement of those systems, some of that is in the capital plan.

I would advocate not enough, but we do have to prioritize those and triage them the best we can. Does that answer your question?

Susan Fredricks: Yes, it does. Thank you very much.

Chair Szczygiel: John.

John Gerard Champagne: Hey, Champagne, Erie. I just have a question about how priorities are determined for building. I'm going to speak really frankly about our campus. I'm in a building that was built the year that I came to Penn State in, 1993.

Nothing has been done in that building. Meanwhile, we have a new gym coming up. We already have a huge gym. We also have office spaces that don't have bathrooms in them. It seems like a crazy combination of priorities. I don't know, is that—are those decisions made on the local level, how are things like this decided?

William Sitzabee Jr: Well, I don't want to get into the specifics of the Behrend campus, but I will tell you the gym, the Erie Hall replacement was mostly funded by student dollars. The students advocated for and weighed in on what they wanted to spend that money on.

Now, I don't have the specific dollar in front of me, but I would say, don't quote me on this, but 70 or 80 percent of facilities funded by facility student fee money. That was a major driver for that particular decision. But in all cases, what we tried to do is take the facility condition. What is the current facility condition?

Look at what's the opportunity in terms of should we maintain it, should we replace it? Then overlay the program impacts. What programs from a baseline, things like safety compliance code are a major factor in driving the priority; accreditation issues usually are pretty high on that priority.

But, I think sometimes some of these look a little bit confused because there's different pots of money. The student fee money is separate, then education in general money is separate from the ICA money, separate from the residential auxiliary money.

Those priorities are usually within their bucket. When it comes to the education, I'm assuming you're talking about an education in general facility. That priority would stack up against all the other education in general facilities where that \$1.7 billion a backlog is sitting and get prioritized based on programming condition.

John Gerrard Champagne: Thanks.

Chair Szczygiel: Bill, I know you not I have talked about this before, but it says pockets of money that which lead families, parents and students to walk around.

They see the huge cranes, the booms are up and new buildings springing up all over and leading to the question of why can't we fix what we have thing. It is a very confusing scenario out there, really is. I'm not going to ask you to try to explain it more detailed, but we appreciate the complexity of the job that you've got and the job that you're doing and trying to communicate that to everyone else. I appreciate that.

William Sitzabee Jr: Thank you. I will tell you. I've only been here a little over four years, but I had presented the state of the physical plan to the Board, and I was told the feedback I got is that that's the first time that they've had a comprehensive look at the state of the physical plan and that's my goal, is to advocate for the facilities and do what I can.

Chair Szczygiel: That's great, thank you. Margaret, is this your hand up for Dr. Sitzabee? Sure, go ahead. One last one.

Margaret Michels, College of the Liberal Arts: First, thank you. I apologize if I missed this question already because I accidentally logged out. But I'm wondering in the new facilities that are being built, are there energy considerations such as solar, etc, being put in place?

William Sitzabee Jr: Well, the short answer is yes. We think about the energy now the specifics to solar from a district heating and cooling and energy consumption perspective, commercial grade solar is far more practical for cheaper and more beneficial.

We just executed an off-site solar project to replace 25 percent of our purchased electric with solar. You might not see solar panels on the roof. But we are basically buying our power through the grid, through a sustainable resource. Now as we constantly think about energy and trying to lower our energy consumption.

That's one of the best things we can do is create tighter, better insulated facilities that use less. You've got a demand side and you got a supply side so we have to solve that question on both sides of the equation.

Chair Szczygiel: Okay. Thank you Bill so much and for your patience, it's greatly appreciated.

William Sitzabee Jr: Thank you.

Chair Szczygiel: Alright, I think now we're ready to look at the results of our earlier votes. Laura, my understanding is Anna's voice is about ready to give up. Can you please read out each of the report's name and the results of the vote for the record.

Laura Pauley, Senate Office Executive Director: Sure, I will do that as soon as it comes up.

Chair Szczygiel: All right.

Anna Butler: Someone is going to have to give me sharing because right now I can't share.

Laura Pauley: Security. You should be ready, Anna.

Anna Butler: Okay. I can now.

Laura Pauley: We had four Legislative Reports that we voted on. The first one Revision to Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6(p) elected Senator Standing Committee had a vote of 102 Accept, 59 Reject. This report passed. The Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6(d), Committee on Education, Addition of DEI Principals had 137 Accept, 7 Reject.

This report passed. Revision to Standing Rules, Article III, Section 8, Faculty Athletics Representatives 142 Accept, 7 Reject. This report passed. The last was Revision to Policy 45-00, Faculty and Student Responsibilities Regarding Canceled Class When a Campus is Closed, there were 108 Accept, 34 Reject. This report passed. The last two were the Nomination Reports and we already presented those results.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you very much, Laura and Anna.

Anna Butler: Yes. Thank you, Laura.

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS - NONE

Chair Szczygiel: Item L moving on with our Agenda, New Legislative Business. Is there any New Business to bring to the floor? Please raise your hand.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Szczygiel: Moving on Item N, Comments and Recommendations For the Good of the University. Are there any?

Keith Shapiro: Keith Shapiro, Arts & Architecture. I just wanted to thank the Senate Office staff and Laura and a whole bunch for doing a great job today. It was really a lot of work and we appreciate it, Anna's voice about the to go. She's still here.

Anna Butler: Thank you, Keith.

Chair Szczygiel: Bless their hearts. Mary Beth?

Mary Beth: Yeah. I also want to thank the Senate Office staff, especially Anna and Destiny, who did a huge amount of work in the last couple of weeks of implementing our legislation in January. They've created all the new curricular policies for you to see on the Senate website. It's thanks to their hard work for doing that. I want to say thank you and bravo to them for doing that.

Anna Butler: Thank you, Mary Beth. You're welcome.

Chair Szczygiel: Thank you, everyone. Echo all of those comments. It's been a really interesting meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Mary Beth Williams: So moved.

Chair Szczygiel: I didn't hear you, but I think I heard so moved, all in favor say aye loudly.

All Speakers: Aye.

Chair Szczygiel: The motion passes, the next regularly scheduled meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, April 26th, 2022 at 1:30. As of now, we are planning for an April meeting to be in person at University Park. Senators from Commonwealth Campuses will receive information on travel and hotels.

The following Senators were noted as having attended the 3/15/2022 Senate Meeting.

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

- Farnan, Kaitlin
- Fausnight, Tracy
- Findley, Samuel
- Fox, Derek
- Frederick, Samuel
- Fredricks, Susan
- Freiberg, Andrew
- Frisch, Paul
- Fuller, Ed
- Furfaro, Joyce
- Gallagher, Julie
- Gaudelius, Yvonne
- Gayah, Vikash
- Glantz, Edward
- Graham, Joshua
- Griffin, Christopher
- Grimes, Galen
- Gross, Charlene
- Grozinger, Christina
- Guadagnino, Frank
- Haddad, Owen
- Hanses, Mathias
- Hardin, Marie
- Hardy, Melissa
- Harris, Jeff
- Hauck, Randy
- Hayford, Harold
- Hemerly, Nathan
- Higgins, Jeanmarie
- Holden, Lisa
- Hook, Stephen
- Hufnagel, Pamela
- Iliev, Peter
- Jett, Dennis
- Jones, Nicholas
- Jordan, Matthew
- Karpa, Kelly
- Kass, Lawrence
- Kass, Rena
- Kennedy-Phillips, Lance
- Kenyon, William
- Kim, Agnes

- King, Beth
- Kitko, Lisa
- Kramer, Lauren
- Kubat, Robert
- Kunes, Melissa
- Lang, Dena
- Larson, Allen
- Le, Binh
- Lear, Matt
- Ledford, Savanna
- Linch, Amy
- Love, Jeff
- Mahoney, Joseph
- Malcos, Jennelle
- Mangel, Lisa
- Marko, Frantisek
- Mason, John
- Mathews, Jonathan
- Maximova, Siela
- McCloskey, Andrea
- McKinney-Marvasti, Karyn
- Melton, Robert
- Messner, John
- Michels, Margaret
- Mocioiu, Irina
- Mookerjee, Rajen
- Moore, Jacob
- Mulder, Kathleen
- Najjar, Raymond
- Nesbitt, Jennifer
- Noce, Kathleen
- Nousek, John
- Novotny, Eric
- Nurkhaidarov, Ernek
- Ofosu, Willie
- Ozment, Judith
- Page, B.Richard
- Palma Anda, Julio
- Palmer, Timothy
- Parizek, Heather
- Perkins, Daniel
- Petricini, Tiffany

- Petrilla, Rosemarie
- Pfeifer Reitz, Dawn
- Phillips, Kathleen
- Pierce, Mari
- Posey, Lisa
- Potosky, Denise
- Precht, Jay
- Purdy Drew, Kirstin
- Rhen, Linda
- Riccomini, Paul
- Robicheaux, Timothy
- Robinson, Brandi
- Roy, Matthew
- Ruggiero, Francesca
- Rutherford Siegel, Sue
- Saltz, Ira
- Saunders, Brian
- Schaeffer, Lillian
- Schneider, Noelle
- Scott, Geoff
- Seymour, Elizabeth
- Shannon, Robert
- Shapiro, Keith
- Sharma, Amit
- Shea, Maura
- Shearer, Gregory
- Shen, Wen
- Shurgalla, Richard
- Signorella, Margaret
- Simmons, Cindy
- Sims, Damon
- Sinha, Alok
- Skladany, Martin
- Sloboda, Noel
- Slot, Johanna
- Smith, David
- Snyder, Stephen
- Springall, Robert
- Sprow Forte, Karin
- Stine, Michele
- Strauss, James
- Strickland, Martha

- Strohacker, Emily
- Suliman, Samia
- Swallow, Nicole
- Swinarski, Matthew
- Szczygiel, Bonj
- Tallman, Nathan
- Tavangarian, Fariborz
- Taylor, Ann
- Taylor, Jonte
- Thomas, Emily
- Tyworth, Michael
- Volk Chewning, Lisa
- Vrana, Kent
- Walker, Eric
- Wang, Ping
- Warner, Alfred
- Watts, Alison
- Wede, Joshua
- Whitehurst, Marcus
- Williams, Mary
- Williams, Nicole
- Wolfe, Douglas
- Wong, Jeffrey
- Yagnik, Arpan
- Yen, John
- Zorn, Christopher

Elected	168
Students	7
Ex Officio	6
Appointed	11
Total	193