

Penn State Berks Senate
Monday, November 13, 2017
12:15-1:15 PM
Room 5, Luerssen Building
Agenda

- **Call to Order**
- **Additions, Corrections, and Approval of the Minutes of the October 9, 2017 meeting**
- **Announcements and Reports by the Chair**
- **Motions from Committees**
 - Academic Affairs Committee Legislative Report on Academic Integrity Policies, October, 2017 (**Appendix A**)
 - Faculty Affairs Committee Legislative Report on SRTE Use Best Practices, November, 2017 (**Appendix B**)
 - Faculty Affairs Committee Advisory Report “Engaged Scholarship Report,” November, 2017 (**Appendix C**)
- **Informational Reports**
 - Academic Affairs Committee, “Progress Report on Hybrid Classes Issue,” November 6, 2017 (**Appendix D**)
 - Physical Facilities Committee, Charge 1 Report, Fall 2017 (**Appendix E**)
 - Physical Facilities Committee Minutes, October 31, 2017 (**Appendix F**)
 - Intercollegiate Athletics Committee Minutes, October, 2017 (**Appendix G**)
 - Strategic Planning and Budget Committee Minutes, September 26, 2017 (**Appendix H**)
 - Strategic Planning and Budget Committee Minutes, November 6, 2017 (**Appendix I**)
- **Reports of Officers and University Senators**
 - Vice Chair Infantolino
 - Secretary and University Senator Zambanini
 - Senator Ansari
 - Senator Bartolacci
 - Senator Mauer
 - Senator Snyder
 - SGA President Ryan Morris
 - Student Senator
- **Comments/Announcements by Administrators**
 - Chancellor Hillkirk
 - Associate Dean Esqueda
- **Unfinished Business**
- **New Legislative Business**
- **Forensic Business**
- **Comments for the Good of the Order**
- **Adjournment**

Penn State Berks Senate
October 9, 2017
12:15-1:15 PM, Luerssen Building, Room 5

Attendees: Mohamad Ansari, Mike Bartolacci, Tara Beecham, Catherine Catanach, Donna Chambers, Justin DiAngelo, Azar Eslam Panah, Hassan Gourama, Nathan Greenauer, Jinyoung Im, Ben Infantolino, Samantha Kavky, Mahsa Kazempour, Joseph Mahoney, Cesar Martinez-Garza, Clifford Maurer, Jennifer McDougal, Pauline Milwood, Tami Mysliwiec, Shannon Nowotarski, Meghan Owenz, Jayne Park-Martinez, JoAnne Pumariega, Michele Ramsey, Matt Rhudy, David Sanford, Jennifer Sciple, Stephen Snyder, Yuan Xue, Bob Zambanini (Faculty); Marie Smith (Staff); Pradip Bandyopadhyay, David Bender, Kim Berry, Paul Esqueda, Lisa Glass, Keith Hillkirk, Michelle Mart, (Administration); Katherine Cinesi, Ryan Morris, Tom Rigg, Tyler Wactley (Students).

1. Call to Order

- 2. Additions, Corrections, and Approval of Minutes of the September 18, 2017** – Chair Mart called for corrections, additions to the minutes; one small typo was brought to the Secretary's attention and will be corrected for the record. A motion was called to approve the minutes and was seconded; *the minutes were approved.*

- 3. Announcements and Reports by the Chair** – Last month, there were a couple of requests made from faculty about commencement times with regard to the May ceremony and when each division is scheduled to process. The request was for each division to alternate which ceremony they would participate in going forward (morning vs. afternoon). This topic was discussed at the Executive Committee and both the Chancellor and Senior Associate Dean were in agreement to endorse this new practice with one exception: should there be a significant changes to the number of potential graduates in the future, adjustments will need to be made. Currently, the number of potential graduates for the morning ceremony balances to the number of potential graduates for the afternoon ceremony.

It was also noted that that today's meeting was in close proximity to the previous meeting; this occasion is the only time this year where this will occur. Chair Mart then turned the floor over to Kim Berry, Chief Operating Officer to provide an update to an announcement made earlier with regard to the closure of the Thun Library.

Kim reported approximately a week and a half ago, two boxes that were stored in the archive room showed evidence of mold. They were removed, cleaned and mitigated to the archive room, which is a window-less room, and the problem was thought to be resolved. Last Thursday, the staff in the library identified books located in the stack area that again showed evidence of mold. A number of adjustments were made in the cooling system as well as brought in dehumidification units, and on Friday, the mold had spread to a wider area. It is contained within the stacks but it had grown. A decision was made late Friday that we would close the library and we called in a restoration service company to assess the problem. The assessment made from over the weekend appears that the mold has stopped growing. We have a consultant from the library facilities coming later today who will shed more light with regard to recommendations and the timeframe to accomplish the cleanup. Additional information will be shared as it becomes available. Senior Associate Dean Esqueda shared the staff from the Center for Learning Teaching who were housed in the library will be working out of Gaige, room 311 and others from home.

4. **Motions from Committees**

- **Revisions to the Penn State Berks Senate Constitution and Bylaws, Executive Committee (Appendix A)** – Chair Mart called to everyone’s attention the changes that were made and shared that these were not changes we initiated. There is a committee at University Park called the Unit Constitution Sub-Committee of the Senate Council, and they periodically review constitutions’ at the various campuses. Berks was reviewed recently and it was decided there were some ambiguities within the Berks constitution and recommendations made for additional changes/clarifications. All changes were reviewed; rationale provided. Chair Mart called for any additional comments; hearing none, the motion was called to a vote; *the motion was approved.*

5. **Informational Reports**

- **Priorities/Actions for Academic Integrity Policies, Academic Affairs Committee (handout)** – Chair Gourama provided an overview of the report and indicated during the last ten years, fourteen strategies were developed with the hope to better promote academic integrity within the college and reduce the number of academic integrity violations. The committee prioritized and came up with the top four priorities, which the committee recommends for implementation and are outlined on the report. The last four items on the report are already in existence. The recommendation is to reinforce these policies and make sure that they are being delivered in a consistent way and on a continuous basis. A concern was raised that many faculty currently do not know the process of reporting academic integrity violations and also to the difficulty currently in place with regard to filing an academic integrity violation. A suggestion was made that perhaps streamlining or improvement of academic integrity website would be beneficial. Chair Gourama stated this is why they are recommending yearly training for both full and part-time faculty. Additional questions/concerns, suggestions raised. Chair Gourama indicated we want the focus on preventive techniques, training, as a starting point and for any additional suggestions presented to focus on the policy, not procedure. Chair Mart suggested if anyone has any concrete policy suggestions to forward them on to Chair Gourama.
- **Recommendations for SRTE Use, Faculty Affairs Committee (handout)** – Chair Infantolino provided an overview; recommendations reviewed, and opened the floor for discussion. Some of the questions raised concerned whether University Park has come up with any additional incentives for students to participate with the online SRTE so to increase participation; and if any consideration was given to reducing the number of questions on the SRTE. An additional point was made as to the lack of statistical significance involved with this process. Chair Mart reminded all, the charge is about the recommendations that were made from this committee last year at University Park and how those recommendations on SRTE use be disseminated and used because a lot of research was put forth noting, these are the current issues with the report but it still is our starting point. These are also bigger issues in terms of investigating another method of evaluation as well as the SRTE or our interpretation thereof. She called for any additional concrete suggestions to be brought forth to Chair Infantolino for consideration.
- **Final Report to the Penn State Berks Senate, 2017, Physical Facilities and Safety Committee (Appendix B)**

6. **Reports of Officers and University Senators**

- **Vice Chair Infantolino** – No additional report.
- **Secretary and University Senator Zambanini** – No report.
- **Senator Ansari** – Senator Ansari provided a report from a recent Senate Council meeting. Provost Jones spoke about the progress on the implementation of the University’s Strategic Plan.

There is an Oversight Implementation Committee which oversees several executive and student committees. The Provost's Office is making seed money available for pilot projects toward the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Within the first phase, so far 64 proposals have been received. Provost Jones also spoke about WorkLion, which is the new HR platform. The first monthly payroll with the new system will take place January 31, 2018. One component of WorkLion is WorkDay and at each location, there is an ambassador. The ambassador for Berks is our Financial Officer, Lisa Mikula. Vice Provost Kathleen Bieschke spoke about progress on implementation of HR21 as it relates to new titles for fixed-term faculty and also the establishment of the Fixed-Term Promotion Committee. She assured us that their office is monitoring the progress and things are moving forward.

- **Senator Bartolacci – No report.**
- **Senator Mauer** – Senator Mauer shared that he serves on the Intra-University Relations Committee, which monitors things that are done at all of the colleges including University Park. Some of items we will focus on for this year include monitoring the implementation of Fixed-Term Promotion Committee across all the colleges. The policies at Penn State Berks and Altoona are currently being used as a model. The other area we are tasked to investigate has to do with looking into the rate of tenure achievement among minorities and women vs. non-minority males. Currently, it appears it is skewed toward non-minority males so we will be taking a closer look into this in order to investigate as to why this is the case.
- **Senator Snyder** – Senator Snyder reported the SRTE's are not anywhere on our agenda for this year. He shared that a top priority for the year will be to conclude the work which was started over the last few years, with the primary focus being on the language within HR21 in the hopes to provide a bit more advantage to fixed-term faculty as it relates to contracts and the pacing of contracts. Rather than having an overwhelming number of FT-1's that have one-year contracts for multiple years, the goal will be to connect promotion with a 3-year or 5-year contract. Our primary concern right now is to have this resolved by the end of the semester.
- **SGA President Ryan Morris** – This past weekend, we attended the Council of Commonwealth Student Governments at University Park, which went very well. A couple of highlights to share include, our student governmental chair, Steven Filby, won the constitutional review committee so there was Berks representation there. Also, the Council of Commonwealth Student Governments used our PR team as an example and convened a committee based on our PR team. We had two ad hoc committees, which are new this year, Young Women in Leadership and Conflict Management; both had representation from Berks. There was also representation on the Academic Affairs, Governmental Affairs and Student Affairs Committees. President Morris also sits as a voting member on the Commonwealth Fee Board, which has voted that guiding principles and operating procedures are going to be remaining as references instead of additions to the Steering Committee Handbook, which will cut down on the time for changes to be made and voting to take place. President Morris met with the student trustee on the Board who indicated he was excited to visit Berks in the summer. Penn State Berks is setting the standard across the Commonwealth.
- **Student Senator** – No report.

7. Comments/Announcements by Administrators

- **Chancellor Hillkirk**
 - A few days ago, we received word that Penn State Berks was ranked 4th amongst 58 public colleges and universities in Pennsylvania; this news will be distributed widely as well as I will be speaking to this at our upcoming open house on October 21. Those universities ranked preceding Penn State Berks are: #1, Penn State, University Park; #2, University of Pittsburgh; and #3, Temple University. This honor is a reflection on all faculty, staff and students at Penn State Berks. Not only is this a reflection upon our academic quality but

you are contributing to a welcoming environment here at Penn State Berks. On this same day, I was informed that another national rating agency by the name of College Raptor that identified Penn State Berks as what they called a hidden public gem. This agency assists families nationally in making choices for college. Also with that same mention were Penn State Erie and Penn State Harrisburg.

- The Open House, which will be held on October 21, is a very important event for us. It provides us an opportunity to really showcase the campus. If you are planning to contribute to the open house, I want to thank you in advance.
- As was stated previously, and for reasons out of our control, Penn State has added resident housing to Penn State Abington and Penn State Brandywine, which creates a more competitive market for us. We have a meeting scheduled, which will take place in the next few days, and have already met to discuss some things that we to change in terms of our marketing strategies. For the first time, we are aggressively marketing our residence halls through a variety of means.
- Penn State Berks hosted a few days ago the association by the name of the American Society for Engineering Education. We had approximately 120 in attendance from as far away as Nigeria for this event. I would like to commend and thank all those who were leading this event.
- Some of you may remember Aniyia Williams, who was a Schreyer Honors Scholar and attended Penn State Berks. She went on to University Park and has been very successful. She lives in Silicon Valley and is an entrepreneur and inventor. She invented ear buds that also are jewelry. Her company is called Tinsel. She organized something called a Black and Brown Founders Project to try to support and encourage more young people of color, including students, to become involved in entrepreneurship and job creation. Nine of our students along with Walt Fullam and Solange Israel-Mintz, are in Philadelphia today and tomorrow participating in that conference as well as participation from several other Penn State campuses. Aniyia is going to be at Penn State Berks on Wednesday for a dialog. This event will be held in Gaige, 121 at 12:15 p.m. Please feel welcome to stop by.
- As earlier reported by Senator Ansari and with regard to the Strategic Plan, I wanted to mention three areas that I have been involved with in meetings recently where I think we may have some opportunity for involvement as it relates to some of the proposal development. They include: addition, prevention and treatment; obesity, related to exercise is medicine program; and a piloting program proposal where doctors are able to prescribe to patient's fresh fruits and vegetables, rather than traditional medicine.
- Real problems exist surrounding the current state budget stalemate. If Penn State does not receive its appropriation, it will create lots of issues for us as well as across the university. I recently forwarded President Barron message encouraging all of us to communicate with our legislators. If you have done so, I strongly encourage you to do so and let your voice be heard.
- **Senior Associate Dean Esqueda** – We have selected a topic for the upcoming faculty retreat, which will be held the morning of Friday, December 15, it is: *Classroom Management Tools for a Disruptive Classroom*. There have been incidents of class disruption either because there are students with disabilities or because there are students who get out of control. Also, we have recently noticed a trend which indicates an increase in the number of students with disabilities here on campus.

8. Unfinished Business – None

9. New Legislative Business – None

10. **Forensic Business – Discussion of “engaged scholarship” and “engaged teaching,” and evaluation of these categories, Faculty Affairs Committee** – Chair Infantolino shared last May, this award was generated through the Penn State Berks Advisory Board. The Senate’s role will provide recommendations and/or comments on engaged scholarship. We have also researched evaluation criteria for the award. We are asking for faculty feedback over the next week or so. This information will be presented to Chancellor Hillkirk in November who will then present it to Advisory Board members.
11. **Comments for the Good of the Order - None**
12. **Adjournment**

(APPENDIX A)

Penn State Berks Senate
Academic Affairs Committee
Legislative Report

September 22, 2017

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Room: 113 Luerssen Building

A. Call to order

B. Agenda

- Introductions
- Brief discussion of the 2017-18 charges
- Using 2016-17 Academic Affairs Committee Informational Report on Academic Integrity Violations, prepare legislative report with recommendations for implementation of top priorities from report.

C. Legislative Report

In spring 2017, the Academic Affairs Committee investigated reports of academic integrity violations during the last ten years and developed a list of strategies to better promote Academic Integrity within the College and reduce the number of academic integrity violations. These strategies proposed by the committee were in no particular order. The current charge from the Executive Committee to the Academic Affairs Committee is to draft a legislative report with recommendations for implementation of top priorities from the above report.

The Academic Affairs Committee discussed these strategies and focused on the ones that we believe will help prevent academic integrity violations by students and better promote the policies of academic integrity among faculty, staff and students.

The following is a list of the four top priorities that the committee recommends for implementation within the next two academic years. The Office of Academic Affairs will work out implementation details with the faculty and divisions.

1. Have students who violate academic integrity take the online training module (<http://academicintegrity.psu.edu/>) and obtain the certificate. This is in addition to any academic and/or disciplinary sanctions reached by the Academic Integrity Committee and the Judicial Affairs.
2. Have all first year students take the online training module for academic integrity (<http://academicintegrity.psu.edu/>) and obtain a certificate.

3. Organize yearly workshops on academic integrity for full-time and part-time faculty.
4. Organize workshops for faculty and staff on how to properly use plagiarism detection software (i.e. Turnitin)

The following four items are already being delivered to a certain degree, and the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee to the Office of Academic Affairs is to reinforce these policies and to make sure that they are being delivered in a consistent way and on a continuous basis:

1. Include instruction on academic integrity policies, ethics and prevention of academic integrity violations in all the English 15, English 30 and English 202 courses.
2. Have the program coordinators implement instructions on academic integrity policies and prevention of academic integrity violations in the core curriculum courses and “W” courses for junior and senior students.
3. Remind the faculty members before the start of the academic year to list and explain academic integrity policies in their syllabi.
4. Have all First Year Seminar (FYS) courses include a session on academic integrity.

Respectively submitted

Academic Affairs Committee 2017-18

Michael Bartolacci

Dave Bender

William Bowers

Alexandria Chisholm

Katherine Cinese

Ruth Daly

Paul Esqueda

Lisa Glass

Hassan Gourama, Chair

Matthew Rhudy

Kirk Shaffer

Christian Weisser

(APPENDIX B)

SRTE Summary Report, Faculty Affairs Committee

Charge #9: *Prepare summary report on 2017 University Senate Report on role of SRTE scores in faculty reviews for dissemination to all faculty and administrators.*

The following report summarizes the 2017 University Senate Report on the SRTE's then suggests "best practices" that can be shared with individuals serving on P&T committees as well as Division Heads to help remind individuals what the SRTE's are and are not and how the data should be interpreted.

Respectfully submitted,
Ali Alikhani-Koopaei
Paul Esqueda
Rocky Huang
Ben Infantolino (chair)
Jen Murphy
Lolita Paff
Michele Ramsey
Steven Snyder

Recommendations for Use of SRTE Data in Faculty Reviews

- STRE data can be **one** source of information but **cannot** be the only source. Gathering of other data should be done systematically, not informally. (Report, p.5)
- The overall trend is more telling than anomalies and anomalies should not be given much weight. A complete history should be considered, not one composite or weighted average score. (Report, p.5)
- Likewise, rare comments should not be given much weight over numerous comments in the same vein. Look for patterns: over time, across different course types. (Report, p.12)
- SRTE data cannot be used to compare faculty as it is unlikely each faculty member taught the exact same group of students under the exact same circumstances.
- Administrators and faculty need to recognize faculty-faculty comparisons most negatively impact "those who do not fit common stereotypes of the professorate- typically women and faculty of color." (Report, p.14) "The research on gender bias has a longer history than does the research on racial, ethnic, or cultural bias, in part because minority faculty still constitute a relatively small percentage of the faculty. The number of studies is increasing and evidence is mounting that such biases exist among students and may impact student ratings" (Report, p. 21).
 - The Report makes this statement but doesn't address the implications, or call for special care when interpreting and evaluating feedback in these cases.

- Aside from the ethical problems of awarding merit increases based on biased data, reports now indicate the possibility of legal action by faculty members. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 prohibits determining wages on the basis of sex and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 mandates that institutions and business are forbidden from using discriminating promotional practices on the basis of race or sex.
- Faculty examination of the 177-question pool should be routinely incorporated in review of teaching. Opportunity to select/alter the questions based on course and student characteristics should be integrated more fully into the process. See http://www.srte.psu.edu/SRTE_items/
- Evaluation committees and administrators must recognize SRTEs do not measure learning. SRTEs only measure perceptions about students' experiences in a particular course, in a specific semester, with a specified instructor. Students' perceptions of their learning, or of the learning experience, do not necessarily reflect actual learning.
- Reminder about the role of students: producers of course feedback data; faculty and administrators are interpreters of that data (Report, p.4)
- May not be under Berks purview, but the following issues are problematic:
 - Calling them STREs suggests students are evaluating, when all they are really doing is reporting their experiences. It's up to faculty and administrators to evaluate and interpret the student-source data. (Report, p.4)
 - Reliance on mean values instead of medians given the long-tail, non-normal distributions of scores. Can the report provide the median? (Report, p. 13)
 - To provide context, consider providing data to evaluators: history of student ratings at the institution and literature on student ratings.
 - Online collection issues. Report refutes claims it has led to lower scores (pages 21-22). What is not addressed is the bigger problem (particularly outside UP where sections are much smaller) of statistical insignificance and unrepresentative small sample sizes. The "tail" values carry greater computational weight in the mean when sample sizes are small. "Faculty are wise to be concerned about the response rate as smaller numbers of responses are less likely to be representative" (p.24). "Administrators should be wary of over-interpreting small-enrollment courses with low response rates" (p.25) Unless an institution has set a minimum response rate for inclusion in the dossier, all results will need to be included" (p.23).
 - Report posits several ideas for increasing participation rate. (p.24)
 - Early access to grades???
 - Rewarding students for reaching a particular response rate???
 - Sincere encouragement from faculty that results are taken seriously
 - Regularly collect data throughout the term to establish the habit

- Experimental teaching & Gaps in Collecting SRTE data. First-time teaching a course or teaching in an experimental way may be grounds for administrator to agree not to administer the SRTE. Get it in writing. “We suggest that the student ratings be administered even if the administrator agrees to the exclusion because some have found that their ratings do not decrease as expected” (p.24).

Recommendations from the Faculty Affairs Committee

1. Produce a "Best Practices" document that a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee can present at P&T charge meetings as well as to DH's annually
2. Invite Angela Linse to campus to discuss the Senate Report and recommendations at a future teaching colloquium
3. Recommend the 2018-2019 Faculty Affairs Committee investigate other methods to evaluate teaching
4. Recommend the 2018-2019 Faculty Affairs Committee investigate what Penn State Berks can control as far as SRTE's are concerned

Best Practices for the use of SRTE Data

1. SRTE data can be **one** source of information but **cannot** be the sole source
 - Use of a metric that has known biases with respect to gender, racial, ethnic, or cultural bias can present serious legal concerns
2. SRTE's are student's perceptions of teaching, individuals using SRTE data need to interpret the data
 - Anomalies should not be given much weight
 - Rare comments should also not be given much weight
 - The overall trend of SRTE data and comments should be used as opposed to anomalies or rare comments
 - Comparisons between faculty are not valid since the pool of respondents and specific course are not likely to be similar
3. SRTE's do **not** measure student learning and should not be used to evaluate how effective a teacher is which is in opposition to the name of the metric
4. SRTE's are a rough estimate for collecting student perception data, they are not a precision instrument

(APPENDIX C)

Engaged Scholarship Report, Faculty Affairs Committee

Charge #11: Review criteria and procedures for new Faculty Engagement Award to make consistent with other faculty awards.

The following report details the committee's suggestions for changes to the Engaged Scholarship Award. There was some initial confusion about this award which was cleared up by Dr. Esqueda; the Advisory Board initiated this award and therefore is not similar to the Teaching, Research, Advising, and Service faculty Awards. Since the Advisory Board started this award, the senate is merely passing on the suggestions to Chancellor Hillkirk who can then approach the Advisory Board as he sees fit.

Respectfully submitted,

Ali Alikhani-Koopaei

Paul Esqueda

Rocky Huang

Ben Infantolino (chair)

Jen Murphy

Lolita Paff

Michele Ramsey

Steven Snyder

Chancellor Hillkirk,

The following pages include the suggested changes to the new Engaged Scholarship Award description based on discussions in the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Berks Faculty Senate. We respectfully request that these changes be passed to the Advisory Board for their consideration. We understand that the advisory board has created this award and therefore may choose to ignore our suggestions. Because the academy thrives on shared governance between all members of the academic community, we encourage the advisory board to accept our suggestions, as they are based on consultation throughout the college. In the case that the advisory board disagrees with our suggestions, we respectfully request that the award not be presented at the Faculty Luncheon in May where the Berks Faculty Awards are presented, as this award would not be one that is created with faculty input and thus is not in line with the other awards presented on that day.

Regards,

The Berks Faculty Senate

Berks Advisory Board Outstanding Engaged Scholarship Award

The Outstanding Engaged Scholarship Award is given by the Berks Advisory Board to a ~~Penn State-Berks~~ faculty member who has demonstrated the highest level of excellence among his/her peers in engaged scholarship during the previous year. Penn State defines engaged scholarship as "out-of-classroom academic experiences that complement in-classroom learning." It includes, but is not limited to, activities such as undergraduate research, internships, study abroad, service learning, experiential learning, and capstone experiences.

Eligibility

The recipient must have been employed as a full-time faculty member for at least three years and must not have won the award in the previous five years.

Evaluation Criteria

Excellence in engaged scholarship is judged on the basis of significance and impact of the faculty member's ~~scholarly work~~ engaged scholarship in the previous year. The award winner should engage in many, but not necessarily all, of the following activities:

- Address issues that have been identified as priorities by leaders in the community¹ consistent with the definition of engaged scholarship above
- Involve students in on-going projects/problems that address pressing community needs and attempt to create sustainable solutions.
- Allow students to apply skills and knowledge learned in class in real life problems
- Create economic and/or social value for the community
- Provide experiences that help ensure student success and at the same time retain our future graduates in our area

Evidence that would help to demonstrate engaged scholarship should be provided by the nominees and could include (but not limited to):

- Scholarly work (articles, books, book chapters, conference presentations)
- Letter(s) of support from students describing the impact of the engaged scholarship
- Letter(s) of from the community impacted by the engaged scholarship
- The actual work that impacted the community (brochure, outreach activity, presentation etc.)

Selection Procedure

Each Division Head will use the above criteria to select one nominee based on Faculty Activity Report (FAR) information from the previous year. This selection will take place after all FARs have been read and spring conferences with all faculty members have been completed (barring scheduling difficulties). Nominees will be notified by Division Heads on the fourth Friday of March each year. Division Heads will ask nominees to compile supporting materials based on the evaluation criteria outlined above, and will submit those to the selection committee on the second Friday of April. The selection committee will notify the Senior Associate Dean of its final decision by the third Friday of April.

In any given year, Division Heads may choose not to submit a nominee for this award and the selection committee may choose not to give this award if they do not feel there is a faculty member who merits the

¹ The term community is used in the broad sense and it includes local, regional, national and international communities

award.

The winner will be selected by a committee consisting of the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Advisory Board, ~~the Chair of the Community Relations and Engagement Committee and the Director of Continuing Education at Penn State Berks.~~ **the Chair of the Berks Faculty Senate, and the previous three award winners. Until there are three previous winners the Chair of the Community Relations and Engagement Committee of the Advisory Board and the Director of Continuing Education at Penn State Berks will sit on the committee and one individual will be replaced by a previous winner for the next two years.** The selection committee will select the winner based on the above criteria and any supporting materials.

(APPENDIX D)

Penn State Berks Senate

Academic Affairs Committee

Progress Report on the Hybrid Classes Issue

November 6, 2017

A. Charge :

Investigate course scheduling for a) hybrid classes with the default of MW + online F, and the prevalence of this model, and b) the lack of F classes, which meet on campus. Prepare legislative report on whether this or other existing scheduling has an academic impact and whether there should be clear, campus-wide course-scheduling guidelines.

B. Background

This charge came to the Executive Committee from some faculty over the summer with the following issues to consider:

- “Many of the hybrid classes use Friday as the on-line/hybrid day. There was the concern that this impacted students' attitudes toward the Friday classes that met face to face, since it seemed to some faculty that students increasingly resented the faculty members who made them come in on Fridays, with the students sometimes complaining, "this is my only class on Fridays..." Resentment was expressed that maybe some faculty members have created for themselves a de facto 2 day a week teaching schedule, although, traditionally, faculty (in most disciplines) have alternated at our campus each semester between a 2 day and a 3 day teaching schedule. Finally, a related concern which also touched on issues of equity in teaching loads, is that some faculty question whether the hybrid meetings are really any different than regularly assigned homework for traditional classes; so was the work required of students and faculty in a 3 credit traditional course and 3 credit hybrid course the same?”
- “A second concern had to do with space use on campus when the majority of classes used Friday as the hybrid day? Might it not make more sense to have faculty teaching hybrid classes alternate/vary hybrid days among courses, so that room usage was more evenly spread out throughout the week, and there was less strain on the other 4 days?”
- “Finally, the question was raised about whether we are becoming a 4-day a week campus, since the number of classes meeting on Fridays is substantially lower than on the other days.”

C. Summary of deliberations by the AAC

During the first meeting of the AAC to discuss this issue, the committee concluded that there is no major issue about the scheduling of hybrid classes and the related use of physical space at the Berks Campus. This is based on the information provided by Dr. Bender that included an Excel document showing the meeting times of hybrid classes for fall 2017 and spring 2018 and the distribution of classes/class scheduling patterns at all campuses for fall 2017.

The committee decided to do some research, to find out if other Penn State Campuses have any scheduling guidelines of hybrid classes, and to continue investigating to see if the existing scheduling has an academic impact and whether there should be clear, campus-wide course-scheduling guidelines. The following are some of the findings, comments and concerns that were raised by committee members so far. Some of the comments are direct quotes:

- A consultation with some other campuses revealed that the issue of “Hybrid Friday” is causing some problems and that there is a need of policy or guidelines that will include student learning as the guiding principle.
- There is presumption by administrators in some other campuses that some faculty are “skipping Friday” by using the day as the on-line/hybrid day.
- Penn State Harrisburg Campus has a policy about hybrid courses (<http://harrisburg.psu.edu/policy/hybrid-courses>). The policy was approved in 2011 and is currently being revised.
- “Considerable time generally goes into preparing a Friday on-line/hybrid component for students well before that Friday not to mention many faculty then follow up by monitoring/grading online discussion. Also, are we to assume that if your hybrid day is a Monday or Wednesday, then the faculty member is “skipping” those days as well? I don't see that there is any way to prove any of this. And without proof and evidence, I'm reluctant to start saying we need to change policy. In addition, if we were to say that anyone teaching a hybrid Friday has to do additional work to prove that what they're doing is academically valid, then that raises the specter of discrimination against a minority faction of the faculty. I don't think that's where we want to go either.”
- “One concern is that the policy that full time faculty teach at least three days a week at least one semester per year is selectively enforced. Some full time faculty have been teaching two days a week every semester for years. It doesn't seem fair to consider requiring some faculty teach in the classroom three days a week rather than teaching a hybrid course, while other faculty are scheduled to teach two days a week every semester every year. Do we have numbers as to how many faculty are exempt from the policy we are discussing? And, what are the criterion for being exempt?”
- “If it is a question of days teaching on campus, then someone can teach 3 days a week (m, w, f for instance) come in for 3 hours each day to do the three 50 minute classes power-point lectures and leave. How is this a good thing compared to someone

teaching online or in a hybrid class who may spend more actual hours per day in chats, emails, and other interactions with students and their work. I think the whole requirement (for days in class on campus) is archaic and useless and should be abolished. Faculty are rated via their FAR's on teaching. If someone is neglecting their teaching duties, be it online, hybrid or in class, it will show up and be addressed by Paul and their division head. Mandates will always have lots of exceptions pop up and create ill will for the rest when they are given. Also, what about faculty who ALWAYS must teach evening classes, should some accommodations be made for them since they are forced to teach evenings or specific days due to the nature of the program they teach in and the many non-traditional students taking their classes.”

- “The research shows that hybrid and online courses can be equally rigorous and demanding, and often more time-consuming, than a course that is 100% traditional classroom. Further, hybrid courses often score high in student satisfaction. So perhaps we could shift the conversation away from "policing" the locations and times of instruction and focus on ensuring a high quality of instruction in our growing number of hybrid/online courses.

The Center for Teaching and Learning with Technology offers many workshops for faculty interested in online teaching, but my guess is that some of the folks who think hybrid classes are "skipping" Friday" have never attended a TLT workshop and don't fully understand what is involved. I wonder if Daonian or Mary Ann Mengel could give a quick overview and talk about "best practices" for online teaching at an upcoming faculty meeting? That might help the traditionalists understand how much work goes into a hybrid class--Friday or otherwise.”

- “At the next committee meeting, I recommend that we discuss suggesting that the Executive Committee charge the Faculty Affairs Committee to look into the issue since several of the comments refer to faculty workload.”
- “I agree, many aspects of this issue are related to faculty workload and scheduling, which should be handled by the Faculty Affairs Committee. And this can be one of our recommendations in the final report. Also part of the charge to our committee is to look into the academic impact of this type of scheduling. Which I believe comes under the responsibility of AAC.”
- “The issue overlaps with faculty workload but, in my opinion, this is a more complicated issue to reflect in a policy. I would focus on quality of learning and teaching and work my way to what is reasonable in a mix of online and face-to-face.”

The Academic Affairs Committee will continue to seek more information and discuss this issue in order to prepare a legislative report.

Respectively submitted

Academic Affairs Committee 2017-18

Michael Bartolacci

Dave Bender

William Bowers

Alexandria Chisholm

Katherine Cinese

Ruth Daly

Paul Esqueda

Lisa Glass

Hassan Gourama, Chair

Matthew Rhudy

Kirk Shaffer

Christian Weisser

(APPENDIX E)

Physical Facilities and Safety Committee

Charge 1 Report Fall 2017

Review plans and make recommendations regarding construction, renovation, and physical development of the campus.

Over the summer of 2017 campus-wide improvements were made to parking lots and outdoor light fixtures. Currently, the Beaver Community Center renovation project is the highest priority renovation. Other high priority renovation projects include improvements to the office spaces, lab spaces, and classrooms in Franco, and to continue with office space expansion campus-wide as opportunities arise. This committee recommends to proceed with office space renovations and developing new lab spaces, especially in Franco, throughout the Beaver renovation project. Additionally, the committee recommends looking into the feasibility of developing a long-term plan for office and academic expansions to be incorporated into the campus Master Plan.

The Administration has requested that renovation efforts be directed toward immediate concerns and the Beaver renovation project. Beaver Community Center fund raising is underway with a reported \$12 million required to break ground on Phase 1 of the 3-phase project. The renovation plan is proposed to add an additional 45,000 square feet to the existing space by building out towards the highway, the parking lot, and toward Perkins Student Center (see image below).

Phase 1 will involve building out the front façade of the building and renovating the weight room, dance studio, and adding an auxiliary gym. Challenges associated with this phase will be building access to both Beaver and Perkins, parking in the adjacent lot, and demolition of the Kinesiology Teaching and Research Lab. To date there is no timeline in place for when Phase 2 and 3 will follow Phase 1, which may displace the Kinesiology Teaching and Research Lab space indefinitely. This committee recommends developing timeline for the phased project, as well as a contingency plan for maintaining normal curricular activities and maintaining research productivity.

Phase 2 will involve building the connector between Beaver and Perkins which will house office space for Athletics and Kinesiology, lab space for teaching and research in Kinesiology, and food service space. Phase 3 will involve renovating the remainder of the existing building, including renovating locker rooms and training room space. Challenges associated with Phases 2 and 3 will be access to health suite and loading dock in Perkins, access to office space, access to parking, and disrupted use of gym facilities. This committee recommends developing a contingency plan for disrupted use of these facilities, in particular, office space, gym facilities for practice and competition, and the health suite.

Housing and Food Services has plans to develop a Convenience Store, in the new connector between Beaver and Perkins, similar to that of Harrisburg, Behrend, and Altoona. This would serve to provide our growing international student population with alternative food items to be prepared in the Ivy kitchen, and provide access to essentials such as cold medication, toiletries, health and beauty items, as well as bulk items such as cases of water, pints of blueberries, boxes of cereal, etc. In addition, HFS has identified the yard space in the Village as a potential flower garden and outdoor activity area for lawn games, such as horse shoes, putting green, etc., along with outdoor seating.



(APPENDIX F)

Meeting Minutes from Physical Facilities and Safety Meeting Oct 31st, 2017

Attendance: Brenda Russell, Allison Singles, Azar Panah, Jennifer McDougal, Shahid Khan, Zohra Guisse, and David Bender

The agenda addressed Charges (1) reviewing plans and making recommendations regarding construction, renovation, and physical development of the campus and Charge (8) to investigate physical facilities aspect of course scheduling for hybrid classes and the prevalence of this model and lack of Friday classes that meet on campus.

Committee members addressed the report for charge one. Brenda Russell stated that she would like to include more emphasis on continued efforts to renovate Franco building to provide additional office space and faculty labs. It was suggested that renovations to Franco should proceed in concert with Beaver renovations, not after Beaver renovations. Azar and Allison addressed the importance of emphasizing some of the challenges that can occur in the process of the Beaver renovations. This included lab space, space for student and faculty research. There needs to be an in-depth discussion about how the disruption of the building can cause problems in class rooms, teaching, lab space and parking. For example, in phase 1, there in kinesiology there are 4 classes that have labs in that space—we will need to find classrooms, lab space during the renovations. In phase 2, displacement and disruption will/can occur in nurse's area, athletics, kinesiology, and MPR. It was suggested that recommendations be added to further develop a timeline and what we can do about potential problems associated with displacement. Shahid and Allison addressed the issue of thinking further into the future with regard to future faculty hires and Allison suggested perhaps administration should over-budget for planned expansions (10-year strategic plan). It is essential to assess long term needs. For example, athletics has budgeted for 15 offices but what happens if we hire more faculty? A plan and budget beyond 5-years is recommended.

Zohra and Jen provided information on hybrid classes. Dave Bender was invited to speak on the topic of classroom space availability. Jen and Zohra provided statistics of courses offered and demonstrated that Berks is meeting the minimum senate standards of less than 15% of course offerings on Fridays and meets the primetime distribution of courses (45%). The amount of unused classrooms on Fridays are slightly lower, but we are meeting senate requirements. Online courses does not mean faculty are not working on Fridays, as faculty remain available online. Jen mentioned we are only talking about 10% of classes that are hybrid. Of the 80 hybrid courses approximately 30 classes are using MWF's as hybrid. Dave Bender mentioned that from a physical facilities standpoint if this room is used MW's he cannot put another course in that area—having fewer classes on Friday is not a course scheduling issue.

Allison stated that she will be making revisions to her report to include committee recommendations and Zohra and Jen reported they will have a report completed within the week. Brenda asked the committee members to read the report and provide suggestions/edits and email final approvals of the two reports before they are sent to the Senate.

(APPENDIX G)

Intercollegiate Athletic Committee Meeting (I)

[October, 10 2017; 12:15pm; L113]

Attended by: Tom Rigg, Ryan Morris, Marietta Scanlon, Catherine Catanach, Samantha Kavky,
Katie Amaral, Praveen Veerabhadrapa

Meeting Highlights:

- Committee charges# 3, 9 & 10 were mainly discussed
- Intercollegiate Athletic Schedule for *Fall 2017* semester was approved
- Formal report would be prepared by the end of 2017/18 term
- University Faculty Senate Policy# 67-30 Athletic Competition (D III & PSUAC) was noted and briefly discussed. (<http://senate.psu.edu/policies-and-rules-for-undergraduate-students/67-00-athletic-competition/#67-30>)
- Per senate policy, the committee plans to have a total of 3 meetings by the end of 2017/18 term
- No other issues/concerns were reported

APPENDIX H

Strategic Planning and Budget Committee

Meeting Date: 9/26/2017, 2:00 – 3:00 PM

In Attendance: Ada Leung (chair), Malika Richards, Lauren Martin (vice chair), Maureen Dunbar, Hartono Tjoe, Lisa Mikula, Jayne Park-Martinez, Michelle Mart (guest)

Absent: Keysha Whitaker, Colleen English

Michelle Mart was invited to attend the first committee meeting to explain the charges in the academic year of 2017/18:

1. Investigate faculty salaries at Berks in comparison with those at other campuses, considering all divisions and ranks. Prepare advisory report with clear goals and action items to address inequities for Berks faculty. [Apr]
2. Investigate and prepare advisory report regarding any gender differences in salary at Berks; if there are inequitable differences, provide clear goals and action items to remediate. [Apr]
3. Investigate and prepare advisory report on budget levels for faculty travel and research, and whether they have kept up with the increased number of faculty in recent years. Provide specific goals and implementation plans to address. [Nov]
4. Investigate and prepare advisory report on use academic budgets for group meals involving students in comparison with policies at UP; make specific recommendations for best practices and consistency [Nov]

Regarding to Charge #1:

Ada Leung will seek the most updated 2016-17 Faculty Benefits Table from PIR Office at UP. Committee members are encouraged to help with updating charts and document of the Informational Report on Faculty Salaries at Berks.

Regarding to Charge #2:

Ada Leung will follow up with PIR Office at UP about provision of data to conduct multivariate analyses of faculty salaries (e.g. gender, rank, years in position, discipline, campus, number of credit hours generated in Berks vs. peer campuses). By including these variables in the analyses, we are able to test the arguments with empirical data.

Regarding to Charge #3:

Ada Leung will follow up with Marga Row and Melody Althouse about past 5 years data on RDG grant and faculty travel. The total RDG grant in 2017/18 is \$43,400.

Regarding to Charge #4:

As mentioned by Lisa Mikula, there is only one policy at PSU, no difference between UP and Berks: <https://guru.psu.edu/policies/FN10.html>

Michelle elaborated on this charge: how do we define events with an educational or academic purpose, e.g. does it include retention of majors and if so what is allowable in terms of spending funds for that purpose?

Next meeting - TBD

APPENDIX I

Strategic Planning and Budget Committee

Meeting Date: 11/6/2017, 12:15 – 1:15 PM

In Attendance: Ada Leung (chair), Malika Richards, Lauren Martin (vice chair), Colleen English, Maureen Dunbar, Hartono Tjoe

Absent: Keysha Whitaker, Lisa Mikula, Jayne Park-Martinez, Manpreet Kooner (student representative)

We made some progresses about the charges in the academic year of 2017/18:

Regarding Charge #1: Investigate faculty salaries at Berks in comparison with those at other campuses, considering all divisions and ranks. Prepare advisory report with clear goals and action items to address inequities for Berks faculty [Apr]

Jayne Park-Martinez provided the committee with student credit hours (2013-2015) by campus. It helps us confirm the peer campuses of Berks (with similar student credit hours per faculty). Berks is 182.2 in Fall 2015, and the figures for other peer campuses are: Abington (168.9), Altoona (181.6), Erie-Behrend (194), and Harrisburg (164.7).

We obtained the most updated 2016-17 Faculty Benefits Table from the PIR Office at UP. Committee members have updated charts of faculty salaries of Berks and its peer campuses. The Informational Report on Faculty Salaries at Berks will be updated hereafter.

Regarding Charge #2: Investigate and prepare advisory report regarding any gender differences in salary at Berks; if there are inequitable differences, provide clear goals and action items to remediate [Apr]

We cannot ascertain gender inequity in salary at Berks based on the current formats of the Faculty Benefits Table, as the data were tabulated according to discipline, rank, and campus.

We followed up with Betty Harper of the PIR Office at UP about provision of data to conduct multivariate analyses of faculty salaries (e.g. gender, rank, years in position, discipline, campus, number of credit hours generated in Berks vs. peer campuses). By including these variables (data of past 3 years) in the analyses, we are able to test the arguments with empirical data. In essence, we can determine if there is any gender difference in salary by testing the hypothesis of whether or not gender is a statistically significant variable in predicting salary level, controlling for other variables.

However, Betty Harper cannot provide us with the data as she is not a data steward for this information and she is not in the role to determine who has access to the data. As of now, both the Faculty Senate and the Commission for Women are interested in investigating the issue of salary equity. Berks may need to reach out to these parties, and also to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs about our data needs and proposed analyses. If the VP for Faculty Affairs agrees to our request, the PIR office will work with OHR to conduct the appropriate analyses.

Regarding Charge #3: Investigate and prepare advisory report on budget levels for faculty travel and research, and whether they have kept up with the increased number of faculty in recent years. Provide specific goals and implementation plans to address [Nov]

Marga Row and Melody Althouse provided the committee with past 5 years data on RDG grant and faculty travel. The total travel funds awarded at Berks have increased from \$102,093 (n=65) in 2013/14 to \$119,111 (n=75) in 2017/18. On average, each award is amounted to \$1588 in 2017/18, compared to \$1570 in 2013/14.

The total RDG funds awarded at Berks have decreased from \$88,370 (n=40) in 2013/14 to \$46,750 (n=30) in 2017/18, although the number of applications increased from 40 to 51. This is a serious concern among committee members. As stated in the Strategic Plan, Strategic Initiative V, Berks faculty, staff and students are to embrace the values of curiosity and academic integrity through their research and creativity. The reduced research support makes achieving key priority 1 (increasing the number of refereed publications and creative accomplishments per faculty member with research obligations from 1.26 in 2013/14 to 1.5 in 2019/20) difficult.

Regarding Charge #4: Investigate and prepare advisory report on use academic budgets for group meals involving students in comparison with policies at UP; make specific recommendations for best practices and consistency [Nov]

There is only one policy at PSU; there is no difference between UP and Berks:
<https://guru.psu.edu/policies/FN10.html>:

Meals, meetings and other events which include students, both graduate and undergraduate, are permitted and encouraged as part of student engagement. General funds may be used as the source of funding if the event has a clear educational or academic purpose and a faculty or staff representative will be present, or if the event falls under student affairs or activity programming. Unrestricted donor funds must be used for all other events, including those for social purposes and meals provided for regular class sessions.

As indicated in Dr. Esqueda's email on March 28, 2017, meal expenses related to events involving students, e.g. recruiting and retention of majors, are to be consulted with the division head before the events take place. If the events are to be held outside campus, prior approval from division head is required. The expenses are then submitted through ERS, along with the purpose of the event and names of all attendees.

Next meeting - TBD