



THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

T H E S E N A T E R E C O R D

Volume 55-----April 26, 2022----Number 9

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.	<a href="#">Final Agenda for March 15, 2022</a>	Pages ii-iii
II.	<a href="#">Minutes and Summaries of Remarks</a>	Pages 1-59
III.	Appendices	
	a. <a href="#">Attendance</a>	Pages 60-65

FINAL AGENDA APRIL 26, 2022

- A. [MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING](#) Page 2  
Minutes of the March 15, 2022, in The Senate Record 55:8 Page 2
- B. [COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE](#) Page 2  
[Senate Curriculum Report of March 29, 2022](#)  
<http://Senate.psu.edu/curriculum/Senate-curriculum-reports/>
- C. [REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL](#) Meeting of April 5, 2022 Page 2
- D. [ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR](#) Pages 3-7  
  
John W. White Graduate Fellowship
- E. [COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY](#) Pages 14
- F. [COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST](#) Pages 14-24
- G. [FORENSIC BUSINESS](#) Page 24-

**Senate Committee on Education**

- [Making General Election Day a Non-Instructional Day – Appendix B](#) Page 24-30
- H. [UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE](#) Page 30
- I. [LEGISLATIVE REPORTS](#) Page 30-39

**Senate Committees on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid And Education**

- [Revision to Policy 48-40: Deferred Grades – Clarifying Language – Appendix C](#) Pages 30-31

**Senate Committee on Committees and Rules**

- [Revisions to Bylaws, Article III, Election to Senate – Appendix D](#) Page 31  
(presentation at 4/26 Plenary Meeting, vote will occur at next Plenary)

- [Revision to Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6\(a\) Establishing Subcommittees – Appendix E](#) Page 31  
(presentation at 4/26 Plenary Meeting; vote will occur at next Plenary upon approval of the Bylaws revision above)

- [Revisions to Standing Rules, Article I, Section 12\(e\) Tellers – Appendix F](#) Page 31-32  
(presentation at 4/26 Plenary Meeting; vote will occur at next Plenary upon approval of the Bylaws revision above)

*revision above)*

## **Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and Curricular Affairs**

[Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure Section 6\(c\) – Addition of DEI to Curricular Affairs – Appendix G](#) Page 32

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

Proposed Preamble to the Senate Constitution entitled: A Statement On the Role of the Faculty Senate at the Pennsylvania State University – Appendix H Page 33-37  
*(presented at the 3/15 Plenary Meeting and voted on at the 4/26 Plenary Meeting)*

## **Senate Committee on Education**

[Rescind Policy 44-40: Proctoring of Examinations – Appendix I](#) Page 37-38

## **Senate Committee on Global Programs**

[Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6\(h\) – Committee on Global Programs – Appendix J](#) Page 39

## **J. [ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS](#) Page 39**

### **Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits**

[Guiding Principles for the Design of Health Care Plans – Appendix K](#) Page 39-46

## **K. [POSITIONAL REPORTS - NONE](#) Page 46**

## **L. [INFORMATIONAL REPORTS](#) Pages 46-57**

### **Senate Committee on University Planning**

[PSU COVID Financial Impact – Appendix L](#) Page 50-54  
*[15 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]*

[College of Medicine Budget Report – Appendix M](#) Page 46-50  
*[15 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]*

### **Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid**

[\\*2021 Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program – Appendix N](#) Page 54

[\\*Annual Report on High School Students Enrolled Nondegree In Credit Courses – Appendix O](#) Page 54

### **Senate Committee on Education**

[\\*Summary of Petitions by College 2020-2021 – Appendix P](#) Page 54

## **Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations**

[Faculty Tenure Flow Annual Report – March 2022 – Appendix Q](#) Page 54  
*[10 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]*

## **Senate Committees on Faculty Affairs, Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, and Educational Equity and Campus Environment**

[Earning Tenure During COVID – Appendix R](#) Page 55  
*[10 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]*

## **Senate Committees on Intra-University Relations and Faculty Affairs**

[Non-tenure-line Promotion Flow Report, 2020-2021 – Appendix S](#) Page 56-  
*[10 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]*

## **Senate Committee on Global Programs**

[Role of Sustainability in Penn State Global – Appendix T](#) Page 56  
*[5 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]*

## **Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity**

[\\*Commonwealth Campuses Research Programs – Appendix U](#) Page 56

## **Senate Council**

[Report on Fall 2020 – Academic Unit Visits – Appendix W](#) Page 57  
*[5 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]*

[Report on Spring 2021 – Academic Unit Visits – Appendix V](#) Page 57  
*[5 minutes allotted for presentation and discussion]*

## **Elections Commission**

[\\*Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2022-2023 – Appendix X](#) Page 57

[\\*Report of Senate Elections – Appendix Y](#) Page 57

\*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 59

The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, April 26, 2022, at 1:30 p.m. via Zoom Webinar with Bonj Szczygiel, Chair, presiding.

**Chair Bonj Szczygiel, College of Arts and Architecture:** Welcome. This is so thrilling. We wanted to begin [OVERLAPPING] our time spent today with a brand new video that was prepared by the Communications Advisory Group. This is a group that came together over the summer, and has been working hard on lots of the things that you may or may not have noticed. One of which a more recent one is—[INAUDIBLE] [BACKGROUND] The lovely melliflous voice is that of his spousal unit.

Thank you very much. It's a family thing. Today I am happy to report that this is our very first in-person/hybrid mode. We have a good showing here, in 112 Kern. We also have an excellent showing online. This will probably not be unusual. We will always have a bit of a split. But we hope to see a few more faces in the crowd. But right now this is a good start.

Welcome one and all, no matter what mode you are joining us in. As usual, and I'm sorry, but let's spend a few minutes talking about reviewing our meeting instructions—who can speak in a Senate meeting. The privilege of the floor during Senate meetings is only given to members of one of the following categories. First, for the vast majority of you in this room, if you are an elected or appointed student, faculty, or administrative senator, you have the right to the floor.

That's the first category. The second category are senators elected representing retired faculty. We have two. The third are past chairs of the Faculty Senate. We've got a few of those in the room I think. The meetings are public. But unless you were described in one of those categories, please do not try to ask a question. You can email Erin Eckley, to my right, in the Senate Office, if you would like to request to speak at a future meeting.

We've placed her e-dress in the chat, I believe, or will be. This meeting, like all Senate plenary meetings, is being recorded. Please be mindful for those of you attending on Zoom to mute your mics, that we don't have background noise. As well for those of you in the room, let's be sure to mute our cell phones and other devices. If you are joining us on Zoom, if you feel comfortable doing so, please feel free to turn your video on.

It's always good to see faces. If someone should have to miss a meeting, the recording will be available in a matter of days through the Senate website. Regarding the use of chat on Zoom, we've come a long way, kids. Just a reminder, the chat feature is available for attendees to communicate with each other as appropriate during a professional meeting. I need to say no more. Thank you all.

If you are presenting a report when it's time for you to do so, we will call upon you. Please wait to speak until you are introduced by the Chair, or please come forward if you are in the room. When you're finished, please mute. If you have an emergency, technical or otherwise, email Anna Butler, or Destiny Anderson. Likewise, their e-dresses have or will be placed in the chat. If you have a question, you can raise your actual hand.

I know they're creaky and you had to stretch a little bit to get them up. In Zoom, of course use the raise hand function. I'm logged on to Zoom, so I can see when that is happening, and other people are watching as well. I want you to feel like you belong to this group. Either way, wait until the chair recognizes you. If in the room the mic is brought to you to speak, begin by stating your last name and

academic unit. For example, Szczygiel Arts and Architecture, please speak clearly and slowly as the audio is not always clear.

How do you vote? In order to get an accurate vote we'll be using TallySpace. Did everyone get a notice this morning from their committee chairs? No, I'm seeing a lot of blank faces, so I want to meet the committee chairs afterwards.

But I'm sure you were all told, I know you were, that, I'll remind that our clickers are long gone. They will not be coming back to 112 Kern. If you're on Zoom, you'll be used to the voting process, and will be logging into TallySpace. If you're in the room, you need to be hooked up to the Internet in any way that you possibly can and log on to TallySpace. The directions were provided in the Agenda, so it'd be good just to get your Penn State ID ready and maybe to open it up.

TallySpace does have a time limit, so maybe wait until you actually log in. As always, be patient, we are running a meeting like this, has a lot of moving parts. We have every single Senate Office person manning various aspects of the meeting. They are sprinkled throughout the room. They are behind the scenes. They are here to warm your coffee if that should be needed.

They are trying to do everything in their power to make your experience very pleasant this time. I want to welcome everyone and thank you again for being here. Your commitment, everyone, is as important now than ever. You are the Faculty Senate. In all aspects of your contributions, your enthusiasms, your intelligence, your energy, what you bring to this forum is just humbling and amazing.

---

### **MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING**

#### **Minutes of the March 15, 2022, Meeting in The Senate Record**

**Chair Szczygiel:** It's been such a privilege to be a part of that. On to the Agenda, Item A, Minutes of the Preceding Meeting. The minutes of the Senate meeting are in two forms, a video recording of the meeting, that is posted within a few days of the meeting, and the formal Senate record, which provides a full transcription of the accounts at the meeting. Both have been posted and are available in the Senate website for review.

This is, again, a little bit new, that's why I keep repeating it. We should note that since the Senate record is a verbatim account, corrections to the transcript can be made at any time. If you happen to be perusing through the transcript a year from now, you see your name misspelled or some other egregious error, you can let the Senate Office know and they will be able to correct it.

Having said that and knowing you have full flow to access to the record, are there any additions or corrections to the March 15th, 2022, plenary record at this time?

Please raise your hand.

Seeing none and hearing none, the record is approved.

---

**COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE**  
**Senate Curriculum Report of March 29, 2022 – Appendix A**

**Chair Szczygiel:** Next Item, Communications to the Senate. The Senate Curriculum Report of March 29th, 2022 is posted on the University Faculty Website and listed on the Agenda as Appendix A.

---

**REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL**  
**Meeting of April 5, 2022**

**Chair Szczygiel:** Item C. Report of the Senate Council, meetings of the April 5th Senate Council can be found by the link in your Agenda. Included in the minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President earlier that same day.

---

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

**Chair Szczygiel:** Item D. This is where I get to talk for a little bit. It's my last time so I'm going to take advantage of this. Keith knows how to get me off the stage.

He'll just look at me, you know that eye, that look. What a way to end a Senate season. We are in person, it is springtime things are looking up, there are hopeful signs all around us. We have a room populated with fresh and friendly and happy faces with honored guests and visitors and members of the Senate family who are I think, pleased to be out amongst people.

The success of these past two days began many weeks ago with the Senate Office. Especially the efforts for two of whom the in-person Senate experiences absolutely brand new: Erin and Sarah. They have, the entire office staff, have spent the better part of this past month sorting through the many details associated with now, travel, accommodations, committee room reservations, the Commonwealth Caucus gatherings, lunch, all the while still holding down the fort and conducting Senate business.

I want to thank and please stand up as I recognize each of you. The following, our latest edition to the Senate Office, Amy Harris. Amy, are you in the room? Amy, everyone say hi. You get the most applause, stay standing, please. We're going to wait and do the applause at the end just to save time but I love your enthusiasm. In addition to performing curricular duties, Amy will help Sarah and Erin with general office tasks.

Thank Goodness you are here, much needed Amy, and welcome. The second newest and part-time addition is a Philadelphian, Destiny Anderson. She is, of course, not here, but Destiny, please stand. Destiny, okay, there she is. Destiny is our Communications Specialist for whom we are very grateful and I personally would like to see Destiny become full-time, if we could swing that, someone.

Our all things curricular expert Kadi Corter is here. Kadi, please stand up, Kadi. Kathe Craig, Kathe Craig. Kathe keeps FR&R process running smoothly and kindly handle student petitions with the utmost of care. We also have the tabulating magician behind all of our votes, Anna Butler. There is Anna is waving to us. Way to go, Anna.

We have a special thanks to Interim Executive Director Laura Pauley for a very successful semester. Laura, please stand. Laura, you are tossed in midstream and somehow managed not to drown, but instead you flourished, and we're a tremendous help to the Senate Office and to its Officers. Thank you.

The face of the Senate Office, the voice, I should say, of the Senate Office. The amazing maestro of the reception and the person that you probably get on the phone when you call, where is Sarah? There she is, Sarah Silverman. She is as kind as her voice sounds on the phone, see, it's very nice. Then a onto the face of the Senate Office, the brilliant and amazingly fearless office manager, Erin Eckley. She has been my lifeline. She has been my lifeline and many times over the past few years.

Thank you, Erin. I can attest this group has worked very hard to anticipate our every need and make our first in-person gathering in a while, a seamless one. Now I'm going to make you applause again. A round of applause for everyone, please. Thank you. I just received a note from Erin to say, if you have rose petals or any coins and want to toss it on the stage. Just do it; don't hold back.

My sincerity thanks to you all. Next, I am very happy to report on two very new developments that will carry forward important Senate work. Sometimes we hear these reports, we are trying to do a better job of letting you know when they've been passed and approved by the President and what their thereafter post-Senate life has been. These are two great examples of the Senate work coming to life.

Sometimes it takes a while, but they should be recognized and celebrated nonetheless. Following up on last year's report from EECE calling for a University-wide DEI dashboard and its subsequent approval by President Barron is the Special Joint Committee on the Penn State Diversity, Equity and Inclusion dashboard. Current EECE chair Doug Bird and vice chair are Apran Yagnik have been working with Karen Vance from OPAIR and the Office of Educational Equity to pull together this special Joint Committee.

I am very happy to report that this project is off to a fantastic start. They started working while the Provost and I we're still trying to figure out what their charge should be. They were very anxious and now that they have a full charge, as you can imagine, developing a University-wide dashboard and reporting mechanism, which, by the way, will include some Standing Committees of the Senate, is a large and daunting task.

Nonetheless, they're already on the way toward figuring it out and we are fully anticipate a fully functioning dashboard come April of 2023. Thanks to everyone for working on this and bringing this important initiative to life. It's fantastic. Additionally, we will soon have an even younger Joint Task Force in place for the re-examination of AC76, Penn State's Academic Policy on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

The Senate has had a long history of committed engagement with the procedures involving the rights and responsibilities of all full-time faculty when problems arise and cannot be resolved through other channels. From its inception in 1973, AC76 has not had a significant holistic update and review. It is needed and no one brought this note to my attention than our Parliamentarian, Keith Shapiro, who in his spare time that is, when he's not chairing the Senate Self-Study or helping to provide procedural advice at CC&R and Senate Council and, of course, the plenary meetings, plenary meetings and when he's not also chairing FR&R.



I'm exhausted for you. Has managed to be ever mindful of these larger issues and needs of the University Faculty Senate throughout. I want to give a very special thanks to our colleague Keith for his diligence in all of his administration. Last, on a slightly more somber note. Again, while I still have access to the mic.

You may remember I started my year as chair with a focus on the notion of shared governance, the notion of deliberative communication and joint problem-solving where appropriate between the Faculty Senate and the administration and the Board of Trustees. I'd like to go out on a similar note. While Senate relations with our administration and the BOT, and I'm just looking at Nick and Kathy right now, have always had its highs and lows, I'm happy to reflect and I'm nodding my head trying to get a nod in response that we are ending this year on a positive trajectory.

There's a little force, but okay. We recently heard though the troubling news of recent faculty contract non-renewals of those receiving shorter contracts or those who lose their jobs because of program closures. Among these numbers are senior faculty who have been loyal, dedicated long-term employees of Penn State. This news is troubling, and made worse, I will suggest by a lack of rather conjecture and misunderstanding through a lack of information and communication.

The rumors above and beyond the harsh reality simply fueled of fear and concern. This fear and concern rippled throughout our community. Those fears and concerns were real, they were palpable and again, unnecessary. It's my understanding the Provost will be sharing more of the details of a situation with us today, and I thank him for that.

But I'd like to suggest that if this University is to continue with the mantra of one Penn State geographically dispersed, we must seek better ways for communication to occur. If we are one Penn State, we need to be able to celebrate all the great events in our midst, but also be informed when hard decisions must be made, where they're being made and their extent, and we should be told.

I've got nothing else to close, so I don't know. We should be told these with clarity and transparency regarding financial accountability behind those reasons. This is true for the loss of 18, whether it be 18 or 48 jobs or the closing of programs and we should be sharing that news, good and bad. If we are one Penn State, we need to build stronger ties across this entire University. I have observed this time in and time out.

We need to ensure that our colleagues east to west in the stage feel an essential part of this large and wonderful and complex institution. Their voices equally heard and equally valued. One of my colleagues sitting right in front of me, recently shared a simple truism. She said better communication breeds trust. But to all, please know that shared governance does not stop at the Senate door, nor is it the exclusive domain of central administration, those are the obvious ones.

But it is, if you will, a value system that I believe we all in this room share. It is a value system that needs to be further and better understood and it needs to be protected throughout all of the levels of our operations, including local faculty governance organizations. The responsibility of shared governance shouldn't stop at the door of our deans and chancellors, or our Provost or Vice Provost.

It needs to filter down into every core, every essence of what we do as a University faculty and students. How we engage with staff. Everyone who is in a supervisory role has supervisory oversight and everyone who has a vested interests in the health and well-being of their workplace, should be interested and

concerned and active in promoting shared governance, and again, by that I mean communication with your colleagues and trust.

The senate body should seek involvement with local faculty governance organizations. We should help guide our colleagues as they seek engagements and accountability with their administrators. That dialogue must begin somewhere and we're as good a place as any to start. We've all heard about the President-Elect campus visits. That outreach must continue to deepen and create shared governance in a meaningful way.

If there's one message I would send to the President-elect, it is the necessity to strengthen those ties that bind our campuses. To support all employees by upholding and encouraging shared governance principles at every level, both in the good times and ensuring the bad times. It is the right and much needed thing to do.

### **John W. White Graduate Fellowship**

**Chair Szczygiel:** Moving along. The Senate Committee on Student Life has selected the recipients for the Annual John White Graduate Fellowship for the 2022-2023 academic year. Tim Robicheaux, member of the Student Life Committee, will recognize, come on down Tim, these fellowship recipients. Tim, the podium is yours.

**Timothy Robicheaux, College of the Liberal Arts:** I don't know how to find a podium. Only went up. Hello everyone. Hello everyone online. Each year, the Penn State Faculty Senate Committee on Student Life has the privilege of awarding the John W. White Graduate Fellowship to among the most impressive students in this University to be eligible to apply for the award. Students must be graduating cum laude and intending to engage in some graduate study. Various choices, but something.

The John W. White Fellowship is one of the oldest continuing fellowships at Penn State. The award was established in 1902 by James Gilbert White to honor his father, Reverend John W. White of Milroy, Pennsylvania. Student Life Chair, Tim Palmer and vice chair Erin Boas have been gracious enough to allow me to present these recipients this year.

This is my third year getting to do this, but my first one in person, so I'm glad about that. This was my third year of getting to see these amazing applicants, and it's my third year of letting my mom know how much of a slacker I was in undergrad and then she pointed out it wasn't just in undergrad. When we're reviewing these, we took a holistic approach to reviewing the applicants.

We did not have any major plans going in beyond looking at them as a whole. There was great inter-rater reliability between us, so it works out well. We reviewed dozens of applications and selected eight students to interview. There was overlap on almost every selection with one refusal. We've decided that all eight of these students who we interviewed have earned a part of this Fellowship Award, and we're pleased to introduce them.

Before I introduce them, I do want to remind you that you can donate to the fellowship, that is online on the Senate Webpage. It is tax deductible, and that's your accounting. But you know, it is supposed to be tax deductible. You could donate. I would ask you to please do so. I think that one potential concern that individuals have is that you're not going to be able to donate enough to make a difference.

These are small awards overall. I will say, and this is not to pat myself on the back, this is to challenge you, that I have donated as much as everyone else combined in the past three years. That's not because I

donated a bunch of money, that's because I didn't have a lot of competition. Please donate, Senate Website, there's still a link on there and go to do that. It doesn't take much.

If we had 10 dollars from every person on Senate, then that would be another person funded. Give a little bit something and if you get audited, I'm sorry. Now let me go for the introductions. Claire Swedberg will be graduating with a Bachelors of Science in bio-behavioral health. This is one of two students who graduated with a bachelor's of science in bio-behavioral health.

They represented this time. Claire is a Schreyer honors student scholar and is graduating with a perfect 4.0 GPA. Claire would not tell me what the worst thing was about working with my friend and colleague, Dr. Laura Klein, I asked. She did, however, do a wonderful job selling their work on exploring the relationship between maternal infant health, health outcomes and microaggressions in healthcare.

Claire was a lead author on a presentation titled positive bio-behavioral effects of self-compassion and forgiveness among college students in the United States. Self-compassion and forgiveness is what I will do, my pre-written jokes, I wrote that one too. Claire also served as a data collection volunteer for the Mask Up study, one of two individuals on this, which is a CDC partnered study, on University mask adherence.

She has shown particular interest and issues related to women's health. She has been a teaching assistant in a relevant course. She served as a student intern at the Sexual Assault Forensic Examination Telehealth Center. She is the founder and president of the Penn State chapter of Saving Mothers, a non-profit group that organizes domestic and international interventions to reduce preventable causes of maternal death.

Her interests in maternal health prompted Claire's intention to study in a global health masters program at the beautiful, historical Maastricht University in the Netherlands. There's a syllable at the end there that I can't do. Claire, "I've never returned to when I graduated in the University of Nebraska and I have not returned to Lincoln since then. I will be making my third trip to Maastricht this summer, it is a beautiful place and I can't imagine getting to study there at the University, enjoy every single second. It is amazing."

Claire's probably thinking that I forgot to mention something important about her. I saved it for last intentionally. Claire graduated in 4.0 GPA. Like I said, she's accomplished a lot. She did all this while dedicated over 38 hours per week to practice composition and community outreach, while a genius student athlete on Penn State's softball team.

The team by the way, that the day before our interview at Michigan for the first time since 2005, very excited about that, to get all of this work done while also being a student athlete is beyond impressive.

Our next recipient, Emily Duddy. Emily is one of the many fantastic future educators and school professionals that Penn State has produced.

She's a bright future as a school psychologist. Upon graduation, she will be going to a yet to be decided program where she intends to attain a master's degree and education specialist degree in school psychology. Emily is inspired by her family's experience navigating the educational system for her brother who has special needs. She notes that the field of school psychology mirrors her dual interest in psychology and in education.

She has been accepted to multiple graduate programs. The programs Emily is considering were chosen because of their emphasis in social justice and collaboration. She hopes to, "Advocate for all students to

have access to psychological support, especially students who are commonly overlooked or whose abilities are underestimated."

In the normalization of telecommunication these days, Emily was in her car during the interview, just to be clear, she was parked safely. She was on her way back from visiting one of the graduate programs where she was accepted. During her time at Penn State, she's been involved in Thon, an active member at the Pennsylvania Psychological Association, has served as Schreyer Honors College Orientation Mentor on the communications and social media team.

She assisted Dr. Karen Bierman with research on school and community-based intervention programs and has served as a school psychologists intern for soaring high school for students with autism spectrum disorder. Among the many lessons of the past few years is the crucial importance of education, both primary and secondary in a functioning society. She will undoubtedly be able to contribute to this in the future.

Next, because it's an easy transition to make, we're proud to honor Amber Lucas. Like Emily, Amber is also involved in education and participated in the interview from an unconventional location. Amber will be graduating with a bachelor of music education degree with an emphasis in secondary band. She has been a proud member of the marching blue band and has served as a music selection leader and as a squad leader.

At the time of her interview, we could hear background sounds of music room at the Bellefonte Area High School, where Amber serves as a music student teacher. Through our application material in our interview, it's clear how passionate Amber is about music education. She participated in the Philadelphia Urban Seminar, a two-week immersion class where she taught a general keyboard class.

She also served as a theater assistant at a Mastery Charter School in Camden, New Jersey. I'm still exhausted at this point, serving two years as a girl scout troop co-leader, and we only met twice a month. Amber for the past six years has been teaching clarinet private lessons to students in Grades 4 through 12 in State College.

She noted these experiences with the lessons and the teaching has guided her work to develop her on teaching strategies and to appreciate the importance of individualized learning and with music instruction that's based on the needs of individual students.

Amber also enjoys performing and has numerous relevant awards and accomplishments. She was a festival of performance for longings divergent studio, where she commissioned and then performed six new works for clarinet and flute. She's involved with Penn State's new music organization, Living Music. You might be wondering what new music is, you who are not in the music area.

It is about new music, extends the classical tradition, and it's music written by modern living composers, as you know now, I looked it up. She collaborated with six student composers, performed four world premieres and was featured on two professional recordings and got to take part in an international New Music Festival. Amber's currently deciding between several graduate programs as well, but she attends to earn a master of music and clarinet performance.

I'm going to get the last joke, it says she'll read a lot clarinet major. I'm going to skip that one. Next student, Nora Van Horn. Across my three years of involvement in this interview process with John White

Fellowship, I've been blown away by how quick on their feet these students are when we ask questions, we don't get any questions in advance, and they do a great job with it.

Our next recipient would be just as easily form an immediate answer to the question about the intersection of mathematics, theater, and nutrition science as she could to a question about why Penn State would be better able to fill its responsibilities as a land-grant university by opening a Cajun restaurant and the hub and I hope the administrators here will consider that. Nora Van Horn graduated with a Bachelor's of Arts, several of them, and philosophy in Global and International Studies and in Chinese, is undoubtedly one of the sharpest students I've ever met.

I asked her a question and then realized we're running short on time, so I said hold on, don't answer that question, I have another one that I'd rather you answer because I want to know the answer to that one. Somehow she answered both simultaneously. I don't know how she did it, but she did. Well, in her own words, Nora witnessed how corporate power change, community discourse, and it promoted decisions that created environmental issues when an energy company began to buy support in her small, rural, Pennsylvania towns, starting with naming the baseball by a baseball field.

This led to her commitment to sustainability. Nora has served as an intern with Penn State Sustainability Institute across two years. She co-designed a curriculum and co-instructed a 300 level sustainability course in the Smithfield College of Business. She also worked to develop a \$250,000 environmental sustainability fund in her work on the student fee board. She studied in China.

She is extremely committed to academic freedom, but perhaps not the way we would initially think about it. She presented a capstone project titled "Culture of Impunity" at a TEDx PSU event. She argues that sociocultural speech norms limit discourse and prevent robust anti-sexual violence policies. She continues her work on academic freedom with her honors thesis on ethical issues and University decision-making and is a very, very convincing advocate for the broadening of open records laws in higher education.

Assuming that all goes well this semester, which I would be terrified personally because she's taking a lifetime jogging course, which in no way I would pass. But assuming all goes well in her classes, Nora will graduate with a 4.0 GPA with three degrees. During the interview, Nora asked if she needed to rewrite her application essay because she started by noting that she'd be earning her Juris Doctorate at the University of Chicago.

But then two other decent Law Schools sent her acceptance offers. Now, Nora must submit a choice and she is choosing between the University of Chicago, Columbia and the LSU of the Northeast, Harvard University College of Law. We did not require her to rewrite the essay, but those are not amazing choices to have. She asked our opinion, which I don't think I'm qualified to, it's not a decision I've had to make.

Our next student, Bobur Rakhmatullaev. Let me look up the pronunciation ahead of time. Let me try it one more time, Rakhmatullaev. One question that he asked to most interviewees is what they would change about Penn State if they were allowed to make one single change. Our next awardee was the only one to mention a Senate policy. He attended Penn State at our Greater Allegheny Campus, and is graduating with two degrees, one in psychology and one with criminal justice to single minus sign on his entire transcripts.

He will be graduating with 3.99 GPA. Bobur has been involved in research in both of his disciplines adventures. He had a poster at the American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting titled, "Do More

Guns Mean Less Confidence in Police", a room perspective. The coauthor on two manuscripts currently under review or in preparation. That's the criminal justice side.

On the psychology side, he's a research assistant for a qualitative research study on the role of diagnosis of students with ADHD in social settings. Bobur is motivated by his experience as an immigrant and a first-generation college student. His application essay, he noted that some young immigrants must quickly act as translators, as legal representatives, and even financial contributors to family members who might struggle with languages and cultural barriers.

The strain this causes can lead to a host of mental health problems. This is what motivated his plans to become a clinical psychologist, specializing in aiding immigrant populations in the United States who struggle with mental health challenges due to their immigration. Returning to the Senate policy. Bobur is graduating with two degrees, one for each year that he has been a student at Penn State.

He probably earned a credit just in the time I've been talking here. He is one of those students who some of us were wondering about when we're talking about the 24 credit limit in class, and we're saying who's doing this? I said to him, the least amount of credits you've taken in a semester was the most I took in undergrad, but then I looked at his transcript again and realized that's not true because he also was taking courses at another university at the same time, so nowhere close.

In his lowest semester, he took 24 credits, to 29 credits in summer of 2021. Two degrees, two papers under submission, a poster presentation, and is currently working on a paper. If I had the power to do so, I would be taking a third-degree in logistics, because I cannot imagine a summer schedule especially, that's so interesting. Two degrees. For those unfamiliar with Penn State's Integrated Undergraduate Programs, these are five-year programs that allow students to simultaneously earn undergraduate and graduates degrees.

Our next recipient, Nicholas Prestayko, will graduate with a Bachelor of Science and Bio-behavioral Health and a minor in biology as part of an IUG program. Next year he will complete the master in public health portions of the program. To my knowledge, he's the first recipient of the John W. White Fellowship to be part of an IUG program. For his MPH work, he is engage in the Epidemiology and Biostatistics track.

He will also earn a certificate in global health. If you wanted to find Nicholas on campus in the past few years, you might be in one of the mini courses he's personally taken. But you also might find him at the Division of Undergraduate Studies, or the Eberly College of Science, or the College of the Liberal Arts, or the College of Health and Human Development. He has worked as a teaching assistant in all of them, or in some capacity.

He's been a learning assistant in general chemistry since August of 2020. He was a dialogue facilitator for Sociology 119. He was a teaching assistant for Penn State's first-year seminar. Though he had no experience with American Sign Language prior to college, he also served as a teaching assistant in American Sign Language, where among other things, he practiced signing with students and collaborated with the assistance.

He's our second recipient who volunteered at the Mask Up studying and he works as a pharmacy technician at a national pharmacy chain. I appreciate our interview with Nicholas. He was our last interviewee, and we had to schedule it at five o'clock because of all our schedules. It was a really fun conversation. During the process, I stopped to look up a class that he mentioned, a PDH course that I

would love to take, and I will say why Behavioral Health should hire Nicholas as someone who will market the major and courses.

**Rosemary Jolly, College of the Liberal Arts:** Vice chair, and I'm not intimidated by the fact he's [INAUDIBLE]. He's still at shit. I can come back at him and say, well, what about you, to be— [BACKGROUND] [LAUGHTER]

**Timothy Robicheaux:** ... Nicholas still shared his specific courses at the major level. After earning his MPH, Nicholas intends to gain employment in the public health sector and to work in that sector for a few years while completing further educational requirements that he will need before applying to medical school. His long-term goal is to practice medicine in a global context with particular interests in health issues related to infectious disease and related to natural disasters.

Carrie Little was a bit of a wildcard for our decision-making. I don't mean in terms of her capabilities or appropriateness for this fellowship, that was easy. Rather, we were interested in how her undergraduate education fully fit in with long-term goals. Like many of us, Carrie has been sucked into higher education and is going to likely stay put. She will graduate with a Bachelor of Science in Human Development and Family Studies with minors in addiction and recovery and in psychology.

She will graduate with a certificate in Rehabilitation and Human Services. Carrie assisted Dr. Jacoby Rocks dissertation research on exploring trauma-related needs of incarcerated and young adult offenders. She served as an undergraduate teaching intern in the Department of Bio-behavioral Health, in this course on a neurological basis to human behavior.

She utilized, and I'm going to quote this too because I don't understand it, "Counseling micro skills and motivational interviewing to build rapport and to create a successful mentoring relationship focused on student change." When serving as an academic peer mentor through the Division of Undergraduate Studies, her paper, "The sociological and psychological continuation of systemic racism, why the BLM movement is about more than police brutality", was used in two different programs here at Penn State.

We have her academic work, mentorship work, research, and teaching. Keep going here. Carrie has decided to dabble in advising, working as an office assistant and intern for the Center for Student Advising and Engagement in the College of Health and Human Services. She assisted students with course selection and first semester schedule building via her impact, as a program assistant for the New Student Orientation.

She is the first student to hold the position of Programs Support Intern for Penn State Hello, and this semester, she is working as a Student Engagement Coordinator for the College of Health and Human Development Office of Undergraduate Education. In a future shared governance, she will be heading in back into higher education where she hopes to find a career and to continue a career in student affairs or in other aspects of higher education administration. Sorry.

I could even make eye contact with Julia. In a move that would please Norah, I'm going to be fully transparent in my decision to end with this student. When I was writing up this script, my office felt a little bit dusty. I decided that it would be a really smart idea to end with this instead of beginning because I'll be able to read. Our final recipient is Julia Montevechi.

Julia will be graduating with degrees in Italian Language and in Criminology. She's serving as a Student Marshall for Italian. In further transparency, the phrase, "Italian already got Julia," was uttered in the

meeting to determine who would represent Criminology as Student Marshall. Rumor has it that she sits in the front of classrooms, that she asks great questions and she demonstrates a true passion for course material, at least in the University's most interesting courses.

Throughout these interviews, Julia was the only person to correctly answer a question that I asked, which is, what's one class that all students should take at Penn State? The answer is Social Science of Wrongful Convictions, but the rest of you were very close. Julia serves as a Teaching Assistant in that class. She signed up for study abroad in the Netherlands that was canceled due to COVID.

She signed up for study abroad in Italy that was canceled due to COVID the next year. I'm hoping she gets to travel soon and use this money for travel as allowed. In Julia's first semester at Penn State, she took a Criminology course with a very jaded instructor who likes to begin the semester dashing dreams of students who go to Criminology because they want to be Profilers for the FBI.

He points out for those students that there are five times more students in the classroom than there are Profilers in the FBI, we call them Self Profilers, he also explains that. That doesn't mean students should give up, but it means that the FBI needs to really expand their program. Julia decided that she needed a backup plan and she found one. Final full transparency, Julia was accepted for this interview without my intervention and she does stand here on her own merit.

I did not disclose anything with her, and said nothing until she was fixed to this. But you can probably tell, I know Julia. When I say that Julia's worked with Youth and Family Services and Lackawanna Department of Human Services as a social work intern. She is currently an intern at Big Brothers Big Sisters in State College. The students in that Criminology course, Julia would have been the one to become an FBI Behavioral Analyst, because she decided to let someone else have her spot.

Julia could be in any graduate program she wants. She's chosen to go to Smith College of Social Work to get a Master's in Social Work, which is not necessarily the highest paying career choice, but she chose this for a good reason. Upon graduation from the program, she hopes to counsel adolescents who have been impacted in some capacity by the Criminal Justice System.

Julia is the personification of resilience and persistence. Without going into more detail, I will just say all students face adversity in their lives. And Julia faces a lot of it in formative years. Succumbing to that would've been really easy to understand, but she thrived in the face of it and is the perfect person to help people in the future deal with similar issues. I made it, no, I'm very close.

I am going to have to stop now for time, but also because I can't go more anyway. Please don't forget to donate to this fellowship, you make a difference in lives of people who can really use this money, but also who deserve our respect and deserve to be honored here. Again, you can find it on the Senate Website. All of these students were beyond impressive, even the ones we didn't interview. It is amazing to see what this University can produce and who we've selected to be here so please give a round of applause to all my students sitting here.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Stand. Thank you, Tim. I don't think there could have been a better person to present those awards or to help us get to know these incredibly gifted students, it's amazing. Congratulations to you all and thank you for spending some time at Penn State, we are the better for it. Now I'd like to offer a special recognition to seven elected Faculty Senators who are leaving the Senate with distinguished record of service over the last eight years as they come forward.



Yes, we're going to ask you to come forward. If you're in the room, you will scamper forward quickly. I will present them with a certificate signed by President Barron and myself, acknowledging their dedicated service to the Senate. If you are in the room, please come forward when I read your name. I'm serious folks, let's hold the applause till the very end. Got it, this is the test.

Dwight Davis, 20-year veteran Senator for the College of Medicine who served on EECE. Come on down Dwight, Vice-Chair and Intercollegiate Athletics Chair. Come over to me, I hand this to you. Remain down here if you would Dwight, now sit.

As you can tell we're having a few technical issues here. Moving on, congratulations Dwight.

Andy Freiberg, nine-year Senator for College of Medicine, who served as Chair and Vice-Chair for Outreach and Vice-Chair on Global Programs.

Andy, say much, please, sit next to Dwight. I'd like to also recognize Willie Ofori, 17-year Senator member who is not here today for Wilkes-Barre Campus, who served as Chair of both Global Programs and Faculty Benefits and as Vice-Chair on IRC.

Lisa Posey is a nine-year Senator for Smeal College of Business—where do you get off leaving, but okay, we can talk later—who served as Chair of the University Planning.

Lisa, thank you very much, just stand up here, please. Robert Shannon, 16-year Senator of Agriculture, who served as Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee. Stein Sigurdsson, unable to attend, also 10-year Senator for Eberly College of Science, served as Vice-Chair for both the University Planning and Research Committees.

Stephen Jay Van Hook, sorry Stephen. Eight-year Senator for Eberly College of Science, having served as Vice-Chair for both Faculty Affairs and Education Committees. If we could all give a round of applause to our distinguished guests. I would like to now acknowledge Senate Officers for their contributions over the past year. Immediate Past Chair, Beth Seymore. Beth, where are you waving? She's here.

For her unwavering support, her invaluable insights and good cheer throughout this past year. She was an exceptional mentor and friend to me as Chair-Elect and equally valuable colleague this year. Thank you, Beth. Lisa Mangel, our Senate Secretary for the past two years. Lisa, it has been a joy working and adventure traveling with you. With Beth, you have been a rock of support and laughter, much needed laughter at times, which makes everything a bit less. Well, just less. Thank you, Lisa.

To the news kid on the block Kim Blockett, Chair-Elect. Kim, you have been an absolute delight to work with. Somehow you filled it seamlessly into this amazing assembly of strong female leadership within the Faculty Senate. Thank you, Kim. To our Parliamentarian, Keith Shapiro, who, as you've already heard me speak about, he's the slacker of the group. Thank you one and all.

Now, I would like to recognize this year's leadership of the Senate Standing Committee and Special Committees. If all the Chairs and Vice Chairs present in the room, wherever you are, office, kitchen, or tool shed, please stand for just a moment. We will feel your presence. Yeah, Chair, Vice Chair of any Special or Standing Committee, please stand up. You are the folks who get the work done and get those reports flowing.

You provide energy and commitment to your work. It would not be Faculty Senate. [inaudible] Our Chairs and Vice Chairs of the Senate—said yes, Tim, with a little arm twisting. We have these leadership roles and that's all about [inaudible]. As you know the job is not for the faint of heart. Hopefully the [inaudible] I could not be more proud and my appreciation is boundless. Thank you all.

Next, I would like to ask all of those who are leaving the Senate, if they would please rise, take the shame. Again, feel free to do so in the comfort of your own homes and offices. Thank you. Have I been battery-less? Thank you for your time served on the Senate and as you close out your Senate careers.

Thank you, sir. Good. May the values of shared governance follow you throughout your next adventures. If we have anyone in the room who is leaving us, retiring from the University, please stand and a round of applause. I want to acknowledge Lee Fessler of the Media Technology Services Group for supporting us and helping us with everything today.

---

### COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

**Chair Szczygiel:** Onward to Agenda Item E. Regarding that, President Barron is not able to join us today as he had prior commitments and I believe maybe busy planning his own next phase of life. I want to send best wishes to the President and thank him for his support on the many, many initiatives undertaken by the Senate body over his past eight years at this University. We have done much good thanks to his support. [Student stands to read letter of protest to President Barron, not present. Did not yield the floor or stand down; meeting was interrupted]

Could you please sit down? [BACKGROUND] We are asking you to please sit down.

[BACKGROUND] One last time. I'm going to ask that you stay seated, please. [BACKGROUND] You have not been given permission to talk at the Senate. [BACKGROUND] This is inappropriate, sir.

[BACKGROUND] Please sit down. [BACKGROUND]

**Unknown Speaker:** [inaudible] gathered from public records do not inspire confidence. Aside from a handful of administrators, no one will [inaudible]. [MUSIC]

---

### COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY

**Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost:** What's that music you listen to? That's a tough act to follow, I must say. Did want to let everybody know for all of you who like to come and visit me or us, I should say, my colleagues in the Provost office, we have moved our office from where we've been for the last nine years. I am now in the middle of the building, at the top of the stairs, as is Kathy and our staff.

When I came to Penn State in 2013, I embraced the land-grant mission of Penn State along with Abraham Lincoln. I now share a wall with Abraham Lincoln. That makes my office easy to find. Come up the stairs, go behind that wall and you'll find our office. Just for the record, I do not intend to share the same fate. I just thought I should mention that. COVID, we actually had an Academic Leadership Council meeting yesterday morning.

It was the first time in two plus years that we did not have COVID as an Agenda item. In fact, there was no discussion of COVID. That was a really great moment and I think is worth mentioning. I wanted to use this opportunity actually, I don't think Todd Camp is with us, but I think Kelly Wolgast has joined this meeting, as she usually, does in case there are any questions.

I just wanted to do a big, big shout out to Kelly Wolgast for her leadership of the COCC through these past two years. It was her attention to detail, her knowledge, her ability to operationalize, the many very, very challenging actions that we had to take and to do it in a fair and open and supportive way that I think was largely responsible for the University getting through COVID in the manner that we did.

Kelly, just a big, big thank you to you. There is not much going on as far as we can make out. There are reports of positive cases. We are still seeing an eight to ten percent positivity rate for walk-ups at University Park. That's a little bit higher than the rate we're used to because generally people who were walking up are people who feel that they have been exposed to COVID. Basically, data suggests that one out of ten of them indeed have.

But there's not a large denominator like there was before when we were doing required testing. Every now and again, we hear of folks testing positive. Every now and again, you will hear of one of your colleagues testing positive and I encourage you to continue to take proper precautions, masking, testing and so on. In fact, I heard that one of my colleagues tested positive.

You'll be pleased to know I took a rapid test before I came to this Senate meeting. I am pleased to report that I am a very negative person. It's still out there. We continue at University Park to monitor wastewater. We're seeing very little activity. We monitor three catchments. One that is Campus, one that is downtown, and one that is an aggregate catchment. We're seeing very little positivity.

Two of the catchments are below the level of detection. One is slightly above, but certainly not anything that is giving us concern at this point. Steady as she goes, we continue to monitor the BA.2 variant. It is a concern. We have noticed that three counties in Pennsylvania have gone back to the CDC orange shade that are in the North and are sparsely populated counties.

We don't have a footprint there, but we are watching very carefully and are ready to mobilize should the circumstances demand it. Two main topics I want to talk about today, Bonj made reference to them in her remarks. I just want to clarify, I think what has been probably causing concern and angst across the institution. First is budget related matters. We have a complex budget process at this University.

You've heard me talk about it at times since I've been here when I do the formal budget report. But I do want to talk a little bit about the budget cycle, again, just so that everybody knows where we are. The budget cycle for the University for the following fiscal year begins actually in the May to August time-frame. We start thinking about the submission that we make to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania asking for generally, an increase in our appropriation.

That appropriation request is based on very preliminary budget assessments based on how we ended the prior year and what we anticipate the needs will be for the following one. We submit that to the Commonwealth in September. In parallel with that base budget, we begin to consider different factors, consider constraints, consider opportunities, consider that all the data that are starting to come in for the current academic year.

In parallel, the appropriation request is working through the legislature. The Governor puts the budget out in February-March time frame, legislative hearings usually attended by the President who makes the case along with the presidents of the other state related university. We don't hear about appropriation by the way, until the May-June time-frame, so it makes it not possible for us to have a final approved budget until the Board meeting that follows us knowing what the numbers actually are coming from the Commonwealth, so that means the July board meeting.

The reason we go every year go through this crazy process of providing general salary increases when we do, usually showing up in the September or October paychecks backdated to July 1, is because we don't know what our final budget is until halfway through July and it's too late to make the changes to payroll at that point. In parallel to that process that is taking place in the Commonwealth, there's the process that is taking place internally, which obviously considers what we anticipate our salary costs to be, our benefits, our costs of programs, continuing existing programs and development of new programs, operating costs.

We also think about sources of revenue, primarily tuition, that's something you all recall, roughly 80 percent of our revenue and the E&G budget comes from tuition and other sources of income. This is a process that takes place in parallel to what's happening in Harrisburg. At the same time, there is another parallel process that is playing out and it starts usually at the beginning or towards the beginning of the calendar year where we ask units to start preparing their budgets for our consideration centrally because we of course, roll up all of those budgets to see what the needs are and reconcile that with the University's budget request.

Associated with that process, we send out planning parameters. We do that every year. There's a standard memo. We change the date, we change the numbers a little bit from year-to-year. Every now and again, we change the process a little bit. It's a standard part of the budgetary sausage-making that takes place every year. The units are all working on this process now.

One of the things that unfortunately we have done now for the fourth year in a row, actually, it's a third year in a row. It's a fourth year that we potentially will have a budget rescission. It is the third year that we have planned for one. We do ask units to think about how they would incorporate a reduction and the allocation from central funding into their budgets.

What would they do in order to meet their expected uses with a reduced source supply from central. For eight of the nine years that I have been here, this has been a boring, inconsequential and uninteresting process. This year, somehow it got into the media, and the planning parameters were interpreted differently from how they've always been interpreted, and I think it did cause a lot of angst, and we didn't expect the media to take an interest in this because it's really the same process that we have used for many years and it is a work in progress now.

Most units haven't gotten us all figured out yet and we actually are just going to begin in a week or two. Actually, it starts on May 9th. The first day of Neeli's presidency, we begin the budget meetings with all of the Units. We have asked Units to plan for a three percent budget rescission in the fiscal 2023 budget year that runs from July 1, '22 to June 30th, '23. We've asked people to plan for that.

We asked them to plan this time last year for a two percent rescission, with the possibility of an additional one percent rescission being imposed mid-year. We did impose an additional one percent

precision mid-year because of enrollment challenges. The year before, we asked Units to plan for a three percent budget rescission, which we did impose the year before that.

We imposed a one percent budget rescission without any planning. We did mid-year because that was the year that COVID hit. It is imprudent for a Unit to go into the next fiscal year if there is a possibility of a rescission. It's imprudent for them to have not planned for it, so we ask units to plan. We are not saying that there will be a rescission, it is part of the budget planning process.

We might have a three percent rescission, we might have something less than it, there might be no rescission, but I think that's probably unlikely as well. It's got to be somewhere between zero and three. We're asking people to plan for three, so that they are ready should that happen. When will we know? We will know in the middle of the afternoon of the Friday of the July Board meeting because that is when the budget with all the best and final numbers that we have is presented to the Board and the Board votes on it. We are enduring a difficult time, budgetarily, as a result of COVID.

I think some of you have heard either me talk at campus visit, I'm about two-thirds of the way through or have heard I think Mary Lou may have presented this morning at the Planning Committee, Jim, is that right? "COVID Impacts" was at presented?

**Provost Jones:** Last week. I'm rounding the numbers a little bit. Don't hold me to these a little North of \$450 million in total impact offset by \$150 million in her funding that came from the federal government. The other 150 million that came from the Feds went to Direct Students Support. We had a \$300 million financial impact both in terms of out-of-pocket costs associated with COVID, including \$50 million spent on testing alone, plus revenue losses associated with enrollment declines, cancellation of programs, and various other factors. As big as Penn State is, a \$300 million impact is a big impact.

We had reserves strategically set aside to cover things like this. We used them. Those were pretty much used up, not completely, but pretty much. We need to build those reserves back and there was still a little bit of a lingering hangover from an enrollment decline that takes a few years to work through the system before revenues start to get back to where we need them to be.

So we are going through a difficult budgetary period for the University. Continued belt tightening is necessary. That's budget, and I'm happy to take questions on any or all of this in a moment. When it comes to positions, first, I want to just clear the commitment that the University has made for the past two and half years through COVID to supporting people everywhere in the University.

Compared to many of our peers, we have actually eliminated few positions or laid off very few people. In the last two years on the staff side, there have been 52 layoffs against a denominator of 21,000 full-time employees and 14,000 part time employees. Most of that 52 was in 2020 and associated with two entities, one hotels with the closure of the Lion Inn and the second was with a reduction in force in Enterprise IT.

Those two alone constituted the vast majority, actually of roughly 40 of the layoffs of those 52 that have occurred in the last two years. There's been obviously minimal impact on tenure line faculty in the last two years. There were five contract non-renewals due to enrollment challenges. Five, that's a pretty small number. So even though we were facing enrollment challenges, we and I give a lot of credit to Kathy, who kept an eye on this as things were considered across all of our campus locations.

The number of contracts that were not renewed were relatively few in number. This year, the number is a little higher and we did collect all the data. This is a process that happens every year. We always look at

enrollments and enrollment data and the Budget Executives, the Deans, the Chancellors, make decisions about whether or not contracts will be reviewed. Across Penn State this year, and we tried to get this done by the beginning of April so that people have plenty of notice.

There were 18 Non-Tenure Line faculty members not offered a new contract due to low enrollments. Altoona had the highest number, there were eight and the remaining units ranged between one and three faculty members. If you do the math in your head with 20 Commonwealth Campuses, there were many campuses where there weren't any non-renewals at all.

There were another eight faculty who did not receive a new contract due to non enrollment related issues. For reasons that include these were people who were hired on soft money and there were no funds. Some people had been hired to fill in for somebody who was on a sabbatical leave, so knew that it was a single year appointment, and then other issues including performance of course.

There were a few reductions in contract—six, in fact—and only one of those was due to low enrollments. The message I want to make sure is clear is that these decisions are part of a process that takes place every year. This year, there's a slightly higher than normal number, particularly compared to the last two years where they were relatively few. But these are decisions that are made every year by Deans and Chancellors across all parts of Penn State.

They are not taken lightly. They are very carefully considered. Nobody wants to do this. But when the enrollments just don't support the renewal of a contract, those are difficult decisions that have to be made.

Good news is that a good number of those people this year, and I don't think we have an exact count at this time because it's all playing out in real time, but maybe a third to a half, Kathy, is that about right? A third to a half of those folks I mentioned have found positions elsewhere in Penn State where there are needs, actually based on enrollment growth. So this is a work in progress. I don't think that everybody will, but a good number have already basically signed for new contracts elsewhere.

I also heard actually just this morning that there was concern that we were not renewing contracts and signing up for the Digital Learning Consortium. I hadn't heard about that, but we did a bit of a scramble this morning to look into that. That is, at least, as best as we can find out in the limited time we had to check it out, just does not seem to be the case that we are swapping people for participation in the Digital Learning Consortium and particularly in Altoona, where the largest number was. We looked there and that is absolutely not the case there.

They have been no requests from Altoona for courses that replace courses that were being taught by faculty who would not be renewed. These are difficult processes. There is no question, I would be silly to try to not suggest that when a contract is not renewed, it has budgetary implications. The arrow does go that way. But in this case, these are two parallel processes. The arrow does not come back the other way.

These decisions about non-renewals were made primarily for enrollment or other reasons independent of budget. I just wanted to be clear. I think there's been some conflation, and in particular, in the news media, these two processes have become a little conflated, created an inaccurate representation of what is happening. I think as a result, probably added to the angst and the concern that Bonj was describing before. Let me stop there Bonj, I know I've talked for a while. I'm happy to take any questions on any of those topics or anything else that might be on your mind.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you. If anyone has a question in the room, please raise your hand. Wait until you get a mic in your hands. We see in the back, John.

**John Champagne, Penn State Erie:** Hi.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Please state your name and unit for.

**John Champagne:** Champagne, Penn State Erie. Unless I misunderstood, we just recognize a student for having done research on how “Norms of Civility Interfere With Social Change and The Search for Justice.”

I want everybody to recognize that first. Again, unless I misheard, that was a student's research project that we just acknowledged. I want to know about these things on this piece of paper, and I want to know why did I have to learn them from students?

What is being referenced here when it says the letter outlines concerns about the 60-day limit? I know that this process has gone on longer than 60 days because AAUP wrote a letter in January complaining about this process, but also the public roster of committee members on the Standing Joint on Tenure has been changed in the middle of the AC70 process. To what does this refer?

**Provost Jones:** John, I am limited as you know I think in what I can say and not say about the case, but there was a change in participation of two of the membership of the committee because of a recusal of one of the participants. When that happens, we have alternates who have already been named, and so the committee was reconstituted with an alternate.

**Provost Jones:** What's that?

**Provost Jones:** What's that? The Standing Joint Committee is a joint Senate administrative committee. There are five members of the committee, three are appointed by the Senate, two are nominated by the administration. I don't participate in the process, Kathy doesn't participate in the process. I received a communication from the Chair of the Standing Joint Committee indicating to me that, well, I guess the letter didn't come to me, but there was a communication indicating that there had been a recusal.

As for the 60 days, 60 days is absolutely the time frame. As you know in our processes, things don't always go according to script, and when that happens, we have to be flexible so that we can fairly represent the interests of all parties.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Professor Jones. Thank you, John, for your question. Any other questions from the audience, in person, or online?

**FEMALE\_1:** [inaudible]

**Chair Szczygiel:** We have Kofi. Kofi, by all means, the floor is yours. Kofi, please state your name and your unit.

**Kofi Adu, Penn State Altoona:** Kofi Adu, Penn State Altoona. Thank you Bonj. My question relates to whether the University has a plan or have any plan in place that provide a safe environment to protect protesters and counter protesters, and two, to provide an environment such that every one voice will be heard, and three, not to stifle free speech, but to promote free speech. My question is, do we have any plan to create a safe environment on all our campuses so that everybody's voice will be heard without physical confrontation? Thank you.

**Provost Jones:** I think it's a great question and we are absolutely committed to that ideal. I think in this, I'm not sure if this is a reference to the incident back in the summer, but most certainly, the University stands fully behind the notion of free speech and will do everything that we can do to protect that and the safety of the individuals in exercising that right. We talk about this in President's Council frequently. It is an absolute gold standard for the University and we stand behind it.

**Julie Gallagher, Penn State Brandywine:** My name is Julie Gallagher, Penn State Brandywine. Listening to the number of years that the University has asked units for money back is not business as usual. Frankly, it feels like a very unhealthy way to go about the budget. Our units, particularly those of us that are smaller, have nothing left to cut, and year after year after year midway through, we're being told to give back one percent, two percent, three percent, and some campuses more than that.

This just can't persist. I don't know why we can't do a budget forward model that anticipates. Why don't we go with a more cautious budget than ask people to give back in the middle of the year, which leaves people scrambling and wondering literally about how they're going to make ends meet through the year. We can't give anymore. I realize that enrollments are struggling, but please know that across the University, one, two, and three percent a year, year after year. The media might have gotten a hold of this year, so it might feel exceptional.

[INAUDIBLE]

**Provost Jones:** Four years ago, when we could see that there were some storm clouds ahead, I asked budget executives then to come up with scenarios as to how they would handle a 5, 10, and 15 percent rescission in their budgets. Most people came back and said five percent would hurt, but we can do it. Most people said 10 percent gets really hard and we are starting to cut to the bone, 15 percent would be disastrous.

We didn't do a 10 percent budget rescission, but we've backed into one over a four-year period in increments. So we know how difficult this is. A big driver is tuition revenue. We have seen declining enrollments at the University, particularly across the campuses over the last several years. This has being exacerbated by COVID for sure, and we are pulling out all stops to turn that around.

There were two ways to increase tuition revenue, which is 80 percent of the education in general funds budget. One is to increase the number of students which we're looking for every opportunity to do, I'll come back to that in a moment, and the other is to increase how much we charge for tuition. But that is a tough thing to pull off right now, particularly given what the nation is facing and what families across Pennsylvania are facing in terms of their own personal finances.

So, big tuition increases are unlikely to be in our future. It's all about driving the enrollment. We're not sitting on our thumbs. Right before COVID, we wrote out the discover Penn State Program, which, as you probably know, was a program to drive enrollments from out-of-state contiguous states, to Pennsylvania. Most of you have driven out of state and see the big signs trying to attract Pennsylvania students into other states.

So we figured it was time to fight back, and so we have often in-state tuition to out-of-state residents, contiguous states. Brought that out right when COVID hit. It's worked. It's a little hard to see how well it has worked because COVID had an impact. But that is one of many strategies that we are looking to roll out in the months and years ahead to turn around the challenging enrollment trends that we're seeing really across the Commonwealth, but I absolutely hear you.



I feel the pain not in the same way that your boots on the ground do, but I am very sensitive to the issue. I visit every campus every spring and I don't just hear about it, I see the impacts firsthand. So it is something that we're very focused on. It is all about increasing enrollment and driving our revenues up. That is going to be critical to our ability to come out of this.

The good news is, when we went into COVID, we had to do enrollment projections to figure out what the revenues were going to look like so that we could do the best job we could managing the University through. What I found was that if I asked for different experts across the University, what their enrollment projections were for the out years. I got four different answers because everybody was looking at this issue through a different lens.

We put a broader group together, and now I have a more comprehensive holistic approach to enrollment projection that we didn't have before. Lance Kennedy-Phillip's team is in charge of this effort and we've got all the right people sitting around the table. Their projections are that we should have stable enrollment for the years ahead without factoring in some of the new initiatives that are being developed.

So, I am optimistic that when I stand here and say, we need to drive enrollments and increase revenues through that vehicle, I am optimistic that we will be able to do it. We've got a good baseline looking ahead and it's up to all of us to figure out how to drive enrollments to the campuses. So we're all going to be laser-focused on that moving forward. We have been, but even more so moving forward. But I'm sensitive to the pain and the frustration. I know what's real, it's palpable, I feel like when I'm at the campuses. I was at two campuses last week. I'm going to be at two on Thursday, and I know I'm going to feel it again.

**Julio Palma Anda, Penn State Fayette:** Julio Palma, Penn State Fayette. First of all, thank you for your statement. I am deeply disappointed that President Barron is not here in this panel meeting and I hope it's not an emergency. But I thank you that you are here. What just happened is not unrelated to what is happening in the budget, that is, I think an issue of the transparency and clarity of the processes.

We have been told in our campus that this is a set decision, and then we have communications from Stratcom that is not final decision, and I think having that uncertainty and being ambiguous leave us without clear questions. I do have a very specific question. This uncertainty is not good for the morale of the faculty. The morale in my campus is very low.

We're very concerned because we don't know why the people not being renewed are leaving, and that is restarting our programs. I am very concerned about my campus, by the way. The enrollment, it is very low, and they projections, I mean, if humans are good with something, with patterns, and the patterns are not looking great. So my question to you is, how can we trust faculty that whatever the process and decision-making process, whatever the benefits are better than all the risks?

Because I really cannot see with those decisions of cutting the budget, I cannot see how that can help our campus, I just don't see it and I would like to see how the administration and the leadership of the University took those decisions, and I want to be sure that the benefits are bigger than the risks and the losses.

**Provost Jones:** Julio, that's a hard question to answer. Bonj and I have had discussions this year about having a Joint Committee on University Budget that would have representative faculty appointed by the administration and other folks appointed by the senate, and that group would meet with the University

budget officer on a regular basis, maybe quarterly to talk through these things so that you would know that they were centered and other faculty voices more intimately involved in the process.

There are many things that get talked about in the budget planning process that are sensitive and confidential. I can't stand here in front of you today and I can tell you what we'd like to do for a general salary increase, but it is very difficult for us to talk about these numbers, talk about some of the intimate details of benefits and benefit rates and what benefits are costing the University.

In a public setting during the planning process, it's difficult to do that because word gets out and people draw all kinds of inferences from it. But to have eyes on it from the faculty is an idea that I support, is being a change in the way we manage the budget at the University. That means that somebody else will be responsible for putting that committee together. But it's an idea that I support and I think it's good that we do that.

Now, that would likely be eight pairs of faculty eyes on budget and budget processes. But that's better than zero pairs of faculty eyes that are not on it. No double negative intended. So I think that that would be something that could be helpful and hopefully given that half of the committee would be senate-appointed, half would be from the administration. I'm hoping that that would give this body more confidence in the process and that the things that are being talked about and being planned, are things that make sense.

**Chair Szczygiel:** I see we have some hands raised online. I'd like to highlight some voices that we don't normally hear from. I'd like to recognize Kaitlin. Kaitlin, you have the floor. Please recognize yourself. Identify yourself and your unit.

**Kaitlin Farnan, Penn State Altoona:** Thank you, Bonj. Farnan, Altoona. Provost, in January, at the plenary session, the issue was raised of student on faculty conduct issues. It's obviously a very serious issue that has not only been experienced here at Penn State across several campuses by many faculty members, but has been documented in several publications and studies throughout the United States.

Initial said actions were taken to actually investigate this matter and take it further, with some initial responses from administration being that, one, perhaps we should hold some listening sessions, but also faculty just needed more training on how to deal with student issues. I have two follow-up questions, Provost. First being, what training would you recommend would be useful for faculty to deal with the implicit biases that have been well-documented in students that is precipitating a lot of this conduct on their behalf?

Two, if listening sessions were the primary focus, I'm concerned that the formatting is greatly limited. The actual open feedback that faculty can have in these sessions. Not only with the format of the sessions, but also given that there's only spots for 120 faculty out of the thousands that exist within the Penn State community. Thank you.

**Provost Jones:** I know that the listening sessions have been scheduled. I didn't realize that there were issues with availability of those sessions and we can certainly take that message back to Katy Larkin to see if there's a way that the involvement can be expanded. I think a lot of energy and effort went into thinking through how to best utilize those listening sessions to gather feedback from all of you so that we can come up with training or learning opportunities that really get to the core of the issues that you are facing.

We have a sense of what those are. We have reports of what some of those are, but we think that the listening sessions are. Thank you. Is this just water? Thank you. Wait, this has been opened. Just kidding. We really want to tailor any training that we will be coming up with to what are truly the needs or the perceived needs that the faculty members have and the experiences that they're having. We want to have the listening sessions first, and then I'm sure that Ed is involved. Kathy, here's a mic.

**Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs:** They're limited to 30 each session. There's four upcoming sessions. If those are overpopulated or in high demand, we can add more, but we didn't want to put on something that had lots of participants and then people can't share. We wanted to be able to get way more information from people. That's why it was limited to 30. But I'm confident that if these fill up and there's time that they will add more sessions if there's demand for more sessions.

**Provost Jones:** It is true that we truly want them to be listening sessions where we can hear what people are experiencing so that we can better address the training issues and get that right. Hopefully, that is helpful response.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you. I see we have Ed Fuller online. Ed.

**Edward Fuller, College of Education:** Thank you. Ed Fuller. Penn State University Park. Excuse me. I wanted to make a comment about increasing enrollment, which I think everybody understands we need to try to do. My program and department is made between four and six recommendations on how to do that. Some of our recommendations were suggested by Deans and others at other Big Ten Institutions and they implemented them and it has worked, and we keep getting no from the University. We can't do that at Penn State. That's not possible at Penn State.

I think some programs and some faculty have some really great ideas. There's not enough support or allowance for some freedom or some wiggle room in some of the bureaucratic rules, which I understand in a giant university. But I think administration could help us increase enrollment if they'd work with us and listen to us and listen to our ideas instead of just shutting down every single proposal we have. Just a suggestion. There's always reasons for a no answer and I get that, but I think there's some room for more conversation and listening.

**Provost Jones:** "That university" is not a person. I need to know who is saying no because I get proposals that come from colleges and units on a fairly regular basis with ideas to enhance enrollments. Listen, I'm all in. It doesn't mean that I say yes to everyone. Some of them I will send back and say this needs more work and people come forward and they've done more work and it is supportable.

Sometimes I say no, period, but I am always open to ideas and suggestions that will help us meet our educational mission and priorities. I'm all ears. I'm not sure why they're not getting to me, Ed, but they obviously need to go through channels, but I'd be interested in hearing from you, perhaps offline where you think these are being stopped.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Ed. Before we take our last online question, is there anyone in the room? Michele.

**Michele Stine, College of Health and Human Development:** Thank you. Stine, HHD. I have a very quick question. Has the University ever asked units to prepare for rescission and a rescission not happened?

**Provost Jones:** I have only asked Units to prepare for a rescission twice before, and those were both years during COVID. This is the third time we have asked to prepare for rescission. Whether the rescission that was planned for was not fully realized as opposed to not happening at all, that hasn't happened. We've asked for two rescissions and they've both been implemented. In 2019,20, we just imposed a one percent rescission because we had to, and then in the last two years we asked Units to prepare, and then implemented those rescissions. This year we're asking Units to plan for a rescission and we have to wait to see where we end up on this.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Provost Jones. I think we have one last online question from Rose. Rose?

**Rosemary Jolly:** Rose Jolly, Liberal Arts. Provost Nick, I just want to ask, I was appointed by Bonj to the proposed Joint Finance Review Committee, and I have two questions. The one of which is, we all waited for an entire year to be called in to a meeting, and we never had a meeting this year, and so I'm just wondering why that's the case. Secondly, if it's related to the change in budgetary responsibility, I think it behooves Old Main to tell us what that change in budgetary responsibility precisely is and who initiated it. This is not a personal question at all. This is just a question of information, because I think it's very important for us to know if certain financial responsibility normally accrued to the Provost are being moved out of the Provost's office.

**Provost Jones:** I am no longer the University Budget Executive. Sara Thorndike, the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business, is the University Budget Executive. Moving forward, that was a change that was relatively recently implemented.

**Rosemary Jolly:** Just one request. Who has responsibility for deciding when the Joint Committee will meet?

**Provost Jones:** While it was me, Rose, but in light of what was anticipated could be a change. They didn't seem to be a lot of point in me putting together that group, but it is something that I have conveyed to Sarah as what I think is a priority for her to do.

**Rosemary Jolly:** It would behoove the Senate to request that of Sara is what I'm hearing.

**Provost Jones:** I have channeled the request to Sara, and I will certainly work with her to help her get that implemented.

**Rosemary Jolly:** Thank you so much, Provost Nick. Appreciate it.

**Provost Jones:** Faculty member, Rose.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you for that Nick, we needed a laugh. Our time is now up. Thank you.

**Provost Jones:** Should I keep my water or do I have to return it?

---

## FORENSIC BUSINESS

### Making General Election Day a Non-Instructional Day – Appendix B

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Provost Jones. We now move on to Agenda Item G, Forensic Business, and we have a Forensic Report from the Senate Committee on Education titled, "Making General Election

Day a Non-Instructional Day". This can be found as Appendix B. This Forensic discussion will be led by Shelli Stine, Patricia Birungi, and Noah Robertson. I see they're making their way down. 20 minutes are given for this discussion, and I'll ask when you have all arrived. Shelli, Patti, and Noah, do you have any introductory comments before opening the questions you have presented for discussion?

**Michele Stine:** We do. Thank you, Chair Szczygiel. This report is coming to the floor after extensive conversations in the Education Committee on proposals from the student government. The students brought to us a very serious concern about student ability, not just to vote in elections, but to fully participate in the election process and to fully participate in democracy, thought to be overly dramatic about it.

In our conversations and in the discussions in the Committee, we thought that it would be best to open it up to all of you to start thinking about, what are some potential benefits and what are some potential problems that we can work to try and ameliorate in making Election Day a Non-Instructional Day at the University. Because this initiated from the students' senators, I would like to turn it over to them to lead the introduction and to lead the discussion. Noah and Patricia.

**Noah Robertson, College of the Liberal Arts:** Hi everyone. My name is Noah Robertson. I'm the College of Liberal Arts student senator.

**Patricia Birungi, College of Health and Human Development:** Hi, my name is Patti Parangi. I'm the Outgoing Chair

**Noah Robertson:** Thank you, Shelli, for introducing us as well and for placing us on the Agenda and Education Committee. The proposal and topic of discussion today for the Forensic Report is that classes should not be held on Election Day on each November General Election. While some may view this as a day off school for students, we'd like to introduce this as a day on democracy instead.

Our vision is to promote democratic participation in student-faculty and community members, especially for those without the means or know-how to do so. The guiding goals of bringing this proposal to the Senate are to increase voter turnout and political engagement, enable and incentivize community engagement and civic service, and to create a more well-rounded college experience that graduates lifelong citizens.

Again, a day on democracy proposes that classes will not be held on Election Day on each November General Election. In lieu of classes, Penn State can explore ways to support engaged learning through community events that support the well-rounded college experience for students. Consider this could look like taking a festival-like approach to celebrate democracy.

This model has been used at various universities, which we'll talk about in a little bit. Improve town and gown relationships through local vendors, performance art, guest speakers. All of this would be enabled by giving the institution a chance to build up the institutional capacity for that engaged learning and to support students in that way. Sorry, one second.

What happening right now, the current updated Policy 42-27, gives students an excused absence who miss class to vote. This allows them to make up work with the appropriate arrangements with our professor. Although this policy makes voting somewhat more logistically feasible for students, there are some drawbacks to the status quo that we want to draw your attention to.

First, the current policy does not sufficiently remove the barriers on Election Day that perpetuates systemic student disenfranchisement. The UPUA created a survey that we'll get into later, but some of the student responses support that many students still must choose between fulfilling their academic responsibilities and practicing their right to vote. We also note that the current policy discourages sustain forms of civic engagement on Election Day like volunteering and canvassing.

Students report that missing classes detrimental to their academic success and many students cite this for not volunteering on Election Day. Lastly, we want to draw your attention to the fact that the current policy forecloses the institutional opportunity to fully recognize and celebrate Election day going back to the day on democracy model. Now that we've analyzed the current policy, we want to introduce some reasons for changing it and begin moving towards this day on democracy.

First, not holding class on Election Day fulfills a principal goal of higher education cited from President Truman's 1947 Commission on Higher Education as just one example, is to educate for a full or realization of democracy in every phase of living. Not holding class on Election Day is a structural choice that manifestly improves civic outcomes for Penn State students and surrounding communities.

Doing so, it builds capacity for institutionalizing forms of engaged learning. It aligns with Penn State's values and it demonstrates responsiveness to student advocacy. Working down that, higher education and civic engagement have a long-standing relationship with each other. Since the founding of Harvard College in 1636, one of the purposes of higher education has been the preparation of graduates for active involvement in community life.

Penn State, specifically, in 1862, the passage of the Land Grant Act, created institutions that inextricably linked public higher education and the concept of civic engagement, specifically as it relates to agriculture and industry. John Dewey wrote in democracy in education, that the Liberal Arts experience should consist of three essential elements. Engage students in the surrounding community, focus on problems to be solved rather than academic discipline and should collaboratively involve students and faculty.

There's also a body of research that improve civic outcomes happen for students who volunteer and engage in other ways on Election Day. All of these are at the end of the presentation, if anyone's interested in reading more, but participation on Election Day strongly correlates with daytime availability. Again, going back to that idea of students having more time outside of class.

If classes are not to be held, they're more likely to vote. Students are more likely to volunteer if their institution encourages and communicates available volunteer opportunities. Students overcome their insecurities about political engagement, develop a political identity and reduce the psychological distance between their everyday routines and political issues, i.e., voting increases civic learning.

Research suggests that voting at a young age in college dramatically increases the likelihood of forming life-long voting habits. Lastly, promoting extracurricular civic engagement activities has the greatest positive impact on developing civically engaged students. The last thing I'll touch on is the Penn State values. We really feel that this policy would align strongly with the stated values of our institution integrity.

This proposal is in accordance with the highest ethical and academic standards for how to best promote civic engagement through higher education as evidenced by that research. The proposal respects the

importance of Election Day and upholding and performing democracy. It also respects the rights of students to vote unimpeded by a busy class schedule.

Responsibility. Penn State has a responsibility to graduate students to equip specific knowledge, a strong sense of citizenship and lifelong voting habits. This proposal would also hold Penn State accountable to the Higher Education Act of 1965, which requires that public institutions that receive federal funding make a good faith effort to civically engage students through providing the means to vote.

Last three. Discovery. This proposal creates an opening for students to seek new knowledge and an understanding of the importance of democracy voting, and civic engagement. Adopting this proposal would demonstrate Penn State's excellence and leadership in promoting civic engagement in higher education. Lastly, this proposal seeks to foster a culture of civic engagement in Penn State's communities on campus and around the Commonwealth.

**Patricia Birungi:** I would just like to touch on the UPUA proponent of this proposal. This is not a new proposal from the UPUA, this is a long-standing issue that we have discussed and deliberated through at least my four years here and prior to that. Definitely prior to COVID, and just haven't been able to experience two separate Election Days, one midterm election and one General Election.

I've definitely seen the direct impacts it not having a Non-Instructional Day on legislators had on students. The first thing I want to touch on is that because this has been so long-standing, the UPUA has surveyed and supported some leniency, on a Non-Instructional Day on Election Day since our 14th assembly, which was 2019/2020. This is definitely something that students have showed support and a desire for long before this past election season and additionally this past year.

Both the UPUA and GPSA pass legislation in support of a proposal to and hopefully have something like a Non-Instructional Day for Election Day. On top of that, we additionally surveyed students this past year to get a greater gauge on why they feel like Non-Instructional Day on Election Day would be important. We've gathered a few [inaudible]. Yes.

Just synthesizing all of these different responses, there's just a general consensus amongst students that there are a lot of different barriers. Even though the Election Day leniency policy that we currently have in place now is beneficial to some, it still does not take away from a lot of those barriers, such as the demand of course load and ability to really wait in those lines at polling locations, let alone understand the logistics of how they're going to organize their day in order to be civically engaged.

A lot of these testimonies just touch on various student experiences, whether they're TAs, whether they're everyday students just trying to make it to their classes, or they are students who are hoping to volunteer polling locations or students who have long commutes onto campus and don't have a lot of flexibility in transportation to get to their polling locations.

Because students do have different polling locations based off of on-campus versus off-campus status. A lot of these testaments just touch on the various student experiences that can hinder civic engagement on Election Day when there is no Non-Instructional option offered. Additionally, more testaments and students just expressing their desire for greater flexibility.

With that, to touch on our survey data, we were able to survey 277 students, 244 of which did support a designated Election Day university-wide holiday. Not just to have the holiday aspect, but just because

there would be more ideal of an option and it would also limit the size of the lines for polling and voting, as well as engage students more to vote on Election Day.

These responses were evidence that Penn State students have a variety of reasons for missing voting and volunteering options or opportunities on Election Day. This would also just help to integrate the students who would have the ability to vote. It's not made a luxury, but more of an opportunity for everybody. With that, and seeing some of the data we've collected, we wanted to come to you to ask questions about what barriers that you see to implementation for a policy like this.

What opinions, and I guess, feedback that you have for us about the feasibility of this proposal. Then what places there are to possibly compromised as there are specific things that would make this reports implements such as lab responsibilities. This is obviously going to look differently for graduate students versus undergrad students. Then also additionally, how the Senate can support graduate professional students in developing their civic skill set.

How to also release the research, and administrative assistantship responsibilities on Election Day throughout the University so that we can all make this a feasible option. With that, I will take any questions or discussion on this proposal.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you. Of course, the purpose of these Forensics is to get some feedback. They can take it back to Committee inform future action. If everyone or anyone who has a question or comment to offer to this group, please raise your hand. In the back, John.

**John Champagne:** Champagne, Erie. This is not my comment. I am representing a colleague in Political Science who said that now the people can vote by mail, this isn't necessary. All I'm saying is when you take it back to committee, anticipate that objection.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, John. I see Ira online. Ira.

**Ira Saltz, Penn State Shenango:** Saltz, Shenango. In line with just that previous comments, I think there are ways students can vote, and I do think faculty, we have an obligation to encourage students to vote and teach students the importance of voting. But as for being an instructional day, I hesitate to lose another day of teaching in a Semester, we've lost some already for other holidays and breaks and it's not a national holiday. If people were off of work so that they could vote then I would think this would be highly appropriate, but adults beyond college have to find ways to vote and still work, so I not really enamored with the idea of losing another instructional day.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Ira, we have someone in the back.

**Susan Fredricks, Penn State Brandywine:** Fredricks, Brandywine. Is there a parallel study from another University that did this that you could then look and see if there's been an increase in student voting? Because I think that would pair really well with information you've already given us and that might help your cause a little bit more.

**Noah Robertson:** I can give a quick answer to that, too. Knowing the different institutions that implemented this policy. Among them are like Yale, Brown, Columbia, and then a few other colleges and solve data from Tufts, they are directly correlates additional daytime off with increased student participation on Election Day. There are some parallel models like universities that would support increased participation like this and I think that it would adoptable density.



**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, we've got about five minutes remaining, I see Mary Beth.

**Mary Beth Williams, Eberly College of Science:** I'm Williams, College of Science, I want to speak in support of this idea and thank the students for bringing it forward. I think robust participation in democracy and sharing our voices and encouraging students to do that as a lifelong habit is essential to part of the learning that we need to encourage at University. I'd say I know that my colleagues in the College of Science will have the same concerns about, oh my gosh, a lab course, especially how do we deal with loss of instructional time? I'd like to suggest that maybe one thing that we could think about is actually the calendar itself, because it's not just students who have challenges with voting.

As Ira pointed out, there are lots of staff and faculty who have long commute times and who have busy schedules and who also have a hard time voting, they could plan ahead as long as the Pennsylvania legislature lets them. Or we could really think about the University calendar in a way that represents our commitment to participation in democracy and give everybody the day to vote ahead of it being a national holiday, we could actually lead on this, thank you.

**Patricia Birungi:** Additionally, I will say also that I feel like because of the lack of non-instructional day currently, it is slightly difficult for people to plan around, whereas, like, I didn't do wouldn't be beneficial to have that mentality of, like, I have this non-instructional day, I can find the state and I can make time for these things, but I think we negate the planning portion of it.

**Chair Szczygiel:** We have another question on front, here. Erin, you could raise your hand, Erin, and we need to close this conversation, I'm told in a few minutes, so Erin.

**Erin Boas, University Park Undergraduate Association:** Erin Boas, University Park Undergraduate Association, more of a discussion piece than a question. First, I wanted to thank both the student Senators as well as the Education Committee, I know that especially both of these student Senators have worked for the past three or four years on this proposal so seeing it come to the Senate floor in our discussion is really great to hear.

The one discussion piece that I would just bring up as well this would be viewed as a Non-Instructional Day, I would hope that the University and the Faculty Senate would also see this as not being a non-educational day, if anything, it's an opportunity and exposure for students who even talking with places in the University like the Center for Conscious and Character and Public Purpose, there's students that are becoming less involved in government unless involved in politics.

One because of a non exposure, but also an non-unwillingness to affiliate and I think having a University priority being put on things like voting and civic engagement is something that is so essential for students. While we're taught things within the classroom, I think it's more important as well in my experience as well, has been those instructional types of things outside of the classroom and the opportunities to engage with the University, engage with the community, I think has been one of the best parts of having a Penn State experience is having the University put focuses on things like civic engagement as well.

It's also a movement that we're seeing across the Big Ten, the association of Big Ten students has introduced this multiple times within their student roundtables as well and I think it's a movement that we'd see happening across the Big Ten and I would love to see Penn State be a leader in this cause, so thank you students, and I hope the Faculty Senate supports this in the future.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you. Erin I'm going to recognize Steve Snyder online again, I want to hear some voices from people that we don't always hear from. Steve, it's yours.

**Steve Snyder, Penn State Berks:** Yes, Snyder Berks support with no reservations whatsoever absolutely support this. We can work around the Instructional Day, I think we learned that from COVID, I don't really value that as a reason to not go forward with this, our democracy is at risk right now as we speak and we have an opposition that is mobilizing to disenfranchise people from voting and we need to do whatever we can to counter that, that's it. Thank you.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Steve and I'm afraid, folks, we are out of time now to take one last person comment from the floor and then I'm afraid we have to close this conversation down.

**Josh Graham, Penn State Beaver:** Graham, Beaver Campus, I just want to speak in support of this, this is something that I think aligns very well with the current goals of the institution and the goals of higher education in principle, I think that as a university, we have a responsibility to lead and to establish better citizens than we are leaving behind and so by having this policy in place, we are constructing a better future for generations to come.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you very much, thank you, Noah, Patti, and Shelli.

**Michele Stine:** One more note. We really do want to hear from you, we want to know how you feel about this, we appreciate the support and we appreciate your thoughtful attention to the concerns. Please feel free to reach out to me, my email address is available on the Senate website as a committee chair, so if you have concerns, please let us know, we would love for that to become part of the conversation at Committee next year, thank you so much.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you all. I particularly want to thank Noah and Patti for bringing an issue of significance to the student body forward. This is exactly the student advocacy that is important to the Senate.

---

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS — NONE

**Chair Szczygiel:** Moving on Agenda Item H, Unfinished Business, there is none.

---

## LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

### Revision to Policy 48-40: Deferred Grades – Clarifying Language – Appendix C

**Chair Szczygiel:** On to the Legislative Reports, we have eight Legislative Reports, it will go fast, trust me. But first, we need to do a present vote which will help the Senate Staff with attendance and to make sure everyone has access to TallySpace, is there a question or clarification? Problems with TallySpace perhaps?

We are told the poll is up.

**Anna Butler, Senate office staff:** The poll is up

**Chair Szczygiel:** Putting up that whole the poll is up we're told. Here we go, directions for logging in or on the screen, simply select A to record you are present today and of course save my vote. Anna, how are we coming along? She can't speak.

**Anna Butler, Senate Office Staff:** I've many votes coming in.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Was that a yes or?

**Chair Szczygiel:** Alright. That poll will remain open while we move on to our first legislative report from the Senate Committee, Committees on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid And Education, titled, "Revision to Policy 48-40: Deferred Grades – Clarifying Language," and can be found in Appendix C. Chair of ARSSA, Kat Phillips will answer any questions and step forward, and if you want to say anything about the report.

**Kat Phillips, University Libraries and Scholarly Communications:** Hi all. I'm Kat Phillips and Chair of ARSSA, and this really was a language update and I'd like some clarification between this and the ACUE policy G-3: Deferred Grades, and I will be happy to take any questions at this time.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Please raise your hand, should be recognized. I see no questions on the floor and I see none online. Thank you, Kat.

**Kathleen Phillips:** Thank you.

**Chair Szczygiel:** We appreciate your work and effort. Here we go.

It is now time to vote. Anna, are we ready to start that poll? I'm getting a nod.

Yes, here it is. Senators you may cast your vote on TallySpace to accept the motion press A, to reject press B.

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.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Erin, I'm going to ask you to translate for me. If you see Anna in distress, let me know. Until then, we will move on.

### **Revisions to Bylaws, Article III, Election to Senate – Appendix D**

#### **Revision to Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6(a) Establishing Subcommittees – Appendix E**

#### **Revisions to Standing Rules, Article I, Section 12(e) Tellers – Appendix F**

**Chair Szczygiel:** Next. We have three reports from the Senate Committees on Committees and Rules that are being considered together. The first report is a change to the Bylaws and as such, it is presented today and will be voted on at the next Plenary, whether that be in the summer or this fall.

Whenever the next one occurs, since the other two reports are related to the first, the vote on the other two reports will also be delayed. These reports are "Revisions to Bylaws, Article III, Election to Senate," Appendix D, "Revision to Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6(a) Establishing Subcommittees," which is Appendix E, and "Revisions to Standing Rules, Article I, Section 12(e) Tellers," Appendix F. Here to introduce the reports are Ann Taylor, Chair of the Committee on Committees and Rules, and Beth Seymour, Chair of the Elections subcommittee of CC&R.

**Ann Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences:** Thank you. Well, I am very proud of this body of work, but it's complicated. It's easy, but complicated. Beth Seymour is going to walk us through quickly because Beth chaired our Subcommittee on elections this year. You really did all the heavy lifting, so Beth.

**Beth Seymour, Immediate Past Chair:** Hi, I'm not going to go into a lot of detail. Basically, what the Elections Subcommittee and then CC&R decided was that the Elections Commission is an incredibly important body. It overlooks all the Elections processes of the Senate. Both are constituent elections, so your elections as well as the elections within the Senate itself.

As a result, we looked at the governing documents and there were references to the Elections Commission all over the place sort of scattered a bit hodgepodge, and so what you see before you is an attempt to pull it together into three more coherent spaces and create a subcommittee of CC&R that will be a permanent Elections Commission Subcommittee.

That's the short answer. The reason we're asking to wait, so by our rules, we should be voting on Standing Rules at the same time they're presented. Two of these reports are Standing Rules, one is Bylaws. By our rules, we wait on Bylaws and Constitution changes for a meeting, it's introduced in one meeting, it will wait till the next meeting, as this is a package.

We asked Senate Council if we could have the luxury of waiting to vote on all three at our next meeting. There'll be an opportunity to discuss it again, and maybe in an effort of brevity, save all your detailed comments and questions. You can send them to me, ems22, or save them until the next meeting and we will vote on them.

### **Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure Section 6(c) – Addition of DEI to Curricular Affairs – Appendix G**

**Chair Szczygiel:** Okay. Thank you, Beth and Ann, very much. We look forward to revisiting these reports at a later date. Our next Legislative Report, number five, see how quickly it's going is from the Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and Curricular Affairs, titled, "Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure Section 6(c) – Addition of DEI to Curricular Affairs," and it can be found in your Appendix G. Here to present this report again, standing is Ann Taylor and Mary Beth Williams, Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee.

**Ann Taylor:** By now, you're used to us bringing you Standing Rules changes so that we can really make it clear our important commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. In this one, we started about mid-year, just getting a little more opinionated about having really strong language and Curricular Affairs at CC&R and Curricular Affairs met with some of the CC&R folks, and I love what they jointly came up with, and so we're very proud to share these with you today. Hopefully they're self-evident, but Mary Beth can answer questions if you are already.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Are there any questions from the floor or from our Zoom connection? Please raise your hand. Seeing none anywhere. It is now time to vote. Senators, you may now cast your vote on TallySpace. Hopefully you see it. Do you see it? Okay. Sorry . To accept the motion, press A, to reject press B.

**Anna Butler:** I have many votes coming in.

**Proposed Preamble to the Senate Constitution entitled: A Statement on the Role of the Faculty Senate at the Pennsylvania State University – Appendix H**

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you very much, Mary Beth and Annie. The next Legislative Report is from the Senate Committees on Committees and Rules and the Senate Self-Study Committee. It is “Proposed Preamble to the Senate Constitution entitled: A Statement On the Role of the Faculty Senate at the Pennsylvania State University,” and it is Appendix H on your Agendas.

**Keith Shapiro, Parlmartian:** Are you ready?

**Eli Christopher Byrne, Eberly College of Science:** Yeah.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Here to present this report is Keith Shapiro, I'm a little sluggish, Chair of the Senate Self-Study Committee and of course, Annie Taylor.

**Keith Shapiro, Parliamentarian:** Hello everybody, welcome back. It's wonderful to see people here today. We're excited to bring this legislation to you. As we said before, it's aspirational. I think that's a really important thing for us. When we propose this, of course, it's to change to our Constitution so it required a full meeting between the time we proposed and our vote today. During that time, it gives an opportunity for some feedback from other bodies.

R Remember, the President will also have to approve it because the President also approves these constitutional votes. One of the feedback that we've gotten, Bonj you can help us with this if necessary, from our Board of Trustees colleagues is that they suggested that we clarify this section by where we say we have the right to authentic participation. What does that mean?

What does that idea of “the right” mean? What it means for us is that these authorities are delegated to us through the Board of Trustees in the same way we delegate authority onto our units to have their own unit Constitution. We're going to ask you to approve, if possible, through the concept of general consent. If there aren't any objections we can move forward on it.

The changes that we've put on the screen here, that would change it to say we have been delegated the authority by the Board of Trustees to participate and to participate authentically in the shared governance of the institution. My view, the operative term in this sentence when we wrote it, was that idea of “authentic participation.” Also, since it does clarify what we mean by “right,” I would ask that you would accept that and Bonj, if you could ask if there are any objections to that change?

**Chair Szczygiel:** I will, just for clarification in advance, since this is a change to our Senate Constitution, this document is not new. You saw at our last plenary. It has remained there for greater consideration on everyone's part and then for discussion and vote today.

Just a reminder as well of what's going, an amendment to the constitution requires a two-thirds vote of those senators present. Such amendments will not go into effect until they have been approved by the President. Using the general consent, we can avoid a motion. Lisa.

**Lisa Posey, Smeal College of Business:** Lisa Posey, Smeal forget my name. I don't have any objection to this. I was just wondering because at the beginning of the constitution it says that it's the President that adopts it. As you said, I'm just wondering, is it the President or is it the Board of Trustees? Is that an actual .

**Keith Shapiro:** Ultimately all of the authority of them, all of the authority comes from [inaudible] [OVERLAPPING].

**Ann Taylor:** Because it is delegated to the President who delegates stuff.

**Jennifer Baka, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences:** Yeah.

**Lisa Posey:** Okay, that's great. No problem. I just didn't want anything to be.

**Keith Shapiro:** We just went to them [inaudible] .

**Amy Linch, College of the Liberal Arts:** Amy Linch, Liberal Arts. I honor the spirit of this, but I'm hesitant about the idea of invoking the Board of Trustees because if they delegate the authority, they can revoke the authority. Is it better maybe just to say that under the constitution of Penn State or to take the document, the charter and its structure as the basis of the authority. Than to say the Board of Trustees gave it to us because they can then take it away.

**Lisa Posey:** What's the reality of that?

**Annie Taylor:** Yeah, that's the reality. [OVERLAPPING]

**Melba Amador Medina, Penn State New Kensington:** That's true?

**Annie Taylor:** In fact, I think Roger has explained that that has actually happened before. Hasn't it, Roger?

**Ann Taylor:** Roger.

**Roger Egolf, Senate Historian:** Yes Yes, the constitution has been changed in the past at the direction of the Board of Trustees who said either you change the constitution or we take away the Senate entirely, and they have the total right to do that. I have no problem with this language, this substitution language. I think it is actually the proper way to phrase it.

**Amy Linch:** Can I just follow up though? Because presumably the constitution binds the Board of Trustees as well.

**Roger Egolf:** No.

**Amy Linch:** It doesn't?

**Roger Egolf:** No, the Board of Trustees gives us the authority they have allowed us to have a Senate. They have that right. They are the University, legally.

**Amy Linch:** Okay.

**Ann Taylor:** This is the Faculty Senate Constitution, not the University's constitution.

**Chair Szczygiel:** We all got to say this place, this group is really well-versed in their Senate Constitution. My gosh, very impressive.

**Ann Taylor:** I would like to add how nice it is to have a Senate Historian.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Absolutely. Thank you, Roger, and Amy for the question and clarification. I see Rose, go ahead. Rose, do you hear me? You're recognized.

**Rosemary Jolly:** Thank you, I was taking trying to unmute with a document in front of me. I just wanted to follow up the further question by saying I completely understand that this is historically correct. I also understand that at one point, historically, the Board of Trustees did, in fact, disband the Senate.

I'm just wondering whether, even though it's accurate in this sense the question is, do we accept the authority of the Board to do that? Sorry, of the authority of the Board of Trustees. That is to say, I think it would be very dramatic now if they asked us to disband the Senate. I'm just wondering if there's any way to indicate how egregious that would be.

**Ann Taylor:** I will respond to that—

**Chair Szczygiel:** If I could jump in. This is just based on conversations that have taken place very recently. Communications into the night. It is certainly an option for you to decline this suggestion or request, but it is also our choice to, if we are going to talk about shared governance and the sharing and the listening and the discussing and the importance of that with the administration as well as the Board, it's just something that we might want to consider.

**Keith Shapiro:** One more thing. It might be nice to remind them that they did delegate this authority to us. To put it on paper that in the authority that were are, describing it is one to have this authentic, when we say authentic, we mean participation, that's real, but we have this we said it earlier today that we have this communication that goes on. When it was presented, When I read it the first time I thought, well it might be in our interested to to remind them this.

**Chair Szczygiel:** I see a question from Steve. Steve, you have the floor online, Steve, you're recognized. There you go. Well, Steve might have a problem with audio. Are there any other questions or concerns from the floor? Yes. Hold on, Steve, we'll get back to you.

**Paul Frisch, Penn State Scranton:** Just—Frisch, Scranton. Because this has to be approved by the President. Since he is no longer going to be the President come next week, if he doesn't sign off on this, would we have to reintroduce this for Dr. Bendapudi? No. Just clarification, thank you.

**Chair Szczygiel:** The answer was no and great question thanks. Very good question. Steve, are you with us now?

**Steve Snyder, Penn State Berks:** Yes, am I recognized, Snyder, Berks?

**Chair Szczygiel:** You are recognized.

**Steve Snyder:** It sounds to me like you don't have unanimous consent at this stage and that maybe it should just move to a motion and a vote.

**Keith Shapiro:** I'm not sure if we are there any—

**Chair Szczygiel:** Are there any objections?

**Steve Snyder:** Yes, I object. I object.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Okay, all right. Then do we need a second at this point in time since it's been presented.

**Keith Shapiro:** I'm making a motion to make the change.

**Jennifer Baka:** I'll second.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Second. All those, Anna, hop into doing.

**Anna Butler:** What would you like me to do, Bonj?

**Chair Szczygiel:** We'd like you to bear with us for just one more meeting, Anna, honest-to-God.

**Ann Taylor:** We need a vote, Anna, so that we can vote whether or not to accept the new language that was presented.

**Keith Shapiro:** This is a motion to accept a new language and however that goes, then there would be another vote on the entire legislation.

**Chair Szczygiel:** We have a move and a second. We also have a question or a comment. Is it too late to take that?

**Keith Shapiro:** I don't think so.

**Chair Szczygiel:** I'd like to recognize Michael. Michael, could you identify yourselves and your unit?

**Michael Wade Smith, Senior Vice President and Chief of Staff:** Thank you, Madam Chair. My apologies. I'm calling in from a vehicle ride heading away from the New Kensington Campus.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Michael, could you identify yourself, please, and your name?

**Michael Wade Smith:** Yes, Michael Wade. My name is Michael Wade Smith. I'm seven weeks old in the Penn State community. I have joined as Senior Vice President and Chief of Staff to President-Elect, Neeli Bendapudi, so brand-new in the community. Just wanted to join to share some thoughts on this amendment to our governance documents here at Penn State. I know we all have not had the opportunity to meet and I would've loved to have our first conversation not in exactly this way, but I am honored to speak in front of the group today.

Please know that Dr. Bendapudi has an incredible commitment to shared governance and that we have heard, in our seven weeks on campus, a consistent theme of frustration at lack of inclusion of faculty and of staff and of students in decisions affecting them at the University. We have heard that loud and clear. As you all know, the 1966 AAUP statement on shared governance calls for this type of collaboration and conversation to happen between the Board of Trustees, the President, and the Faculty Senate. I hope that you can talk to your colleagues at Kansas and at Louisville to know that we have full commitment to operating in that way.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Michael.

**Michael Wade Smith:** There is some concern.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Michael, I'm sorry to interrupt you. I'm being reminded that you are not officially recognized to speak on the Senate floor. That was my error that I recognized you and brought you on, but if you are not a part of the elected Faculty Senate or if you have not requested the ability to speak on the floor in advance, I was incorrect to recognize you. I was just excited to meet you and say hi.

**Michael Wade Smith:** I understand you as the chair—

**Chair Szczygiel:** So, thank you and I'm sorry, Michael. We've got to move on. Do we have any other comments? Yes.



**Berend Mets, College of Medicine:** Berend Mets, College of Medicine. If I look at this language carefully, it actually makes our association or shared governance stronger, not weaker.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you. Any other comments from the floor on the motion before we vote? Seeing none, can we go to the vote?

**Anna Butler:** The poll is up.

**Chair Szczygiel:** The vote is up.

**Anna Butler:** Yes, the vote.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Anna, could you just nod to Erin. To accept the motion, would we press yes or A?

**Anna Butler:** A to accept and B to reject.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Anna. A to accept, B to reject. We are voting on the motion to amend the language in this document only. You could give some indication when you think the votes have slowed down or when we're done.

**Anna Butler:** The vote has stopped and I have 114 Accept and 20 Reject. That's 85 percent accept.

**Chair Szczygiel:** We have a two-thirds acceptance of the motion. We only needed one half. Onto then the final vote, or do we need further discussion on anything else regarding the merits of this? We now have a report with amended language and that amendment has been passed and so we'll be voting. Let's call a vote. Let's vote on this document now, please.

**Anna Butler:** That vote is open.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Anna. Again, select A to accept this report and B to reject, as amended.

**Anna Butler:** Still votes coming in.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Anna.

**Anna Butler:** Okay, I have 127 Accept and 6 Reject.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you very much, Anna. This report is passed.

**Anna Butler:** Thank you.

### **Rescind Policy 44-40: Proctoring of Examinations – Appendix I**

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Keith and Annie. Our next legislative report is from the Senate Committee on Education titled, "Rescind Policy 44-40: Proctoring of Examinations," and can be found on your Agendas and as Appendix I, you do it quick, presenter of the report is Shelli Stine, Chair of the Education Committee.

**Michele Stine:** Hello again. This policy actually, this proposal is quite simple in the interest of simplifying policy. When we looked at this policy and decided whether or not it needed to be revised, I feel like I'm in the classroom. We took a look at this policy, some of the units I brought this policy on requiring proctoring for examinations to us. Policy was written in 1952, I believe, and last updated in 1989.

To give you some perspective on that, in 1989, I was a junior Education Major here. Well beyond its lifespan. When the Committee decided to take a look at how this policy might be revised, we realized it was redundant. Everything we need this Policy to do is already covered in our policies on academic integrity. That the meaning of this policy, the intent of this policy was to maintain the academic integrity of examinations.

We give examinations in a variety of different ways now, and many of them do not require proctoring and should not have proctoring. In an effort to simplify policy, we decided that this policy no longer needs to exist. I will be happy to answer questions.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Any questions for Shelli? We have a question online from Ira.

**Michele Stine:** Hello, Ira.

**Ira Saltz:** Yes. Hi. I guess my only concern is that this could be misinterpreted by some guys to say, oh, exams don't need to be proctored anymore and get even more funding for proctoring pulled. I'm not sure why the policy just couldn't say that add appropriate exams do not have to be proctored or something like that. I'm just afraid of this being misinterpreted, especially by the bean counters who don't want to shell out money for proctoring. That will become more and more important as we get more and more online classes or students online seat. We're fighting that battle.

**Michele Stine:** I appreciate your concern, Ira. We did discuss this possibility, but the policy on academic integrity is extensive and clear. I think there is robust commitment to academic integrity, which would include in many cases, appropriately proctoring exams. But what we didn't want to do is to get into revising a policy down to the minutiae, where we're regulating in legislating specific examples of one type of exam versus another. Rather than go down that route where we are, that policy is never going to be durable. It's never going to catch every possible iteration whereas the academic integrity policy does. Does that make sense?

**Ira Saltz:** I guess. I mean, I don't know. It just scares me knowing we're trying to go. That's a battle that we're going to be taken on is that there's not been a commitment to. I've taught classes on the DLC and I've had fights with the campuses, I want my exams proctored and some of the campuses don't have proctoring resources. It's a big battle and I'm just afraid of someone then throwing, "Oh, well, they rescinded the policy I'm proctoring and so exams don't have to be proctored anymore, so we don't need proctors." I guess I just see a very serious concern there.

**Michele Stine:** I'm sympathetic to that concern.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Any other questions or comments for Shelli while we've got her?

**Michele Stine:** —Make it sound like I'm going to run away.

**Chair Szczygiel:** So, none. You can run away. It is now time to vote, Anna. Thanks. Start the poll.

**Anna Butler:** Poll is open.

**Chair Szczygiel:** You can Accept the motion to by pressing A, Reject, press B. Thank you, Shelli. We're going to wait while those votes are flowing in.

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

**Chair Szczygiel:** Our last Legislative Report is from the Senate Committee on Global Programs titled, “Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(h) – Committee on Global Programs.” You can find it in Appendix J. Here to present the report is not Mathias Hanses, you're Susan Fredricks we have.

**Susan Fredricks:** I'm Brandywine. I'm the Vice-Chair of the Global Programs. This is very simple. It's a name change—the Office of Global Programs has changed its name to Penn State Global. Because of that, the Senate Committee on Global Programs became obsolete name, not in what we do. We would like a name change to the Senate Committee on Global, excuse me, Senate Committee on Global Engagement.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Discussion on this report. Such a clear report, no questions needed. Thank you, Susan. Once again, for the last time, go to TallySpace.

**Anna Butler:** The poll is open.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Anna. Poll is open.

---

## **ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS**

### **Guiding Principles for the Design of Health Care Plans – Appendix K**

**Chair Szczygiel:** We're going to move along to Item J on our Agenda, which are Advisory/Consultative. We have one from the Faculty Benefits Committee, titled, “Guiding Principles for the Design of Health Care Plans,” in Appendix K. Here to present the report is Denise Costanzo, Chair of Faculty Benefits and Jill Musser, Manager of Benefits Program and Services.

**Denise Costanzo, College of Arts and Architecture:** Thank you, everyone. I'm looking at my screen so that I'm not looking backwards, but I'll try to remember to make sure we're on the same page. The Committee on Faculty Benefits has been part of a longer conversation about Penn State's healthcare plans for quite some time. I will make this as efficient as possible given the hour, but just as a reminder, what an important part of the University Budget healthcare is.

It is approximately 11 percent of the E&G budget. A great deal of those costs have to do with the interface between us as employees slash patients, consumers and the outward facing system, what we pay for our care, system administration, how much care we need in any given year. Those costs are complex and depend on a variety of contextual issues. Most predominantly the marketplace model that defines US healthcare.

There's only so much that we can do to resist certain costs increases, which we know we all experience. This is just a reminder that the University does put considerable effort into managing those cost increases and we support that continued effort by all means. The purview of our committee is specifically to look at internal issues that relate to how healthcare fits into our benefits as employees.

Just as a reminder, faculty constitute approximately one third of the benefits eligible employees throughout the system. We're very conscious as we look at our healthcare plans, that the decisions and recommendations that we as a very small committee of only faculty plus colleagues from HR, we are entering into territory that has an enormous impact on employees across the system.

The approach that we chose to take for this report is to look at issues and features of our plans that appear to be unusual and in other ways raise issues of concerns. There are a couple of items where we make pretty direct recommendation, but in general, given the complexity and the high-stakes of this space for every one's physical and financial health, our choice has been to highlight items of importance that we would like the University to consider.

Next slide. Thank you. In many ways, our report is a response in a continuation to a report that was presented in October of last year, meaning October 2020, The Guiding Principles for the Design of Healthcare Plans at Penn State. That came out of this same committee as well as the work of JCIB and other entities over again, several years. Lots of thought and work and expertise and insights that went into that. I'll just point out, Ira Saltz was chair and involved with many of those initiatives over several years.

He presented quite a monster report, very intricate and very extensive. As a reminder, in 2016, this body of Faculty Senate approved six principles, that were accepted to shape the design of our healthcare plans. We have these summarized here; choice of different plans for employees, a certain amount of overall cost-sharing of 75, 25 percent, affordability and equity, informed utilization, quality, transparency, accessibility, etc. You see them all here and then number six, to promote a culture of health for all of us within the University.

The focus of our committee was on primarily principles one, two and three, with some attention to six as well. That's not to say there's nothing to discuss about the other ones, but those were the issues where we saw the greatest amount of attention needed. Next slide. Thank you. Principle one, choice of healthcare plans. There is room for clarity about what exactly meaningful choice means.

The definition as currently written, is a bit implicit, but fundamentally as most of us know, Penn State offers us two healthcare plans; the PPO, which is a traditional insurance plan, which roughly 70 percent of us and all of our fellow employees participate in, and the PPO savings plan, which is a high deductible healthcare plan. That's about 30 percent of our colleagues in that.

Importantly, something to keep in mind is that we are self-insured. All of our healthcare costs are paid collectively by the University and ourselves as members. There is not an external insurer covering our costs. We do have two external bodies; the Third-Party Administrator, which is Aetna for the healthcare plan, and our Pharmacy Benefit Manager, which is CVS Caremark.

When we talk about Plan Design, really what we're talking about is the structures that define how those costs that we all share with each other and carry individually in various extents, how those costs are distributed. What are the mechanisms that send responsibility in different directions?

Just a reminder, there are a number of variables that shape this structure. Premiums, which, in our current system on the website, are called Contributions. I like the word Premium, so that's why I used it.

Deductibles, which is the amount we have to pay out of pocket before full coverage for services begins.

Copays or Coinsurance, which are fixed fees or percentages per service.

Then we also have the seed money that can go into a health savings account if you're a participant in PPOs savings. Next slide. Thank you. One of the things the 2020 report did that was incredibly useful was extensive benchmarking for peer institutions. They surveyed 25 as a whole and noted that and this is mostly working with 2018 data, but at that time, over two-thirds did like Penn State offer more than one plan.

We're going to summarize some of our thoughts and reflections and recommendations along the way for clarity. Something that was very important to our committee is to reinforce how important it is to preserve plan options besides the QHDHP. These are a relatively recent industry development. They are still being understood. They absolutely and clearly deliver immediate cost savings for the employer.

The health outcomes over the long-term are less clear. The way they are structured can benefit some employees, particularly employees in certain categories, very low utilization or relatively high-income, but they can be challenging for others to participate in. One thing that all of us are probably familiar with if you've used the benefits mentor during open enrollment is the forms of guidance that we receive in terms of which plan is most beneficial.

Primarily that guidance certainly through the benefits mentor is strictly quantitative based on some very specific categories of information. It's the past 18 months of usage and it is one of three: small, medium, large, essentially in terms of your anticipated needs for the next year. Of course, we all know that any given slice of time may or may not be predictive in terms of our needs for the following year.

I think even when we get that data, there's a certain amount of uncertainty about how useful the recommendations based on that are. Second, the fact is that high deductible plans are qualitatively very different to use. They involve a particular relationship with savings and payment and planning. Different people have different relationships with the idea of setting aside money that is targeted to go to the healthcare costs, particularly, if your budget is really tight.

That is an illiquid savings vehicle and that's not something everyone can participate in with the same degree of comfort. In addition, we just want to point out that in terms of choice, both of our plans they're structured differently, but they both give us access to identical provider networks. The committee noted that there is a prior choice that happens on the part of the institution, which is of course the selection of the TPA and PBM.

Who we get our plans through is a choice that's part of the system that structures the benefits the rest of us receive. Faculty and staff have a certain amount of participation in that through the JCIB and HAC, that's the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits under President's Healthcare Advisory Committee. Both of those are involved in the request for proposals when it's time for a new contract to come in, but it is a certain amount of participation in an advisory capacity.

Our recommendations regarding this particular principle is to just reinforce the importance of having access to more than one plan when we're making our choices and the importance of ensuring that one of those plans is not a high deductible plan. They are not necessarily best for everyone. Jill is very good at convincing us of the virtues that they have, but it's important to recognize that they are young and there's a lot of information that should still be gained about them.

We would like to see greater faculty and staff involvement in the selection process for the TPA and PBM, as well as in the plan design. We think there's room for a greater role there. Points three and four on this

list will also come back when we're talking about Principle Three, but just to point out, we think that both plans should have similar degrees of access and similar cost protections overall for all of our colleagues.

We want to reinforce the importance of ensuring and learning more about what the health outcomes are for high deductible plans because there is a financial incentive for delaying care that can have negative repercussions over the long run. Finally, we would like to see more robust qualitative selection guidance. Again, HR during open enrollment offers incredible guidance to employees.

There's a central space though, middle space, between getting the number from the benefits mentor that says you would save money on a high deductible plan. Perhaps not being sure what that would mean, what that would be like. We would like to see further investment in helping people understand whether it is something they should invest more time in understanding and then get them to our colleagues in HR for that added level of information.

A very simple, but very firm request is to change the name of PPO savings. You can imagine a discussion about PPO and PPO savings was a little bit difficult to manage at times. We think that could be made more distinct. Very quickly on 75, 25 cost-sharing as a principle, we suggest a minor wording change just to make it perfectly clear that the 75, 25 cost-sharing does not apply to any one of us as a member individually.

It is collectively, we as employees of the institution together are supposed to pay no more than 25 percent of the totality of all of our collective healthcare costs under this. Obviously, the nature of insurance is such that in a good year I may pay 90 percent of my healthcare costs, but in a very tragic year I might pay a much lower percentage. That's not an individual guarantee. It really depends on a number of factors.

Also, in most of the years since its introduction, the high deductible PPO savings plan members have collectively paid above 25 percent of their health care costs. In 2020, it was nearly 35 percent, in 2021 based on the data we have, it was closer to 30, but it's been around 30 for most years and we feel like that is something that should be better understood and potentially addressed. Those are our recommendations on that point.

Finally, the third and certainly the most challenging issue for us to discuss, but also one that we consider incredibly important is the principle of affordability and equity. What makes it particularly challenging is that there are no definitions of what these terms mean for this specific contexts. We are aware of many definitions of equity that operate around our institution, but it's hard to know which one of those applies most directly to the space of our health care plans.

Affordability is even harder. We look to see if there were federal standards that might provide a useful benchmark the way they do with affordable housing, there's a clear 30 percentage of gross income that you can refer to. But both the ACA and the IRS have a standard which doesn't really apply. It's much higher than the cost of any of our plans. It only refers to premiums.

It's essentially twice as much as what any of us would need to pay. It's also complex because it refers to household income and that's not how our plans are calibrated right now. It really was useful. Again, when we're talking about plan design, we are talking about the structuring features that determine the specific flow of responsibilities for costs among each of us.

If we all share that 25 percent of the total slice, how is that distributed among us collectively? It's based on two things, system utilization and employee salary. We have three structures in our plans that are tied

to salary premiums, which are percentage, deductibles which increased by income tier and then the HSA seed which decreases by income tier.

Just as a reminder, this is all information available on the website, which you may be familiar with, but you can see how this plays out. Again, so deductibles increase as your income goes up and then the HSA seed decreases as it goes down. Just for reference in the PPO savings plan, high deductible plans have to meet a federal standard for the amount of that deductible so there's a little bit of wiggle room but there's federal law pertaining to what those amounts are.

This approach to cost-sharing that we have in our health care plans, system utilization that is almost universal thing. May be plans out there where you just pay your premium and go to the doctor and pay nothing else. But I think that's very rare if it exists anywhere. Tying the cost-share to salary is a little less common. It's not unheard of by any means, but it's not universal.

Having our premiums be a percentage of salary has been the practice since 2012. In case you're wondering, when you say salary, what is that? We've got that clarification, which we appreciate it, it's base salary in October. If you're on a 36-week faculty appointment and perhaps you have extra summer teaching you do or research funds that is not included. That's what that means.

Then we see those cut-off amounts for the deductibles and HSA seed happening at \$45-, \$60- and \$90,000. The benchmarking that was done for 2020 showed that of the 24 other institutions that were surveyed, only five did any indexing of costs to employee salary. We are in the minority in that space. None of them did it via percentage of salary. It was all based on a fixed premium per salary tier.

That makes the Penn State program design distinctive both in the way it indexes cost of salary and the extent to which it does. Basically we have two dials on the dashboard at least that mean there's an impact on how much we pay for our health care based on how much we pay. This chart that we produced gives a sense of how extreme that could be within a certain range.

Up to \$140,000, which is when those salary structures level off, because at a certain point it doesn't become insurance if Coach Franklin is paying \$240,000 a year for his healthcare premiums, that would not necessarily make sense. But within the range we were looking at, the amount you pay to be on the same plan as a colleague is going to be roughly proportional to your salary ratio.

If Jill makes three times as much as I do, which she would deserve, she would be paying three times as much for the same plan. Certainly, if we think in terms of premium and deductible, that's a pretty drastic structuring feature of the plans that we have. For the 2020 report, one of the things JCIB did was, they asked the hypothetical, how would our plans look if everything in the structures were uniform?

We did not have those salary indexed features. They generated what they called a flat dollar alternative premium and they calculated consistency and deductibles and HSA seed as well. These were charts from that report. We're just referring back to them here. Again, based on 2018 data and they were only looking at individual plans and family plants. The two person in parent-child plans are not part of this analysis.

But what that showed is that, people on the PPO, essentially everyone earning below \$75,000 a year salary-wise, if we went to the flat plan, they would be paying more than the current premium versus those earning above 75,000 on that plan would be saving money. Essentially, it would benefit people above 75 and impose additional costs on those below. What other the things we did was look a little more precisely at the impact of that change by going to the extremes.

The greatest possible benefit or savings from a consistent plan would go to people at the \$140,000 salary level. People on the family plan would save roughly \$3,200 a year. That would be 2.3 percent of their salary and then it's under one percent for people that salary range on a single plan.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Denise, I'm afraid we have to wrap it up.

**Denise Costanzo:** You have all those numbers, so let's just go down. Thank you for this, I did it losing track. Bottom line, first off, our committee has an immense concern in looking at all these issues. We recognize how many of our colleagues are strapped to make ends meet as it is, and the fact that healthcare costs feel burdensome already. We have an immense concern about not increasing that.

We also see a structure in which affordability for some of us is essentially being achieved by imposing additional costs on others. Fundamentally, we need a compensation structure that guarantees everyone working for Penn State can afford their healthcare coverage. We feel the bulk of the affordability burden should fall on the University, not on other employees, effectively pitting us against each other.

We need an equitable system. Currently, the system is both anomalous and somewhat extreme and we'd like to see it explained in relation to best practices and transparent standards. There are other issues. There are certain anomalies like what happens if you have couples and how that happens. There were a few places where the equity issues were obvious. We're also concerned about a disparity in the overall out-of-pocket costs within the two plans.

There are some complexities there, but essentially, we feel that both plans should offer the same catastrophic worst-case scenario protection for our families. Very quickly, we are excited to see some initiatives regarding promoting a culture of health lessons we've learned from what happened a few years ago, evidence-based, positive incentives, contextual understanding how health is connected to the work environment, and is aspirational rather than defensive in nature.

This just summarizes our recommendations. One final plea is regarding complexity. It's very hard to understand how to move within the healthcare space as it is anything that can simplify the structure of our plans would be welcomed. Thank you. I apologize for the extra time. Happy to take any questions, and I appreciate Jill and HR being available to help.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Any questions from our Zoom participants or the floor, please raise your hand. Yes. Karen hold on until you can have the mic.

**Karin Sprow-Forte, Penn State Harrisburg:** All those people online. Karin Sprow-Forte, Penn State Harrisburg. I don't have a question. I just want to say thank you so much for looking at this so carefully, going into so much detail because it's not something that the lay person would do so I really appreciate all your efforts.

**Denise Costanzo:** Thank you very much.

**Chair Szczygiel:** I see Rose's hand is raised. Rose you're recognized.

**Rosemary Jolly:** Rose Jolly, Liberal Arts. I'm just wondering what happens from here and on. I still appreciate the recommendations you made, but what happens to those recommendations and how do we make sure that they're carried through?

**Denise Costanzo:** I think that's a great question. I don't know that all of them are designed to be something that can be easily checked off of the list. I think of these recommendations primarily as a



request for explanations and articulation. Really, why do we have the plans we have? Why are they structured the way they are? I think they're important issues. Sometimes we have higher salary colleagues who have immense healthcare burdens because of family members with very strong needs for instance.

For someone to say, I don't know if I can afford to subsidize my colleagues, that might be fair. I think there needs to be a system that is explainable and justifiable to everyone affected. I would say that is the fundamental request beneath all of these recommendations. This position I do sit on, the chair of this committee sits on, the JCIB and HCAC so we're part of the conversation around developing and altering healthcare plans.

The voice exists in that process, but I think this is a chance for the Senate to just ask the University to explain its approach. It's an approach that has been consistent for quite some time. We've been lucky that the numbers have not changed since 2018. That will probably not be the case going forward, especially as structures and numbers change. We think it's important to insist on explanations.

**Rosemary Jolly:** What's the mechanism for getting the explanation? That's what I'm trying to figure out.

**Denise Costanzo:** I'm sorry. I've missed the first part.

**Rosemary Jolly:** What is the mechanism for getting the explanation?

**Denise Costanzo:** The mechanism for getting the explanation would, I expect to be announcements from HR regarding any changes in our plans, coming through the two bodies specifically dedicated to healthcare within the institution. But, Jill if you know of any others, feel free.

**Jill Musser, Manager of Benefits Program and Services:** I'll just say that certainly any changes that are coming down the path for 2023, those will be announced during open enrollment and I would be remiss if I didn't do my usual plug for, please attend an open enrollment meeting or webinar. We plan to hopefully visit all of the campuses again this year. We've had to take open enrollment on off the road, if you will, and onto the webinar section.

We're hoping that we're back to the campuses, certainly here at University Park, we would like to have those live sessions again probably at the HUB. I do invite all of you. In fact, I urge all of you to attend an open enrollment session so that you can understand some of the mechanics of these plans. That would be my plug and then, certainly, if Denise has ever out of a job, I could bring her into benefits since she could be of great assistance to me.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Yes, you could. Kevin, I see your hand is raised. If you could ask a very quick question and we need to get on.

**Kevin Bowley, College of Earth and Mineral Science:** Just a quick question or maybe one last—

**Chair Szczygiel:** I'm sorry. Could you identify yourself and unit?

**Kevin Bowley:** Sorry about that. Bowley, EMS. Just a quick note within this as we're stepping forward on this. One thing that I've been hearing more and more from colleagues is not a bit two degree with our health plan, but very much so at the dental plan at least here at the University Park is that, we're seeing a scenario where we're locked into a single healthcare or dental care plan, and we're seeing that most providers locally are not updating into that plan anymore.

They're specifically not being covered by that plan to the degree that we expected them to, despite it being specific to your Campus or to our University. I would just encourage as we take our steps forward on this, to consider a fourth tenet of your plan to really focus on the importance of making sure that the plans are specifically covering multiple providers to our campuses.

**Jill Musser:** Thank you. Feedback well-taken. I appreciate that.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you. I see no other hands raised, so let's move on to a vote.

Anna, there it is. Thank you. We are ready to go. Thank you very much, Denise and Jill. Excellent report. Senators, you may cast your vote on TallySpace to accept the motion press A to reject B. When all of this is taking place, I just want to recognize the efforts of Denise, Jill, and the entire Faculty Benefits committee on its thorough report.

It represents a tremendous amount of work. A few years in the making, yet nonetheless challenging to produce. On behalf of the Senate, I really want to thank you to all of you for your excellent work in bringing this forward. Faculty Benefits has, once again, though one of our smaller standing committees, are proven to be a mighty one. Well done. We're going to move along to the next Item on our Agenda.

---

### POSITIONAL REPORTS - NONE

**Chair Szczygiel:** We have Item K, Positional Reports. There are none.

---

### INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

**Chair Szczygiel:** Item L, Informational Reports. Not "sigh," hold on, 14, six of which are web-only. First, I would like to have a little bit of change in our Agenda flow.

#### College of Medicine Budget Report – Appendix M

**Chair Szczygiel:** The first report is sponsored by the Senate Committee on University Planning and is titled, "College of Medicine Budget Report," found as Appendix M. Fifteen minutes have been allotted. It might not take that long. To introduce this report is Kurt Kissinger, Associate Vice President for Finance and Business and Controller of Penn State College of Medicine. Kurt, if you are with us, you have the floor.

**Kurt Kissinger, Associate Vice President for Finance and Business and Controller of Penn State College of Medicine:** Okay. Can you hear me all right?

**Chair Szczygiel:** Yes, we can.

**Kurt Kissinger:** All right. Thank you very much, Dr. Szczygiel. I do appreciate it. I'm going to go ahead and share my screen here.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Right.

**Kurt Kissinger:** Hopefully, you can see that.

**Chair Szczygiel:** We do.

**Kurt Kissinger:** In presentation mode. Let me go back one more. There we go. Again, thank you for the invitation to be with you here today. I'm in my office in Hershey today. I want to take an opportunity to give a little bit of an overview of the financial position of the College of Medicine. I've had the opportunity at the invitation of Dr. Strauss to present before the University Planning Committee.

As a pretext in giving this report, I just want to level set on the financial or budget model of the College of Medicine. We are actually considered a self-supporting unit here at the College of Medicine. What that means is we get no direct central allocation from the University Budget Office for our operations. Our greatest revenue source actually is the clinical margin support that we receive from Penn State Health, also known as the Academic Support Payment that I'll allude to here in a moment.

We are able to retain 100 percent of our indirect cost recovery or F&A. College of Medicine traditionally is responsible for self-funding its own capital and strategic investments. For these reasons, it's very critical how we manage our operating budget, but as well, our reserve balances. You should be able to see a slide now that provides a high-level financial overview of the unrestricted general fund activity going back to 2019.

This is just the overview of sources and uses over that timeframe. The surplus and deficit denotes the operating margin. This is the operating margin of the unrestricted general fund. The year-end cash reserve balance down here reflects the impact of the annual operating margin combined with annual capital expenditures and other fund transfers, which you do not see here, which is why they do not tie back.

But our capital expenditures typically range from \$19 million to \$26 million a year. The cash reserve balance or year-end over the period shown here is exclusive of what we call as the Regional Medical Campus Reserve. The College of Medicine, as you know, does operate a regional campus at University Park. There are funds that are restricted for use at that Regional Medical Campus.

The cash balance you see here, it does not reflect those available funds for use here in Hershey. When we do have negative operating margins, we do actually draw on our cash reserves. You can see in FY21, I call this out as I did to the committee previously, we had a budgeted operating margin of negative 32.7 million, quite a large balance. We were very fortunate, however, during that year to receive a higher than expected academic support payment by about 30 million, combined with some other one-time revenue that bolstered the operating margin and actually lead to a positive margin and to a net gain in our reserve balances.

For FY22, the year that we're in right now, we budgeted a smaller operating margin deficit compared to the prior year of 20 million. The information that you see here in terms of year-to-date is based on the six months through December. Just last week, I got the third-quarter data and didn't have time to include it in this report, but the general trend continues and that is that the College of Medicine is operating favorable to budget.

We're actually about eight million dollars favorable or ahead of budget and I'll give a little bit more detail here in a moment. When we speak about the College of Medicine's sources and revenue, they are somewhat unique. I wanted to just take a quick minute to highlight those major buckets of revenue and the trends within those major buckets over the last four years.

The academic support payment I alluded to earlier accounts historically for about 33 percent of the operating revenue for our unrestricted budget here at the College of Medicine. As I mentioned earlier, with the exception of a significant increase in '21, ever since the pandemic set in, in the fourth quarter of fiscal year '20, we've been on a somewhat downward trajectory.

I'll speak to that in a moment. Tuition and fees, you can see there are relatively stable. Again, in the spirit of affordability and accessibility, we take very seriously considerations as it pertains to any increase in our medical tuition here at the College of Medicine. Occupancy fees. These are fees that the college of Medicine collects from Penn State Health for being able to operate within the clinical spaces that are actually owned by the University here on the Penn State Hershey Campus.

You'll see the significant increase in FY20 that has to do with the fact that there was a separate obligated group status, we created the ability for Penn State Health to go to the capital markets for its own debt. We took over the improvements within the clinical spaces that are owned by the University here on the Hershey Campus and in return, we receive significant occupancy fees, so that explains the increase in occupancy fees in FY20, and that's been fairly stable since.

Here, you can see our indirect cost recovery, or FF, and either that we receive. In this last category, this auxiliary shared services and other revenues, about six or seven other specific revenue line items, they predominantly have to do with such things as revenue from continuing education or housing and auxiliary services here. We also provide services as the University to the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, the teaching hospital co-located here on our campus.

We do receive revenue for providing those services to the medical center. The major categories of expenditures here at the College of Medicine are laid out here. They're basically in three large buckets—are salary, wages, and fringe, and you can see the development there over the last several years, as well as non-labor operating expenditures.

Then, this last thing as I alluded to earlier, is the debt service payments. These are payments that the College of Medicine makes to the University as a result of making debt-financed improvements to the clinical spaces here within the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center. Actually, as part of the rent that we receive, we turn over a portion of that rent to pay down debt that was taken out in order to make those improvements in the clinical spaces.

We have as part of the rent what I would term “unencumbered rent,” that is rent that's free and clear for the College of Medicine to use to help fund operations. Those are our main categories of debt. The academic support payment, as I mentioned earlier, represents the clinical margin support that we get from Penn State Health. So I wanted to take a minute to explain what that is, how that's been trending, and why that's so critical to the College of Medicine unrestricted general fund budget.

I'm going to start over here to the left, this dark blue line. Before 2019, there was a previous formula that basically showed how much we would receive at the College of Medicine of the clinical margin. That formula was based simply on the financial performance of one hospital within the Penn State Health System and that is the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center of the Quaternary, Tertiary, Academic Medical Center or Teaching Hospital here on our campus.

In 2019, we actually changed the formula and made it system-wide to incorporate all elements in financial performance of Penn State Health across the entire system. That's inclusive of other hospitals that Penn State Health owns such as St. Joseph's in Reading, as well as the projected revenue associated

with the two new hospitals that Penn State Health is building, one in Cumberland County in Mechanicsburg and the other in Lancaster, as well as the growth of community medical sites across the South Central Pennsylvania Primary Market.

That was done in order for the College of Medicine to benefit from a growing net patient services revenue stream into the health system and the margin performance of the system and not be dependent on just the Academic Medical Center. The red line here represents the projection of what the academic support payment to the College of Medicine would look like, modeled out and that was all pre-pandemic. Post-pandemic, with the new formula, actually with the new formula has nothing to do with a pandemic.

There are two academic support payment calculations. One is this dashed line, this is the academic support payment, when you flush the metrics through the formula and then you take that value and you apply it against two caps of the formula. Those caps are in place as the term implies, to cap the amount of academic support payment that flows from the health system over to the College of Medicine, in the event that the health system is experiencing a lower than expected margin or financial performance.

When you apply these projected values of the academic support payment against those caps, you may actually get a lower academic support payment and that's exactly where we've been in FY20, FY21, and FY22 in this current pandemic period. As you can see, these three budgeted amounts of the academic support payment are very significantly below the original projections pre-pandemic.

Now, fortunately, in FY20, the Penn State Health Board of Directors made a dividend payment to make up some of that delta that we otherwise would have experienced. In FY21, because of some infusion of Cares Act Funding for health systems and hospitals across the nation, Penn State Health did have a better than expected margin that was planned.

We actually did receive an academic support payment that was higher than both the cap and the uncapped amount. For FY22, the fiscal year currently, we're back at the capped amount of 53.2. But over time as we recover from the pandemic volumes increase at the hospitals and community medical practices across the health system and net patient services revenue recovers, and Penn State Health fully implements its growth strategy here in the South Central Pennsylvania Market.

It is anticipated that the academic support payment will increase over the next three years and by FY25, meet back to that original projection. That's in part the challenge that we've had to negotiate over the past two, three years. As Provost Jones mentioned earlier in his conversation, we're fortunate that the College of Medicine had over the prior decade built up significant reserves so that we've been able to maintain core mission, activity, and support by tapping into those reserves while also maintaining investments in some of our capital needs here at the College of Medicine.

Is it as much as I would like? Certainly not, but we've been able to continue executing on all of our commitments made to faculty and department chairs who've been recruited to the College of Medicine and that's been part and parcel of how we've been managing through the short term impacts associated with COVID and the Academic Support Payment.

The good news is next year we do anticipate a higher than current budgeted Academic Support Payment as it slowly recovers, which should and will lead to a lower draw against the reserves of the College of Medicine. In spite of all of these short-term impacts to the operating margin, we continue to invest in the long term for the College of Medicine. As you can see, we've started investing in a new Central Animal

Quarters in ABSL-3 space here at the College of Medicine, that work has started. That 4.3 million is being funded out of our cash reserves.

The next two projects will be going to the Board of Trustees later this fall in September. They represent significant investments in the research as well as education investments and those will be debt-financed and we continue to make investments in our strategic plan most pointedly, in increasing the amount of funding that we provide to the Penn State Cancer Institute as the University cooperatively with the College of Medicine in Penn State Health seeks to gain National Cancer Institute Designation for the Penn State Cancer Institute.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Kurt, very much. It has been an interesting report and I can't believe you are able to sum it up in 15 minutes. I'm excited it could be done, but you did it. Are there any questions for Kurt on the College of Medicine budget? I see none in the room and I see none on the floor. Thank you, Kurt, very much.

**Kurt Kissinger:** Thank you.

**Chair Szczygiel:** I appreciate you visiting the Senate and giving us some of your time.

**Kurt Kissinger:** My pleasure.

#### **PSU COVID Financial Impact – Appendix L**

**Chair Szczygiel:** We have another report sponsored by the Senate Committee on University Planning. The title of the report is “PSU COVID Financial Impact” and it's found at Appendix L. Here to introduce this report, is Associate Vice President for Budget, University Budget Officer. Mary Lou Ortiz. Mary Lou, are you onboard? Brevity would be great, Mary Lou.

**Mary Lou Ortiz, Associate Vice President for Budget and University Budget Officer:** I was not able to unmute myself for a moment there.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Great. We got you now, that's great.

**Mary Lou Ortiz:** Yeah, I'm still working. Let me see if I can share the presentation. Just give me a second. Can you see that in presentation mode?

**Chair Szczygiel:** Yes, we can.

**Mary Lou Ortiz:** Great. Thank you everybody for allowing me to come talk to you about the financial impact of COVID-19 at Penn State. I think you all know that it has been significant over the past couple of years. When Jim Strauss asked for a report on it, we wanted to make sure that I was able to cover the amount of the financial impact as well as the funding that we received to help mitigate the losses that we experience at the University.

I know you've seen some articles about it. This information is up-to-date as of December 2021. There are still continuing financial impacts that have been absorbed by the University even through this spring term, which we'll update after the close of this fiscal year. But, I wanted to pick a good point in time in which to focus. From March 2020 through December of 2021, the University experienced close of \$471 million in either revenue losses or incremental expenses related to the pandemic.

If you look at the pie chart that's up on the screen, all of the slices that are on the left and top part of the pie are related to our estimates of revenue losses at the University. They're—are broken down into the

various areas at the University that experiences losses. Those include the impact on tuition revenue because our enrollments went down starting in Fall 2020.

Something that we're still experiencing at the University as that wave of students who entered in Fall 2020 continue to move their way through their degree programs. That cohort is smaller than other entering classes that we have had at the University. On the top, left-hand side of that pie are the losses that were incurred by Intercollegiate Athletics. On the bottom left are the losses that were experienced by Auxiliary and Business Services.

You can see they had the biggest losses, but if you realize that that includes housing, food services, the hotels, the airports, quite a lot of areas then it probably will be less surprising to you that the University experience losses in all of those areas. Those were really the areas where you needed to implement some of the layoffs or furloughs of staff because we simply did not have students in our dorms or using our dining halls or hotel use, either they're suspended altogether or drop significantly during that time.

On the right-hand side, the two blue slices are related to incremental expenses. As you can see, COVID testing is a substantial cost to the University close to 48 million through the end of December. I do expect that to increase by a fairly substantial amount. If you think about the timing of when we reported on these expenses, this was before we did all of the testing for the Spring 2022 term.

Also, when you are seeing some of the impacts of the omicron variant on our testing services at the University. There will be a bump up due to that when we do another report and update on the activities that have taken place that are related to COVID. Then, the other expenses that are covered on this pie chart, are purchases of personal protective equipment and other things like computers that we invested in in order for our students to have devices when they were taking classes remotely.

Individual units, such as the libraries, purchasing more e-books again for remote access and expenses like that, that the query either at the central or unit-based level. On all no more than \$74 million, as you can imagine, is quite an impact on the budget. Keep in mind, this is against a budget of roughly \$7 billion. It has been a significant effect as institutionally.

We are fortunate that we received this substantial amount of funding from the University, not enough to cover all the losses that we incurred. But there were funds that were made available to the University, particularly through the Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund, which I'll go into in a little more detail later. But those are not the only funds that were made available to the University.

We did receive smaller amounts of funding related to the airport, daycare, Public Radio, some funding from founding and local sources. All in all, about \$302 million in funding with most of that coming from the federal relief funds. We talk a lot about the federal dollars as if it were one big bucket of money and they are all related funds, but they were awarded at different points in time.

All in all, the federal government had re-rounds of awards that they made to higher education institution all under the bucket of Higher Education Emergency Relief funds. The first round of funding was awarded through the Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Security or Cares Act. That was awarded back in Spring of 2021. We nicknamed it "HEERF 1" just make it a little easier for us to track.

The second round of funding came through a supplemental act, HEERF 2 or CRRSAA, you might have heard it called and that was the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act. The third round of funding that we received was HEERF 3 or the Americans Rescue Plan Act. They all have

different names obviously, but you can think of them as roughly fungible types of awards because most of the requirements around them were the same for all three tranches of funding that we receive.

Penn State was one of the institutions that receive a fairly hefty amount of funding when compared to other higher education funds. With HEERF 1, we received \$55 million in funding. Half of it was to provide aid to students. The other half was for institutional support. For that, we were allowed to either claim those funds for revenue losses that the University experience or incremental expenses related to COVID.

Because the housing and food service operations experience losses as early as Spring 2020, the decision was made that the \$27.5 million dollars for institutional support would be applied to the losses that were incurred in housing and food services. To just give you a sense of the scale of it, they lost about \$42 million in refunds that were issued to students who were sent home in the middle of the Spring 2020 term.

Because they were not living on campus anymore, we felt obligated to issue a refund for both housing and dining plans. For HEERF 2, all of the awards are split between student aid and institutional support. About two-thirds were allocated for institutional support and for that amount of funding you use that to help offset tuition losses related to our enrollment decline, as well as funding for additional revenue losses on Auxiliary Business Services.

We also use the portion of the funding to help cover the COVID cost incurred by the University. I'll just remind you that was by close to \$50 million in incremental expenses that the University incurred. Then finally with HEERF 3, again, that was split between Student Aid and institutional support. We applied some of those funds for additional losses and Auxiliary Business Services and housing and food services.

Another round of funding related to enrollment offices. We also use the portion of the institutional support funds for student debt relief, which we were not required to do, but we felt that would be helpful, beneficial for students to have some of the student debt cleared in addition to the aid that they receive. All in all, when you look at the three rounds of funding, that was \$291- of the \$310 million that I mentioned on the earlier page.

This is another way of looking at how we allocated the funding for HEERF, the institutional portion of it. It ended up being roughly 60 percent going to auxiliaries for lost revenues and the remaining 40 percent allocated to the educational and general budget for revenue losses or incremental expenses related to COVID testing.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Mary Lou. I think we've gone a little bit over time for this report. I don't mean to wrap up for you, are we almost there?

**Mary Lou Ortiz:** Yes. This is the last slide. I just wanted to say there was a gap between the financial impact for COVID and how we needed to fund it. We had to draw down on university reserves either in the auxiliaries or in the E&G budget to cover those expenses that could not be covered by the Federal or State Aid that we receive. I know it was made available to all of you, so I'm happy to answer questions at this time or even the other events.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Mary Lou. This is such an important report and sadly, it is coming at the end of what has already been a long meeting but we have this report on our website. Folks, this is the financial information that has been pressing on many of our minds and here it is in report form for you to



digest. I would hope that you all take advantage of that. We still have a very keen interest in getting JCUB, the Joint Committee on University Budget up and running.

It struggled this first year. We still have people who like Rose are willing and anxious to get it going again. With any luck, we'll find ways to discuss the University budget not in huge increments in one presentation, but rather throughout the year so that we can all keep up to speed with what is going on. Having said that, are there any questions for Mary Lou? Yes, Julio. Question. Microphone.

**Julio Palma Anda:** I am just confused. Just a quick question in slide Number 5, where there is the HEERF 1, HEERF 2, HEERF 3, and then for the first one to 71k for the Commonwealth Campuses, am I the only one who thinks this is pretty low? And then the asterisks, "additional," but then the asterisks say "direct funds" to the Commonwealth Campuses are not available for here. What happened to the "one University, geographically dispersed?"

**Mary Lou Ortiz:** Before we reported as one University on many of our reports, we used to report the campuses separately in some of our IPEDS reporting and because of that, we qualified for funding that was specific to campuses that served rural, or I think, high levels of underrepresented students. We did not qualify to receive that funding under HEERF 3. That's why you're able to apply for two types of for Funding under HEERF 1 and HEERF 2, but not for HEERF 3.

The larger amounts, and the much more significant amounts, was the multi-millions of dollars of funding which were used to offset costs for the entire University, including the campuses. It's just that there was a little bit of increment from funding that went directly to specific campuses, not all campuses, but specific campuses. Does that help clarify?

**Chair Szczygiel:** He's giving you a thumbs-up.

**Mary Lou Ortiz:** Okay. I can't see him on here.

**Chair Szczygiel:** I know. We do have one last question. Doug, you want to identify yourselves?

**Doug Wolfe, College of Engineering:** All right. Doug, College of Engineering. Maybe you had mentioned this, but could you repeat how much we have left in reserves?

**Mary Lou Ortiz:** I don't think I said that we had a certain amount left in reserves. We had to dip into reserves for the amount of about I think it was \$100 million. We try and have a level of reserves that is essentially the Science of Arts and State Appropriation, so in the \$250- with \$300 million in case we lose that funding and also as a cushion for any unforeseen expenses in the budget and so that's the unforeseen circumstance that we have the contingency available. It's a large dollar amount, but a relatively small portion of our operating budget.

**Doug Wolfe:** For clarity, if is it typical appropriation is about \$300- from the state and we've dipped into it \$100 million, we have about 200 million left? Is that the first statement?

**Mary Lou Ortiz:** Roughly, there's other things that drive it up and down.

**Doug Wolfe:** Thank you.

**Mary Lou Ortiz:** But we're trying to bring our reserves back up because we continue to see enrollments impacts related to COVID that doesn't allow us to find as much reserves as we would typically like to do.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Doug, was that good for you?

**Doug Wolfe:** Yes.

**Chair Szczygiel:** All right. Thank you. Mary Lou, thank you again and everyone, please avail yourself of this great information on the Senate website.

**Mary Lou Ortiz:** All right. Thanks, everybody.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you. Appreciate it. We are just, for everyone's identification, we are receiving a couple of requests to move the reports to web-only. We still have a few more, so let's just hang in here together, shall we and we'll get through them. The next two reports from the Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid were submitted as web-only reports.

### **\*2021 Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program – Appendix N**

#### **\*Annual Report on High School Students Enrolled Nondegree In Credit Courses – Appendix O**

**Chair Szczygiel:** The report's titled "2021 Annual Report on Reserved Spaces," and Kat can tell you Line Inverse whatever Reserved Space is all about. Not now though, but if you want to have a drink with her afterwards, she will tell you, and the second report, "Annual Report on High School Students Enrolled Nondegree In Credit Courses." The first can be found in Appendix N, the second in Appendix O. Please visit the website to read those, and thank you, Kat, for submitting those.

#### **\*Summary of Petitions by College 2020-2021 – Appendix P**

**Chair Szczygiel:** The next report is from the Senate Committee on Education. It was also submitted as a web-only report, titled, "Summary of Petitions by College 2020-2021," and Appendix P.

#### **Faculty Tenure Flow Annual Report – March 2022 – Appendix Q**

**Chair Szczygiel:** The following report is from the Senate Committees on Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations comes the "Faculty Tenure Flow Annual Report – March 2022." It is found in your Appendix Q. That has been moved to not web-only and it is right here. Okay. Next one. Couldn't stop him if I tried.

**Josh Wede, College of the Liberal Arts:** I'll just turn it over and thank you to Kathy, Faculty Affairs, for putting this together and also [INAUDIBLE].

**Kathy Bieschke:** I don't think so. I wanted to just take a few minutes to highlight a few things about this report because it's a little different than previous Annual Tenure Flow Reports. The Annual Tenure Flow Report follows a cohort. We're looking at the cohort for 2014. Something we did different this year than we've done in previous years for this report is look at how stays of the tenure clock for a variety of reasons as per policy, having a baby, somebody getting impacted achievement of tenure.

This year it was interesting because this cohort could also take the COVID extension. We had a 54 percent tenure achievement rate of the 138 women and men who started on the tenure track. By the time we got to the 70, 30 of those people had taken tenure. I keep saying women because the vast majority of people who take stays are women. My important point here is that a lot of people are taking stays and I think that's a good thing, and I think people should know that it's okay to take a stay if you need to a stay of tenure.

About a fourth of our cohort took a stay of tenure. Then on top of that, about 26 of that cohort, so we're in their 7th year, 26 were eligible to take the extension for COVID, and 15 took the extension. Our tenure

achievement rate of 54 percent, which is in line with what you would typically see on the low-end, is likely going to go up quite a bit next year because we have 18 people who are still in the tenure flow.

In previous years, the seven-year clock worked because we didn't have that extra stay and very few people take two stays, only seven took two stays, but it's also okay to take two stays if you need two stays. I wanted to make that point as well. We expect that we will have a much higher tenure achievement rate for this cohort and we will start to report that in tenure flow rates to come.

Women disproportionately took the extension right before COVID, and it makes a lot of sense, and we had no idea to decide in March whether you're going to take it March or April. I bet everybody thought, I don't know if I'm going to be able to pull this off, so they took it. We don't know if that gender difference will persist, but we continue to monitor the data and we'll have an extension monitoring report for you at some point.

That's really all I wanted to say. There are data about race and ethnicity in the report. The numbers are so small that if I start down that path, I will be here for another 10 minutes and I don't think anybody wants that. But still, it's worth reading if you haven't seen the report. I think the report this year is really interesting. Not that it isn't always interesting, but this year is particularly interesting.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Kathy.

**Kathy Bieschke:** I'm happy to talk all day long.

**Julie Gallagher:** She is. I'm sorry, I've realized we're all both deeply committed to these issues and profoundly exhausted, so I apologize for even raising anything—Gallagher, Brandywine. I just want to ask that the mechanisms for keeping track of the consequences of this stays, while it's a really wonderful opportunity because clearly, people's lives needed it, we know the implications are salary differentials over long haul, and I think we need to figure out how we manage that.

**Kathy Bieschke:** If you have ideas about how to do that in the context of everything else that was discussed today I'm very open.

**Julie Gallagher:** I know. I just want us to keep it as part of our

**Kathy Bieschke:** We're well aware there is a salary.

**Julie Gallagher:** I know you do, I just want us to all collectively think about it.

**Kathy Bieschke:** Yeah.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Thank you, Julie. Any other questions online or in the room? I'm going to repeat that. Kathy invited you to email her. It's always good. Kathy, thank you very much. It's actually a delight to have you up in front and behind that microphone. That was a treat. Thank you.

### **Earning Tenure During COVID – Appendix R**

**Chair Szczygiel:** Next is our report from the Senate Committees on Faculty Affairs, Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity and EECE comes the report, “Earning Tenure during COVID,” that has been moved to a web-only. It's another interesting report that is available. Thank you all.

## **Non-tenure-line Promotion Flow Report, 2020-2021 – Appendix S**

**Chair Szczygiel:** Next coming from the Senate Committee on Intra-University Relations and Faculty Affairs comes the “Non-tenure-line Promotion Flow Report, 2020-2021,” found in Appendix S. With us is Michelle Duffey, Chair of the Intra-University Relations Committee.

**Michele Duffey, College of Health and Human Development:** Like Josh just did, I'm going to quickly toss it over to Abby Diehl. Hardy, thank you to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Dr. Bieschke, and Abby for putting together a really nice report for us this year. Thank you, to Abby.

**Abby Diehl, Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs:** Thanks so much, Michele. I want to, in turn, thank OPAIR for their fabulous collaboration and partnership. In particular, Karen Vance and Michele Stine for their collaboration on this report. I'm also going to be very brief. You can see the report. I'll shorten my remarks significantly. On the whole, the data are roughly equivalent across the University Park and the Campuses.

I do want to point out that we have a new data point this year. We gather data on time spent in the previous rank before promotion, which I think is helpful to see how long faculty are spending in their rank before they're being promoted. The data show that most faculty receive a promotion, 96 percent for this report. Everyone receives a salary increase that is separate from the general salary increase.

The mean salary increase was 7.7 percent at University Park and 7.2 percent at the Campuses, and the median was eight percent for both. On average, contract lengths increased after the promotion across all campuses, 85 percent of those promoted received a multi-year contract. With regard to time in previous rank, it appears that some people are going up for promotion early.

AC21 recommends at least five years in the first rank before consideration for promotion to the second rank, and there's no fixed time period for promotion to the third rank. It appears that some people are going up early for promotion, but the raw data show that most who were promoted before five years were promoted at four years, so not significantly early. I'll just pause there and see if there are any questions. Again, you can see the full report.

**Chair Szczygiel:** I see no questions from the room. Anyone from Zoom? No. I don't see any action here at all. Thank you very much, Abby. I appreciate your stepping in and your sensitivity to the time of it. Again, these are great reports and I regret that we are running out of time. Thank you, Abby and Michele.

## **Role of Sustainability in Penn State Global – Appendix T**

**Chair Szczygiel:** The next report from the Senate Committee on Global Programs comes the report, “Role of Sustainability in Penn State Global,” found in Appendix T.

This is a really cool report, just from my own perspective. But it has been moved now to web-only, please. Maybe there's a chance for Mathias. I have a note that you had moved. I guess your colleague did not. I've never seen anyone scarred so fast away from the microphone. Thanks. I'm sorry, Susan. No problem, she's good.

## **\*Commonwealth Campuses Research Programs – Appendix U**

**Chair Szczygiel:** The next report from the Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity is “Commonwealth Campuses Research Programs,” found in Appendix U. This report is a web-only posting and will not have a presentation.

**Report on Fall 2020 – Academic Unit Visits – Appendix W**

**Report on Spring 2021 – Academic Unit Visits – Appendix V**

**Chair Szczygiel:** The next two reports are from Senate Council. These are Appendices W and V, and while Lisa just twisted my arm, could she pretty please present these? Not today. These reports have also been moved.

**\*Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2022-2023 – Appendix X**

**\*Report of Senate Elections – Appendix Y**

**Chair Szczygiel:** These are the reports of the Senate Office visits in the fall of 2020 and the University Park Colleges in Spring of 2021. They have been moved to the web-only as well. Our last two reports from the Elections Commission are web-only and report results from the recent elections. Over to you, Erin. These will be the reports of the roster of Senate by your voting units and I'm assuming that will just be online as well. What we will be reading are the results from the recent Senate Elections.

[LAUGHTER] What were you going to read to us?

**Erin Eckley, Senate Office Staff:** I was going to read I forgot about the two reports. They were already on the web

**Chair Szczygiel:** Do we need to see the election results? You got him. Congratulations Josh and Michele, we're going to see you down here pretty soon, and to everyone else. Hey Erin, let's take a look at our earlier votes, shall we?

**Erin Eckley:** [inaudible].

**Chair Szczygiel:** Louder.

**Erin Eckley:** [inaudible].

**Chair Szczygiel:** Yeah. No wonder you're—

**Erin Eckley:** All right. Can you hear me now?

**Chair Szczygiel:** No. Could you just use this?

**Erin Eckley:** How about now? All right. I probably didn't have it on right or some such nonsense. Okay. Let me start over. Revision to Policy 48-40 "Deferred Grades—Clarifying Language", Appendix C, passed with 142 Accepts and 2 Rejects. "Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure Section 6(c) – Addition of DEI to Curricular Affairs," Appendix G, passed with 129 Accepts and 6 Rejects. The motion to Accept the new language to propose preamble.

We know this passed 118 to 20, and then the "Proposed Preamble," Appendix H passed with 129 Accepts and 6 Rejects. "Rescind Policy 44-40: Proctoring of Examinations," Appendix I, passed with 115 Accepts and 13 Rejects. "Revision to Standing Rules, Article II – Senate Committee Structure, Section 6(h) – Committee on Global Programs," Appendix J, passed with 121 Accepts and 1 Reject. "Guiding Principles for the Design of Health Care Plans," Appendix K, passed with 103 Accepts and 3 Rejects.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Excellent. Thank you very much, Erin and Anna. Comments by the Outgoing Chair, That would be me. I will forget it. I'm not making any comments other than this has been an absolute,

unique and a treasured moment in my professional life. It has been a pleasure working with you all. It's been an extraordinary experience. I suggest you all think about running for Chair in the future. Then take your vitamins.

The seating of New Officers so much more important now is the time to seek the new officers. Could we have Shelli Stine, please come down as our new Chair-Elect and take Kim's seat. Sorry, Kim. Kim, would you please come stand by me? I don't bite. Josh Wede, if you would please come down and take Lisa Mangel's. We all are cozy here.

Kim, I am pleased to present you with your very own gavel. Your name is on it and everything. Everyone, please join me in welcoming our brand new Chair. I'm sorry. I suggested we might skip this part. But she says no. Kim, I just wanted to provide you a little token of—this is her gift. This is my gift to her. What does that say?

**Kimberly Blockett, Chair-Elect:** Thank you.

**Chair Szczygiel:** Is it a mug?

**Kimberly Blockett:** It's a mug.

**Chair Szczygiel:** This is pretty damn well wrapped. Yes, it is a very special mug. From our travels together. Yes, in many meaningful moments. So I'm going to keep this to myself right now. All right, thank you very much. That one too. At this moment, I am going to turn this meeting over to your new Chair. Kim.

**Chair Kimberly Blockett:** Well, this has been a year. This fully hybrid meeting, is Senate's first, I believe fully hybrid meeting is a perfect example of the many challenges with both technology and transparency, the controversies, the hard work, and the precious moments of spontaneous humor. I want to thank our venerable Chair Bonj. I've learned so much from you. I've been so very well-supported by Beth, Lisa, Keith, and all the Committee Chairs.

And under Bonj's stewardship, the Senate, in partnership with administrators across the University has done an incredible amount of really important work this year that will make a very tangible difference for the Penn State community. Looking forward, I'm very excited to welcome our new officers, Shelli Stine and Josh Wede, congratulations. I'll end by saying that I'm so proud of all of us, all of our service to our colleagues.

I'm proud of our students, both those being recognized by the Senate earlier and those who care enough about their faculty to protest. Working to strengthen shared governance and academic freedom is not easy or comfortable work. Sometimes we make brilliant advances and sometimes we get it wrong. But we are in this deeply and devotedly. On with the Agenda, which is...? I lost it.

---

## NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS - NONE

**Chair Blockett:** Next Business, something or another.

---

## **COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY**

**Chair Blockett:** Are there any additional Comments for the Good of the University? No comments. Great.

---

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**Chair Blockett:** May I have a motion to adjourn? Yes. Adjourn. If matters arise during the summer, a tentative meeting has been scheduled for Tuesday, July 12th. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, September 13th, 2022 at 1:30. Have a great end of semester, everyone.

---

The following Senators were noted as having attended the 4/26/2022 Senate Meeting.

- Acharya, Vinita
- Adu, Kofi
- Alexander, Chandran
- Amador Medina, Melba
- Aurand Jr., Harold
- Ax-Fultz, Laura
- Baka, Jennifer
- Bansal, Saurabh
- Bartolacci, Michael
- Belanger, Joanna
- Berish, Diane
- Bieschke, Kathy
- Bird, Douglas
- Birungi, Patricia
- Bishop-Pierce, Renee
- Blakney, Terry
- Blockett, Kimberly
- Blood, Ingrid
- Borromeo, Renee
- Bowley, Kevin
- Braman, Valerie
- Brown, Nathaniel
- Browne, Stephen
- Brunsden, Victor
- Byrne, Eli Christopher
- Calore, Gary
- Chen, Wei-Fan
- Cohen, Stephen
- Costanzo, Denise
- Davis, Dwight
- Davis, Felecia
- Demirci, Ali
- Dube, Sibusiwe
- Duffey, Michele
- Eckhardt, Caroline
- Egolf, Roger



- Engel, Renata
- Fairbank, James
- Fanburg-Smith, Julie
- Farnan, Kaitlin
- Fausnight, Tracy
- Findley, Samuel
- Frederick, Samuel
- Fredricks, Susan
- Freiberg, Andrew
- Frisch, Paul
- Fuller, Edward
- Furfaro, Joyce
- Gallagher, Julie
- Gaudelius, Yvonne
- Glantz, Edward
- Goin, Campbell
- Graham, Joshua
- Griffin, Christopher
- Grimes, Galen
- Gross, Charlene
- Grozinger, Christina
- Guadagnino, Frank
- Haddad, Owen
- Hanses, Mathias
- Hardin, Marie
- Hardy, Melissa
- Hauck, Randy
- Hayford, Harold
- Hemerly, Nathan
- Higgins, Jeanmarie
- Holden, Lisa
- Huang, Tai-Yin
- Hufnagel, Pamela
- Iliev, Peter
- Jett, Dennis
- Jolly, Rosemary
- Jones, Nicholas

- Jordan, Matthew
- Joseph, Rhoda
- Kass, Lawrence
- Kass, Rena
- Kennedy-Phillips, Lance
- Kenyon, William
- Kim, Agnes
- King, Beth
- Kitko, Lisa
- Kramer, Lauren
- Kubat, Robert
- Lang, Dena
- Larson, Allen
- Le, Binh
- Lear, Matt
- Ledford, Savanna
- Linch, Amy
- Linn, Suzanna
- Love, Jeff
- Mahoney, Joseph
- Malysz, Jozef
- Mangel, Lisa
- Marko, Frantisek
- Mathews, Jonathan
- Maximova, Siela
- McCoy, Heather
- McKinney Marvasti, Karyn
- Melton, Robert
- Messner, John
- Mets, Berend
- Michels, Margaret
- Mocioiu, Irina
- Mookerjee, Rajen
- Moore, Jacob
- Mulder, Kathleen
- Najjar Jr., Raymond
- Nesbitt, Jennifer

- Novotny, Eric
- Nurkhaidarov, Ermek
- Ofosu, Willie
- Ozment, Judith
- Page Jr., 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
- Purdy Drew, Kirstin
- Rhen, Linda
- Riccomini, Paul
- Robertson, Noah
- Robicheaux, Timothy
- Robinson, Brandi
- Roy, Matthew
- Ruggiero, Francesca
- Saltz, Ira
- Saunders, Brian
- Seymour, Elizabeth
- Shannon, Robert
- Shapiro, Keith
- Sharma, Amit
- Shea, Maura
- Shearer, Gregory
- Shen, Wen
- Shurgalla, Richard
- Siegel, Sue
- Signorella, Margaret
- Simmons, Cynthia

- 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
- Subramanian, Rajarajan
- Swallow, Nicole
- Szczygiel, Bonj
- Tallman, Nathan
- Tavangarian, Fariborz
- Taylor, Ann
- Thomas, Emily
- Tyworth, Michael
- Vrana, Kent
- Vujan McCloskey, Andrea
- Wang, Ping
- Warner, Alfred
- Watts, Alison
- Wede, Joshua
- Whitcomb, Tiffany
- Williams, Mary
- Williams, Nicole
- Wolfe, Douglas
- Wong, Jeffrey
- Yagnik, Arpan
- Yen, John
- Zorn, Christopher

<b>Elected</b>	<b>162</b>
<b>Students</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Ex Officio</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Appointed</b>	<b>5</b>

**Total            181**

