# Penn State Berks Senate <br> Monday, April 16, 2018 <br> 12:15-1:15 PM <br> Multi-Purpose Room (MPR), Perkins Building <br> Agenda 

- Call to Order
- Additions, Corrections, and Approval of the Minutes of the 29 January 2018 and 26 March 2018 meetings
- Announcements and Reports by the Chair
- Motions from Committees
- Strategic Planning and Budget (three reports - one report contains six brief motions) (Appendices, A, B, and C)
- Informational Reports
- Physical Facilities and Safety (three reports: safety; sustainability; energy savings) (Appendices D, E, and F)
- Faculty Affairs Committee - Final End-Year Report (Appendix G)
- New Legislative Business
- Forensic Business
- Discussion of academic structure and academic administrative positions.
- Reports of Officers and University Senators
- Vice Chair Infantolino
- Secretary and University Senator Zambanini
- Senator Ansari
- Senator Bartolacci
- Senator Maurer
- Senator Snyder
- SGA President Ryan Morris
- Student Senator
- Comments/Announcements by Administrators
- Chancellor Hillkirk
- Associate Dean Esqueda
- Comments for the Good of the Order
- Adjournment


# Penn State Berks Senate <br> January 29, 2018 <br> 12:15-1:15 PM, Multi-Purpose Room (MPR), Perkins Building 

Attendees: Mohamad Ansari, Amir Barakati, Tara Beecham, David Bender, Mike Briggs, Catherine Catanach, Collen English, Azar Eslam Panah, Maria Fellie, Walt Fullam, Hassan Gourama, Nathan Greenauer, Ryan Hassler, Ben Infantolino, Abdullah Konak, Jim Laurie, Ada Lueng, Joseph Mahoney, Lauren Jade Martin, Cesar Martinez-Garza, Clifford Maurer, Jennifer McDougal, Catherine Mello, Pauline Milwood, Tami Mysliwiec, Mahdi Nasereddin, Randall Newnham, Shannon Nowotarski, Lolita Paff, Dawn Pfeifer Reitz, JoAnne B. Pumariega, Michele Ramsey, Matthew Rhudy, Malika Richards, Marissa Ruggiero, Brenda Russell, John Shank, Allison Singles, Stephen Snyder, Terry Speicher, Hartono Tjoe, Bob Zambanini (Faculty); Pradip Bandyopadhyay, Kim Berry, Paul Esqueda, Keith Hillkirk, Janelle Larson, Michelle Mart, Belén Rodríguez-Mourelo, Teri Sabatelli (Administration); Charles Miller, Ryan Morris (Students).

## 1. Call to Order

2. Additions, Corrections, and Approval of Minutes of the November 13, 2017 - After noting minor typos, Chair Mart called for corrections, additions to the minutes; hearing none, a motion was called to approve the minutes (Laurie), and was seconded (Gourama); the minutes were approved.

## 3. Announcements and Reports by the Chair

- The Chair commented on Appendix A (End of Semester Report, Fall, 2017). This document was sent out in December. The intent of the document is to begin the process of summarizing Senate activities for each semester.
- The Chair commented on two action items regarding the Office of Academic Affairs that were passed at the Senate meeting of November 13, 2017. As regards the first item, Associate Dean Esqueda was supportive of most of the AA motion regarding academic integrity policies, but he did note that part of the motion about sanctioning guidelines would have to be brought back to the Academic Integrity Committee (which he volunteered to do) to ensure that the guidelines are in alignment. He also raised a question about implementation of what the Program Coordinators are supposed to instruct as regards academic integrity policies and violations, stating that that topic might have to be sent to Curricular Affairs. The second item was the Faculty Affairs motion regarding best practices for SRTEs. The last two recommendations were merely internal Senate matters for next year's Academic Affairs Committee. Paul agreed with the second recommendation, viz., to have Angela Lindsey to visit the campus and discuss best practices. Regarding the first policy, Paul felt that it was not a good idea to have any Faculty Affairs Committee members present at a charge meeting for a P\&T Committee because it mixes the roles of faculty responsibility versus administration responsibility. After a discussion regarding how to implement the spirit of the recommendation, a proposal was discussed in which a representative of the Faculty Affairs Committee would communicate to all faculty about the best practices and FAC rep to speak to Division Heads and the Associate Dean in one of their meetings as a reminder.
- The Chair also mentioned that the issue of potentially revising academic structures and administrative positions in light of the growth of the campus in recent years was discussed preliminarily in the Executive Committee. It was decided that more faculty input was needed in this regard. As a result, a brief, anonymous questionnaire will be sent to the faculty in the next few weeks.


## 4. Motions from Committees

- Physical Facilities and Safety Charge 6 Report (Appendix B) - An overview of the motion was presented by Committee Chair Brenda Russell. In summary, the committee recommended that a pilot program be enacted, using the existing van to shuttle students to and from Broadcasting Square and student apartments, and that Student Affairs coordinate to determine the logistics associated with the use of the van and assisting with funding. Several questions were raised, such as the length of the pilot program (at least a year) and liability. Chair Mart called for any additional comments; hearing none, the motion was called to a vote; the motion was approved unanimously.
- Physical Facilities and Safety Charge 2 Report (Appendix C) - The Chair noted that for ease of procedure, it was decided to split the motions into four separate motions: 1). Conduct a feasibility study of Franco building for adding extra space; 2). Consider converting a general purpose room into office spaces; 3). Consider extra space for faculty office/lab through Beaver renovations project for current and future needs; 4). Add modular buildings for office and lab space during Beaver renovations. Chair Mart called each motion to a vote after each motion was presented and discussed and questions were answered. All four motions were approved with 0 nay votes, with the second motion's having 11 abstentions and the third motion's having 2 abstentions.
- Legislative Report, Academic Affairs Committee, January 21, 2018 (Appendix D) - An overview was presented by Committee Chair Hassan Gourama. He stressed that the Committee had considerable deliberation on this report, and reported on many of the issues that were discussed in the preparation of this report. The Committee's motion was that "...the Office of Academic Affairs determine what is a reasonable mix of online and face-to-face courses that should be offered by the College." After much discussion regarding hybrid classes and Friday scheduling, Chair Mart called the motion to a vote. The motion passed with two "Nay" votes.
- Student Life Committee Report, January, 2018 (Appendix E) - Chair Mart answered questions on this report for Committee Chair Amy White Berger, who was absent due to a family illness. The Committee recommended that additional lighting be added at specified locations on campus. After answering several questions, Chair Mart called the motion to a vote. The motion passed unanimously.


## 5. Informational Reports - Floor Plans, Physical Facilities (Appendix F)

6. Unfinished Business - Engaged Scholarship Report, Engaged Scholarship Report, Faculty Affairs Committee (Appendix G) - At the November 13, 2017 meeting of the Penn State Berks Senate, it was decided to send this proposal back to the Faculty Affairs Committee for additional feedback. Committee Chair Infantolino reported that the committee received no additional feedback. Thus, after further discussion on November $27^{\text {th }}$ and after, the committee removed the requirement of a letter to Chancellor Hillkirk and is now returning the proposal to the Senate. After much discussion, Chair Mart called the motion to a vote. There were 17 yes votes, 13 no votes, and 13 abstentions. Thus, the motion did not pass as it was not approved by a majority of the Senate present for the meeting.

## 7. Reports of Officers and University Senators

- Vice Chair Infantolino - No report.
- Secretary and University Senator Zambanini - The University Planning Committee is working on many tasks, most of which concern University Park. In particular, the Committee will be recommending that the Facilities Planning Advisory Board be dissolved. Additionally, the Committee will recommend that faculty representation be added to the Project Decision Review Board, with the faculty representative(s) reporting to the University Planning Committee ex officio.
- Senator Ansari - Senator Ansari reported on a report from the Faculty Affairs and Inter-University Relations on the revision of AC-21 (formerly HR-21), Provision of Multi-Year Contracts (and not on the topic of smoke-free campuses, as was erroneously listed on the agenda). This report was in the making for 3 years, and for 2 years the Senate has been negotiating with the Administration and made great concessions in order for this report to be passed in December. Since the University Faculty Senate has an advisory and consultative function, any legislation that is passed must be approved by the President. We have now received word of the President's decision regarding the report. There were two recommendations in the report. First, it was recommended that if a faculty member at a second level of review was getting a new contact, then that person should be considered for a multiyear contract of three years or more. Second, it was recommended that if a faculty member at a third level of review was getting a new contact, then that person should be considered for a multi-year contract of five years or more. Unfortunately, the President significantly weakened the first recommendation by stating that if a fixed-term colleague is promoted then at that time that person can be considered for a multi-year contract - a significant demotion. In addition, he removed the second recommendation. President Barron stated the following: "We stand in strong support of the intent of this revision. Penn State is committed to strengthening stability for Penn State's non-tenure-
line faculty and believes that, upon promotion, each should be considered for a multi-year contract. As we have shared with the Senate leadership on several occasions, we cannot in good conscience, however, support the mandated length of the contracts specified in this report. Given that the majority of non-tenure-line faculty are supported with temporary funding, and given that temporary funding does not allow for the provision of a contract longer than three years, it would be unconscionable to support a proposal that is, in essence, unable to be implemented. To do so would create expectations on the part of non-tenure-line faculty that cannot be fulfilled and put academic administrators in the position of being unable to implement this recommendation." Much discussion was generated from this statement. Fortunately, the President responded to the discussion by stating that "We are open for further dialogue."
- Senator Bartolacci - Not present.
- Senator Maurer - Not report.
- Senator Snyder - The response of the President to the Senate Legislation is a disappointment, but is it not disturbing, as President Barron did qualify his statements with sensible comments. However, the original recommendations merely stated that the faculty member be "considered" for a long-term contract.
- SGA President Ryan Morris - President Morris reported that the Student Government Association made a presentation to the Advisory Board last Thursday. The content of the presentation was well received. It included a new show sponsored by the SGA called "PSU Catfood," the video of the first episode of which was launched this morning at 10 AM . It can be found on social media sites such as YouTube.


## 8. Comments/Announcements by Administrators

## - Chancellor Hillkirk

- A couple of weeks ago we had to cancel the kickoff of our $60^{\text {th }}$. Anniversary Year at Berks due to bad weather. The event will now be held on Wednesday, February 14, in the Auditorium, followed by the Campus Chili Cook Out (here in the Multi-Purpose Room), thus making the day a "Kick Off - Cook Off." Other meetings scheduled for February 14 will be rescheduled. The Provost of the University will be in attendance.
- The Chancellor thanked many faculty for their efforts in securing funding in different areas. He mentioned several of the activities which are receiving funding, such as a Veggie RX proposal in partnership with Penn State Health St. Joseph, an Advancing the Humanities and Arts proposal that involve a number of our Humanities and Arts faculty, and a proposal under the theme of Transforming Education, which will be sent to the Chancellor for his approval to be submitted. In addition, we are being invited to collaborate on five other proposals. These efforts help support our Strategic Plan.
- In the very near future we will be sharing some exciting things that are happening regarding our fund raising campaign.
- Senior Associate Dean Esqueda - The Celebrating Teaching Colloquium will be held on Friday, May 4, 2018. The program will begin at 10:00 AM, with breakfast at 9:30 AM. The topic will be the foundation of the general education courses.


## 9. New Legislative Business - None

## 10. Forensic Business - None

## 11. Comments for the Good of the Order - None

## 12. Adjournment

# Penn State Berks Senate <br> March 26, 2018 <br> 12:15-1:15 PM, Multi-Purpose Room, Perkins Student Center 

Attendees: Ali Alikhani, Amir Barakati, Mike Bartolacci, Tara Beecham, Michael Briggs, Jill Burk, Catherine Catanach, Donna Chambers, Alex Chisholm, Ruth, Daly, Justin DiAngelo, Collen English, Marie Felle, Hassan Gourama, Nathan Greenauer, Sarah Hartman-Caverly, Ryan Hassler, Jinyoung Im, Ben Infantolino, Erin Johnson, Mahsa Kazempour, Abdullah Konak, Sadan Kulturel, Jim Laurie, Ada Lueng, Joseph Mahoney, Lauren Martin, Cesar Martinez-Garza, Clifford Maurer, Pauline Milwood, Tami Mysliwiec, Mahdi Nasereddin, Shannon Nowotarski, Meghan Owenz, Jayne Park-Martinez, Dawn Pfeifer Reitz, JoAnne Pumariega, Matthew Rhudy, Marissa Ruggiero, Allison Singles, Stephen Snyder, Terry Speicher, Hartono Tjoe, Praveen Veerabhadrappa, Bob Zambanini (Faculty); Autumn Fritz, James McCarty, Marie Smith (Staff); Pradip Bandyopadhyay, David Bender, Kim Berry, Paul Esqueda, Keith Hillkirk, Janelle Larson, Michelle Mart, Belén Rodríguez Mourelo, Teri Sabatelli (Administration); Kailah Ortiz (student).

## 1. Call to Order

2. Additions, Corrections, and Approval of Minutes of the February 26, 2018 - The Chair reported that there were two sets of minutes inserted into the binder. The first was the completed set from the February meeting, but the second was the draft minutes from the January meeting that were inadvertently added to the binder. As a result, on the February meeting minutes were reviewed at this meeting. The Chair called for additions, corrections to the minutes from the February meeting, hearing none; a motion was called to approve the minutes, second; the minutes were approved.

## 3. Announcements and Reports by the Chair - None.

## 4. Motions from Committees

- Executive Committee, Motion to Amend the Constitution (Appendix A) - The Chair mentioned that this motion was previously discussed at the last meeting and called for any further discussion. Hearing none, a vote was called for. The vote will take place using the clickers (instructions provided). The results were as follows: 30 in favor, 7 opposed; the motion carries.
- Executive Committee, Motion on Ad-Hoc Committees (Appendix B) - The Chair provided rationale regarding this motion, then called for any further discussion. A question was raised if an example could be made. The Chair replied by sharing the example of a new academic program, which usually would be proposed and presented by the Academic Affairs Committee, but which might be presented and proposed by an Ad-Hoc Committee formed by an administrator. The Chair called for additional discussion. Hearing none, a vote was called. The results were as follows: 28 in favor, 13 opposed; the motion carries.
- Academic Affairs Committee, Legislative Report (Appendix C) - Chair Gourama reviewed the charge as stated. He thanked the committee for their help; in particular, he thanked Tami Mysliwiec and Tara Beecham who provide much of the information provided in terms of background. Upon its implementation in 1997, this program had two main goals as objectives: (1) to engage students into learning and (2) to help incoming students with transitioning from high school into college life. In 2007, the University Senate appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to review the entire process and the recommendation was for each unit within the University to come up with a first-year engagement plan for that unit. Penn State Berks came up with their plan in 2008. The main recommendation was that the first-year seminar within the Berks Campus be a partnership between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. The survey shared last fall referenced which also obtained student feedback. As a result, two recommendations and three motions were presented. There was a question raised in terms of compliance numbers obtained. In response, it was reported that data obtained reflected national averages, which are $50 \%$. Plans are in place to improve upon these percentages. It was also asked that if this topic is an academic component and is curricular, then why it is that faculty are not making the decision on the book vs. the campus community. In response, faculty that teach first-year seminars do choose the book. Nominations for books are open to the campus-wide public. Those books that are narrowed down by a committee which are all read and reviewed by the committee are then put forth to the faculty that are teaching first-year seminars as book options for them and then they vote. The first motion was presented as outlined. The Chair called for a vote. The results were as follows: 40 in favor, 6 opposed; the motion carries. The second motion was then presented as outlined. The Chair called for a vote. The results were as
follows: 36 in favor, 9 opposed; the motion carries. Finally, the third motion was presented as outlined. The Chair called for a vote. The results were as follows: 40 in favor, 7 opposed; the motion carries.
- Physical Facilities Report, Charges 4 and 7 (Appendix D) - The Chair referenced the bullet points on the last page of the report, noting that these bullets are in fact the motions. She mentioned that the first bullet item has not changed; therefore, a vote is not required. She then called attention to the remaining three bullet items and called for additional discussion. A friendly amendment was brought forward to change the wording in the last bullet item to precede the word "including" with the phrase "consider including," as it was felt that it was inappropriate for Physical Facilities to be determining curriculum in any way. The Chair moved to call for a second to amend the motion. Hearing a second, she then called for a vote. By unanimous consent, the amendment to the motion carries. The Chair then called for further discussion. Hearing none, a voice vote was called. By unanimous consent, the motions carry.

5. New Legislative Business - The Chair reported on the slate of officers for next year's Senate. They are as follows: Michelle Mart, Chair; Ben Infantolino and Cliff Maurer, Vice Chair; and Bob Zambanini, Secretary. The Chair called for additional nominations from the floor. Hearing none, the Chair called to close the nominations, then moved to close the positions of Chair and Secretary to Senator Snyder. Senator Snyder called for consensus and support in favor of Michelle Mart, Chair, and Bob Zambanini, Secretary. By unanimous consent, these nominations will go forward. The election for Vice Chair will go out for vote via email and will remain open for ten days; results will be shared at the next Senate meeting.

## 6. Informational Reports - None.

## 7. Unfinished Business - None.

## 8. Reports of Officers and University Senators

- Vice Chair Infantolino - The SRTE Committee is trying to find information from other campuses in terms of examining how research is measured. However, this information is not easy to find. The goal is to present a white paper that looks similar to the SRTE. The committee considered suggestions regarding on ways that research could be counted on campus in terms of books and papers. The committee also discussed ways to elect the full professor promotion committees. Finally, the committee is planning to summarize PC compensation and modes of presentation of courses, a potentially challenging topic.
- Secretary and University Senator Zambanini - No report.
- Senator Ansari - Not present.
- Senator Bartolacci - It has imperative that requests for new courses and changes to existing courses contain consultation with other units. Many proposals are being rejected by the Curricular Affairs Committee and sent back to the proposing unit due to vague, short, or even nonexistent consultation.
- Senator Maurer - The Intra-University Relations Committee along with the Faculty Affairs Committee gave two reports at the last University Senate meeting. Both reports addressed discrepancies in the various promotion levels between University Park and the branch campuses, causing one to question former President Graham Spanier's comment that Penn State is "one university geographically dispersed." Progress has been made at Berks; for example, we have increased the number of full professors from two to twenty. I would suggest that the Faculty Affairs Committee make sure that our guidelines: (1) match the general guidelines; and (2) go from one $\mathrm{P} \& \mathrm{~T}$ committee to the next in uniform so that one $\mathrm{P} \& \mathrm{~T}$ committee would not pass one and the next one just because their makeup would fail that one. That should never happen. As far as the fixed term titles, we should develop good guidelines as well because more than $50 \%$ are fixed-term.
- Senator Snyder - The Faculty Affairs Committee also looked at this report. I do not have much to add except that the administrator on the committee is the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and she seemed to understand that this discrepancy exists. The report was a little light on the data. I can share it with the Chair to have it forwarded for your review. It does show there is quite a difference in terms of promotion statements from unit to unit. It should really be much closer. The other report we looked at and spent much time on was AD77 Engaging in Outside Professional Activities (Conflict of Commitment). This document is relatively new. Each unit is supposed to have guidelines for what is appropriate and what is not in terms of conflict of true commitment (mostly teaching), for example, how much teaching is one allowed to do at competing entities? Part of the policy is that yes, Penn State encourages its faculty to get out into the community as representatives of Penn State, provided we are not competing with Penn State in the process.
- SGA President Ryan Morris - Not present.
- Student Senator - Not present.


## 9. Comments/Announcements by Administrators

## - Chancellor Hillkirk

- In-regard to the previous conversation, I would like to make an observation. It is my hope that the conversation moves forward in terms of this idea of us as one university. Perhaps some of you are familiar with tenure and promotion at University Park. I am and feel we would be wise to keep our eyes open in that conversation. We are an undergraduate college. Our mission is quite different than University Park's mission. I would be glad to discuss this further if anyone would like me to do so.
- A number of folks were present at Saturday's Open House, for which I want to express my appreciation. This is a very important time for Penn State Berks in terms of recruitment of new students. We have some challenges right now (such as housing), as do other Penn State locations. We have a larger Open House coming up on April 21 that will be equally important. Half of the students who were here on Saturday indicated that they have already chosen Penn State Berks but the other half, although accepted, had not yet made their decision. These students are very important to us. I also want to thank the many people who have made and continue to make phone calls to these prospective Penn State students. I will be contacting approximately thirty people who are recipients of the Chancellor Scholarship to come to Penn State Berks but have not committed to attend as of yet. At the last meeting, I spoke about the recent gifts from the Hammels and Cohens. The campaign continues to move forward. There is another $\$ 1$ million proposal that is being considered by a donor. We are very hopeful that that will be accepted and funded as well.
- This is that time of year when the pace of time seems to increase. Looking into the near future, Commencement will be held on May 5. Aniya Williams is our keynote speaker. Aniya Williams is a recent Penn State graduate. She initially attended Penn State Berks, then attended University Park. She is an entrepreneur, a former Schreyer's Honor student, and an inventor. She is 30 years old and will bring a different generational perspective to her commencement speech. We are excited that she will be back to speak to our students.


## - Senior Associate Dean Esqueda - No report.

10. Forensic Business - The Chair commented that the past few meetings were so full that we only now can begin the first of what will be several conversations regarding academic structure and academic positions. She thanked everyone who took the time to send comments in writing and who completed the questionnaire. Today's discussion focused on the division structure. There were several comments put forward in the questionnaire about division structure and different opinions were voiced. The Chair opened the floor for additional comments. The first comment raised concerned the overall process, noting that this kind of effort should be guided by clear goals. It is not perceived that there is a defined goal. The Chair agreed that upon initial discussion, the Executive Committee did not have a clear set of goals established. Another comment from a faculty member recently hired within the last few years indicated that she found the questions challenging because some of them stated "as defined," when in actuality these definitions were not available. The Chair agreed that perhaps a good starting point might be clearly determining how these positions are defined. Another comment that was made was that there should be another division head. However, this new position would dramatically increase costs in an organization that is seeking to cut costs. Yet another comment concerned the Strategic Plan. Does our current Strategic Plan prevent us from reaching those goals? The Chair thanked everyone for responding and stated we will put this on the agenda for earlier in the next meeting so that we may gather more information.

## 11. Comments for the Good of the Order - None.

## 12. Adjournment

# Report on Faculty Salary Comparison, Salary Gender Equity, Budget on Faculty Travel and Research, Group Meal Policy 

Submitted by the Strategic Planning and Budget Committee

April 6, 2018

## Introduction

This report is presented in four sections with the goal of responding to the charges of the committee in 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.
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.
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.
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.

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.

We obtained the most updated 2016-17 Faculty Benefits Table from the PIR Office at UP, which contain 2015-16 faculty salary data. See Faculty Salary Report 2017 appended for charts and data.

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).

Although future salary improvement efforts should focus on faculty achievement, the faculty (especially associate and assistant professor) salaries at Berks remained at low levels compared to the other peer campuses. For example, the ranking of an Associate Professor's salary in the Science Division has remained $8^{\text {th }}$ out of 8 and that of an Associate Professor in HASS also remained $10^{\text {th }}$ out of 11 . The salaries of fixed term also exhibited a downward trend, a Lecturer's salary in Science Division dropped from

5th to 6 th (out of 8 ), HASS from 2 nd to $4^{\text {th }}$ (out of 11), and EBC from $7^{\text {th }}$ to $8^{\text {th }}$ (out of 11).

Also, there is a concern that part-time faculty salary information is not included in the annual report by the University Faculty Senate, since many courses are taught by parttime faculty.

Recommendation 1: Berks College administration should review faculty salary at peer campuses regularly to continue a commitment to financially support faculty at all ranks, compared to Berks peer campuses.

Recommendation 2: Berks College administration should request corresponding salary data about part-time faculty from the data steward at UP to examine pay equity across peer campuses.

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.

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. Michelle Mart contacted Dawn Blasko at UP in March, and we have not heard from Dawn about the data access.

Recommendation 3: A university senator from Berks should communicate with the data steward(s) at UP about the access to salary data of Berks and peer campuses. The committee will work on identifying counterparts of Strategic Planning and Budget Committee in peer campuses, and try to collectively appeal to UP about data access.

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.

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 ( $\mathrm{n}=40$ ) in 2013/14 to $\$ 46,750(\mathrm{n}=30)$ in 2017/18, although the number of applications increased from 40 to 51.

See Faculty Travel and RDG 2013-2018 appended for data.
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 expanding research and creative output difficult and especially 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) challenging.

## Recommendation 4: Berks College Administration should consider returning the RDG award amount to 2016-17 level (\$109,425), to help tenure track and tenured faculty achieve key priority 1.

Recommendation 5: Berks College Administration should consider increasing the faculty travel budget to be commensurate with inflation. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics consumer price index, prices in 2018 are 7\% higher than prices in 2013, and the travel fund award per tenured/tenure track faculty has not increased since then.

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
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.

Recommendation 6: For group meals including students for educational or academic purpose, follow PSU policy: https://guru.psu.edu/policies/FN10.html For group meals, names of all participants are required to process the ERS reimbursement.

## 2017-2018 Committee Members:

Maureen Dunbar (Science) Colleen English (Science) Ada Leung (EBC, Chair)
Lauren Martin (HASS, Vice Chair) Lisa Mikula (CFO) Hartono Tjoe (At-Large)
Jayne Park-Martinez (P,R\&A) Malika Richards (EBC) Keysha Whitaker (HASS)
Manpreet Kooner (Student rep)

# (APPENDIX B) <br> Report on Faculty Salaries, 2015-16 

## Penn State Berks College Senate

## Strategic Planning and Budget Committee

## Summary:

The following report on faculty salaries is provided by the Strategic Planning and Budget Committee. Faculty salary information is presented in comparison to other PSU colleges which we regard as our peer institutions within the Penn State system (Erie (Behrend), Harrisburg (Capital), Abington, Altoona, and the University College).

Here is the comparison of salaries by division/rank to peer institutions:

| Division/ <br> Rank | Science |  | HASS |  | EBC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2014-15$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4 - 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4 - 1 5}$ | 2015-16 |
| Professor | 3rd of 6 | 3rd of 8 | 5th of 9 | 4th of 10 | N/A | N/A |
| Associate | 8th of 8 | 8th of 8 | 10 th of 11 | 10 th of 11 | 8th of 11 | 5th of 11 |
| Assistant | 5th of 8 | 5th of 7 | 10th of 11 | 9th of 9 | 9th of 10 | N/A |
| Fixed Term | 5th of 8 | 6th of 8 | 2nd of 11 | 4th of 11 | 7th of 11 | 8th of 11 |

Although future salary improvement efforts should focus on faculty achievement, the faculty (especially associate and assistant professor) salaries at Berks remained at low levels compared to the other peer campuses. For example, the ranking of an Associate Professor's salary in the Science Division has remained $8^{\text {th }}$ out of 8, that of an Associate Professor in HASS also remained $10^{\text {th }}$ out of 11 . The salaries of fixed term also exhibited a downward trend, a Lecturer's salary in Science Division dropped from 5th to 6th (out of 8), HASS from 2nd to $4^{\text {th }}$ (out of 11), and EBC from $7^{\text {th }}$ to $8^{\text {th }}$ (out of 11). We commend the Berks College administration for its efforts thus far to improve faculty salaries relative to similar PSU colleges, and would encourage this continued commitment to financially support faculty at all ranks compared to PSU colleges and PSU University Park.

Also, there is a concern that part-time faculty salary information is not included in the annual report by the University Faculty Senate, since many courses are taught by part-time faculty. In this era of transparency at Penn State, perhaps this information should be made available.

Strategic Planning and Budget Committee:

Maureen Dunbar (Science) Lauren Martin (HASS, Vice Chair)
Hartono Tjoe (At-Large)
Keysha Whitaker (HASS)

Colleen English (Science) Ada Leung (EBC, Chair) Lisa Mikula (CFO) Manpreet Kooner (Student Rep) Jayne Park-Martinez (P,R\&A) Malika Richards (EBC)

## Appendix: Data and Discussion

The University Faculty Senate compiles data on faculty salaries every year. This detailed data can be found at:
https://psu.app.box.com/files/0/f/3589773215/Senate_Faculty_Salary_reports
This report is based primarily on Table 14 of that overall data, which focuses on faculty from PSU Berks and other non-UP locations. Drs. Ada Leung and Hartono Tjoe summarized this data as graphs and charts for this report.

For each category, data given are the median salaries (mid-range salary of the group). This helps to avoid variation caused by one or two exceptionally high (or low) salaries.

It must be remembered that this data is problematic in several ways, which make accurate comparisons difficult:

- Salaries of small groups of faculty are not reported, since this would make it too easy to identify individual faculty salaries. In some cases, low numbers mean data is not given for a particular rank (for example, full Professors in Science at Abington).
- Due to low numbers, salaries are reported only at the Division level. A breakdown by discipline is not given.
- Small groups also make it possible for one or two individuals to greatly change a group's reported median salary. For example, if two faculty members in a group of four retire and are replaced by new hires earning lower salaries, this could greatly lower the group average.
- Divisions contain different disciplines at different locations. This affects comparisons for all three of our divisions. In the case of our EBC division (Engineering, Business and Computing), other locations often split business and engineering, and thus are not fully comparable. Similarly, our HASS division is compared to divisions including "Education and Human Development" (Altoona) and "English" (University College) as well as others which, like HASS, combine Humanities and Social Sciences. Our Science division, meanwhile, is compared to units such as Abington's "Science and Engineering" division and the University College's "Math" faculty.

Despite these issues, we present the following charts and graphs as the best representation of the salary data we have available. In each case the number of faculty at each rank is given ( N ), as is the average number of years in rank for that group $(\mathrm{Y})$. (Generally, we expect that more years in rank would mean higher salary.)

The three divisions of Berks College are presented below, with comparisons to peer institutions.

Division of Science - Comparison of Salary by Rank





Division of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences






Division of Engineering, Business, and Computing



Comparison of Salaries of Full Time Faculty - Engineering, Business, and Computing, Fall 2015 - Rank: Instructor (N=Faculty)
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Salary Tables - Comparison by Year:

## Division of Science

| Science- Professor |  | $2014-2015$ |  |  | 2015-2016 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{N}$ | Years | Salary | N | Years |  |
| Capital- S, E, T | 115,748 | 6 | 11 | 117,733 | 5 | 10 |  |
| U.C.-SCI | 106,011 | 10 | 11 | 108,198 | 11 | 11 |  |
| Berks | 105,854 | 8 | 9 | 107,820 | 8 | 10 |  |
| Erie | 101,763 | 5 | 6 | 102,978 | 5 | 7 |  |
| U.C.-MATH | 100,872 | 8 | 12 | 103,244 | 8 | 13 |  |
| Altoona-MATH \& SCI | 98,681 | 10 | 7 | 99,675 | 11 | 7 |  |


| Science - Associate | 2014-2015 |  |  | 2015-2016 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Salary | N | Years | Salary | N | Years |
| Capital- S, E, T | 98,064 | 25 | 9 | 97,376 | 24 | 9 |
| Abington-SCI \& ENGR | 84,825 | 11 | 12 | 83,277 | 14 | 8 |
| U.C.- HHD | 81,306 | 12 | 8 | 82,836 | 9 | 9 |
| U.C.-SCI | 79,659 | 24 | 10 | 80,082 | 27 | 9 |
| Altoona-MATH \& SCI | 78,809 | 14 | 7 | 81,009 | 13 | 8 |
| U.C.-MATH | 77,742 | 14 | 12 | 77,895 | 12 | 13 |
| Erie | 77,571 | 19 | 8 | 78,642 | 18 | 8 |
| Berks | 76,005 | 14 | 10 | 77,342 | 14 | 11 |


| Science - Assistant | $2014-2015$ |  |  | $2015-2016$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Salary | N | Years | Salary | N | Years |
| Capital- S, E, T | 78,723 | 4 | 4 | . | 3 | 5 |
| U.C.-MATH | 69,336 | 6 | 13 | 70,853 | 6 | 14 |
| Abington-SCI \& ENGR | 68,004 | 9 | 8 | 69,048 | 5 | 10 |
| U.C.-SCI | 67,752 | 26 | 10 | 68,301 | 23 | 11 |
| Berks | 65,007 | 7 | 1 | 67,050 | 7 | 2 |
| U.C.- HHD | 64,836 | 6 | 1 | 67,469 | 6 | 2 |
| Erie | 63,792 | 5 | 3 | 64,890 | 5 | 4 |
| Altoona-MATH \& SCI | 61,961 | 10 | 3 | 62,649 | 7 | 3 |

Salary Tables - Comparison by Year: Division of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sci.

| HASS - Professor | 2014-2015 |  |  | 2015-2016 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Salary | N | Years | Salary | N | Years |
| Abington-ARTS \& HUM | 111,141 | 7 | 15 | 115,146 | 6 | 14 |
| Capital-BHV SCI \& ED | 107,064 | 6 | 7 | 109,089 | 6 | 8 |
| U.C.-SS \& ED | 106,722 | 10 | 8 | 106,614 | 9 | 10 |
| Capital-HUM | 101,889 | 7 | 10 | 98,802 | 5 | 11 |
| Berks | 100,805 | 8 | 6 | 100,665 | 9 | 6 |
| U.C.-ENGL | 98,856 | 9 | 10 | 99,828 | 10 | 10 |
| Altoona ARTS \& HUM | 98,708 | 8 | 5 | 100,481 | 8 | 6 |
| Erie | 96,417 | 9 | 10 | 96,953 | 12 | 8 |
| U.C.-ARTS \& HUM | 95,040 | 7 | 7 | 97,317 | 7 | 8 |
| Altoona ED \& HD | --- | 1 | 3 | --- | 1 | 4 |
| HASS - Associate | 2014-2015 |  |  | 2015-2016 |  |  |
|  | Salary | N | Years | Salary | N | Years |
| Capital-BHV SCI \& ED | 89,487 | 16 | 6 | 90,846 | 15 | 6 |
| Capital-HUM | 86,004 | 9 | 9 | 88,124 | 8 | 11 |
| Abington-SS | 84,150 | 10 | 10 | 85,662 | 9 | 12 |
| Abington-ARTS, HUM | 83,196 | 9 | 12 | 85,275 | 10 | 9 |
| U.C.-ARTS \& HUM | 80,564 | 28 | 8 | 82,377 | 30 | 8 |
| U.C.-SS \& ED | 80,388 | 17 | 8 | 82,080 | 17 | 9 |
| Altoona ED \& HD | 77,787 | 10 | 5 | 79,119 | 11 | 6 |
| U.C.-ENGL | 77,598 | 26 | 10 | 79,119 | 25 | 10 |
| Erie | 76,644 | 14 | 9 | 78,003 | 13 | 9 |
| Berks | 75,042 | 15 | 8 | 74,754 | 17 | 8 |
| Altoona ARTS \& HUM | 72,909 | 23 | 9 | 74,187 | 23 | 8 |
| HASS - Assistant | 2014-2015 |  |  | 2015-2016 |  |  |
|  | Salary | N | Years | Salary | N | Years |
| Abington-SS | 77,157 | 11 | 1 | 88,151 | 10 | 2 |
| Capital-BHV SCI \& ED | 73,746 | 4 | 2 | 75,038 | 4 | 3 |
| Abington-ARTS, HUM | 67,140 | 7 | 3 | 65,619 | 4 | 2 |
| U.C.-ARTS \& HUM | 66,006 | 15 | 11 | 65,160 | 11 | 12 |
| Capital-HUM | 64,895 | 4 | 4 | 65,957 | 4 | 5 |
| U.C.-SS \& ED | 64,242 | 16 | 2 | 65,331 | 13 | 2 |
| U.C.-ENGL | 62,316 | 5 | 4 | . | 2 | 3 |
| Altoona ED \& HD | 61,236 | 12 | 1 | 63,945 | 9 | 1 |
| Erie | 60,570 | 16 | 2 | 61,997 | 16 | 3 |
| Berks | 60,467 | 10 | 4 | 60,143 | 6 | 4 |
| Altoona ARTS \& HUM | 60,170 | 4 | 10 | . | 2 | 18 |

Salary Tables - Comparison by Year:

## Division of Engineering, Business, and Computing

| EBC - Associate | $2014-2015$ |  |  | $2015-2016$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Salary | N | Years | Salary | $N$ | Years |
| Erie-BUS | 138,906 | 13 | 6 | 140,382 | 9 | 8 |
| Capital- BUS | 135,522 | 11 | 5 | 137,057 | 12 | 6 |
| U.C.- BUS \& ECON | 106,803 | 11 | 6 | 108,536 | 12 | 7 |
| U.C.- IST | 105,516 | 5 | 6 | 107,258 | 4 | 8 |
| Altoona- BUS \& ENGR | 105,219 | 7 | 8 | 95,130 | 7 | 8 |
| Capital- SCI, ENGR, TEC | 98,064 | 25 | 9 | 97,376 | 24 | 9 |
| Erie-ENGR | 97,979 | 16 | 8 | 97,245 | 15 | 8 |
| Berks | 96,120 | 10 | 6 | 100,260 | 11 | 6 |
| U.C.-ENGR | 92,340 | 15 | 14 | 93,254 | 14 | 14 |
| Abington- SCI \& ENGR | 84,825 | 11 | 10 | 83,277 | 14 | 8 |
| Abington- SS | 84,150 | 10 | 10 | 85,662 | 9 | 12 |


| EBC - Assistant | $2014-2015$ |  |  | $2015-2016$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Salary | N | Years | Salary | N | Years |
| Erie -BUS | 124,344 | 9 | 1 | 126,855 | 8 | 2 |
| Capital- BUS | 111,542 | 12 | 3 | 113,481 | 9 | 3 |
| U.C.- BUS \& ECON | 90,891 | 9 | 3 | 82,440 | 7 | 3 |
| Erie -ENGR | 83,205 | 16 | 4 | 84,753 | 16 | 4 |
| Capital-SCI, ENGR, TEC | 78,723 | 4 | 4 | . | 3 | 5 |
| U.C.-ENGR | 77,904 | 9 | 8 | 79,281 | 7 | 6 |
| Abington-SS | 77,157 | 11 | 1 | 88,151 | 10 | 2 |
| Altoona- BUS \& ENGR | 76,005 | 5 | 2 | 78,219 | 4 | 2 |
| Berks | 75,006 | 6 | 2 | . | 3 | 2 |
| Abington-SCI \& ENGR | 68,004 | 9 | 8 | 69,048 | 5 | 10 |
| U.C.-IST | . | 2 | 3 | . | 2 | 4 |


|  |  | Penn State Berks RDC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year 2013/14 | Beginning Balance | Number of Applications Submitted | Total Amount Requested |
|  | $\$ 86,823.00$ | 40 | $\$ 112,595.00$ |
| Year 2014/15 |  | Number of Applications Submitted | Total Amount Requested |
|  | $\$ 92,533.00$ | 40 | $\$ 102,714.00$ |
| Year 2015/16 |  | Number of Applications Submitted | Total Amount Requested |
|  | $\$ 104,833.00$ | 54 | $\$ 108,000.00$ |
| Year 2016/17 |  | Number of Applications Submitted | Total Amount Requested |
|  | $\$ 108,833.00$ | 49 | $\$ 138,325.00$ |
| Year 2017/18 |  | Number of Applications Submitted | Total Amount Requested |
|  | $\$ 43,411.00$ | 51 | $\$ 137,945.00$ |

## ; (Appendix C)

| Number of Applications Approved | Total Amount Awarded | End Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40 | $\$ 88,370.00$ | $(\$ 1,547.00)$ |
| Number of Applications Approved | Total Amount Awarded |  |
| 39 | $\$ 91,514.00$ | $\$ 1,019.00$ |
| Number of Applications Approved | Total Amount Awarded |  |
| 52 | $\$ 93,250.00$ | $\$ 11,583.00$ |
| Number of Applications Approved | Total Amount Awarded |  |
| 49 | $\$ 109,425.00$ | $(\$ 592.00)$ |
| Number of Applications Approved | Total Amount Awarded |  |
| 30 | $\$ 46,750.00$ | $(\$ 3,339.00)$ |

## APPENDIX E

## Physical Facilities and Safety

## Informational Report on Safety and Security (Charge 3)

In a meeting with Kim Berry, Kevin Rudy and Mark Dawson in March, 2018, the current status of safety and security was discussed. It appears that the biggest change and challenge this year has been the centralization of the University Police. The purpose of the centralization was to bring greater homogeneity to law enforcement across campuses in other locations, but there have been some challenges along the way.

The centralization process is going well and has actually shed light on how Berks campus doing compared to other campuses. For example, our police staff is highly trained, has access to equipment and resources such as interview rooms, video, and has established communication with residential assistants that other campuses may not have. Centralization has had a short term effect of lowering the number of law enforcement personnel currently employed at our campus, because of officer relocation to other campuses. Our campus police staff has been reduced from 8 to 4 . However, two more officers are in the process of being hired.

Campus police continue to preserve community outreach with law enforcement and safety departments across the commonwealth campuses. Eventually the plan is that there will be a seamless sharing of resources across campuses and our campus has been the leader in this for years.

What sets Berks safety and security apart is that we are one of the few campuses that have naloxone (Narcan) available, as well as a medical drop box in Perkins for the disposal of controlled substances. We also have ballistic shields for police cars, ballistic helmets, and our police staff is stocked with long guns and shot guns---and Commander Rudy is working on expanding these resources to all campuses.

We are also fortunate that our campus police are highly trained to respond in an overdose situation. Our officers have been collaborating with other organizations (Reading Hospital, Service Access Management, and more) to respond to the opioid crisis. We have been working with local health services to provide referrals and emergency response. Reading Hospital is scheduled to host a Triage Training for officers and will supply initial emergency response kits. Officers provide referrals for opioid abuse and mental health-suggesting there is good collaboration with local health services. Commander Rudy also sits on the Board of Directors for the Council of Chemical Abuse (COCA) and people appointed him jointly as deputy for the county DA-and negotiator of the B-Cert team. This allows county law enforcement to conduct trainings at our campus which provides greater familiarity with our campus and emergency response policies. In the same regard, local and state law enforcement have attended the many events offered on campus such as presentations by John Douglas, Peter Langman, and Special Agent Kim Jin.

As school shootings have been in the public eye, training for campus faculty/students about school shootings were addressed. Commander Rudy noted that upon invitation, their staff will show a video called STAY SAFE in classes. Officers are also required to conduct Cleary Drills, and every other year they conduct active shooter drills and evacuate buildings and retain communication with building monitors.

Mark Dawson noted that card access within the campus is increasing. Card access has increased in the library (adding card access doors), Perkins, and Franco is scheduled for card access next. With card access also comes CCTV. $\mathrm{M} \& \mathrm{O}$ is also working on increasing and updating lighting throughout the campus. The University has a design standard for lighting (so many lumens per area) and most lights were installed prior to the current standards so measures are being taken to bring the campus to new design standards. For instance, they are currently replacing old lighting with LED lights and there is another phase scheduled for this Spring. Almost all the academic core of the college has new LED lights and they moving to the residential areas next to retrofit the lighting there. They are also evaluating lighting areas to be improved such as the walkway from the Residence parking lot to the athletic field to Berkshire Boulevard.

One additional challenge with centralization is how to tease apart public safety from environmental health and safety and workplace safety. These are issues that are currently being is being discussed.

## APPENDIX E

# Physical Facilities and Safety <br> Charge 5—Informational Report 

The overall Sustainability efforts on campus are based on the idea of informing, engaging, inspiring and empowering the Penn State Berks community to achieve the desired results.

## Completed Tasks

The downward trend in paper waste continued to lead to a decrease in student printing and resulted in less faculty/staff printing. This trend continued for the past several years from 2014 till $201 \mathbf{7}^{1}$, according to Penn State Berks Sustainability website. There were also sustained efforts with increasing recycling program during the current year. These focused efforts include programs like Paper Waste Reduction and Students for Sustainability Club. These efforts include videos made by a few students to promote and educate about recycling on campus.

The Sustainability Team has held "Film Screening: Triple Divide" and "PLANEAT Film Viewing" events and Food Compost initiatives reaching out to all constituents on campus to get involved. As a result of a Food Compost initiative organized by Students for Sustainability Club, the campus has begun to collect compostable food waste which is turned into compost used in the campus landscape. Such awareness linking our lifestyle of what we eat with sustainability is a notable contribution this year. Moreover, internationally recognized advocate and speaker Dominic Frongillo was invited on campus this year as part of Speaker series. Also, for the first time this year, the Sustainability Team is making efforts to increase awareness through informal discussions on campus about environmentally and socially conscious investments.

The aim of such activities has been to cut down on waste and become a more sustainable campus both in structure and action. Similar to last year, there was a training session for residence hall assistants at the onset of the academic year and the team has had monthly meetings for faculty, staff, and students to engage in sustainability related conversations and plan for activities and events.

The information below is more for information purposes.

[^0]
## 1- Develop and promote academic programs that address sustainability

Similar to past year, there are a number of courses that focus directly or indirectly on sustainability. BiSC3 is heavily focused on sustainability and involves students in a number of sustainability related projects as part of a community-based research project. Several English and history courses focus on sustainability including those taught by Dr. Grobman, Dr. Weisser, Dr. Mart, and Prof. Berger. The creation of the Sustainability Team has brought together students, faculty, and staff and has allowed for conversations about cross collaborations, including those within and across programs.

During the Spring 2018, Dr. Kazempour started number of notable sustainability projects as part of BiSC3 course. They include several projects under the umbrella of City of Reading, Glenside School, and Schuylkill River National Heritage.

2- Create sustainability focused programs and learning opportunities for external constituents
The Sustainability Team conducted a survey during 2016-2017 year to ascertain everyone's interest in sustainability related issues, areas of interest in terms of events, possible interest in getting involved with sustainability initiatives, etc. They have been working with the survey results to plan films and activities during 2017-2018. The "Film Screening: Triple Divide" and "PLANEAT Film Viewing" events were in line with those survey results.

## 3- Utilize the Sustainability Team, the Center for Service Learning and Community Based Research and The Learning Factory projects to identify and advance sustainable practices, programs, and solutions.

There is no specific information that relate to this year. Overall, the Sustainability Team has been very active in getting many things done in the past 3.5 years. The Mobius recycling program and the new signs were a direct result of discussions within the Team. They worked closely with the Center for Service Learning on some of the service learning projects such as the EACAP project in BiSC3 and the Schuylkill River Trail project that was led by Laurie Grobman and several other faculty members. The team is involved in making educational/informative videos and plan to complete more. Events and programs were all planned, coordinated, and implemented by members of the Sustainability Team.

## Physical Facilities and Safety-Charge 5: Energy Savings/Efficiency 2017-2018 Informational Report

Most initiatives for energy savings/efficiency began in 2016-2017. Those initiatives are now in baseline operations during 2017-2018. There was only one new project under the umbrella of energy savings during period of 2017-2018. This involved upgrading another phase of site lighting to more energy-efficient LED technology.

We expect that energy savings/efficiency projects started in 2016-2017 may have some payoff in the 20172018 period in terms of lower energy bill. If we analyze the actual Kilo Watts Hour usage during the last two years, there was about 7\% drop in actual Kilo Watts Hour usage from 2015-2016 to 2016-2017 annual period ${ }^{1}$. This drop may be due to consistent energy savings/efficiency efforts mentioned below but we need further analysis to be sure. Last year's projects and their further updates are described below:

The Energy Management System for the campus was replaced with a system that will allow more efficient control and management of energy use on campus.

The HVAC system in Franco was replaced with a more efficient system, and a number of halogen lights were replaced with LEDs. In all, the Franco renovation eliminated 10 electric heat pumps. With these changes, the heating and cooling equipment that was originally installed to service only the addition to the building will be able to handle the entire heating and cooling load for the entire building. We do not have any information on further progress to report at this time for this project.

Nine window mounted air conditioning units in the Peiffer Farmhouse were replaced with a high efficiency heat pump system.

Over the summer last year, parking lot and road lights were replaced with LED lighting.

A solar thermal disc was installed behind the greenhouse on the Peiffer Farm that will provide heat for the greenhouse. A number of adjustments to the original installation were made this summer, and the system will be back online for the upcoming heating season. Additionally, a three disc electric array is under development behind the Implement Building. The system is a demonstration site for the start-up technology firm CEWA, which is based in Wyomissing. The project and CEWA seed money has been provided by Ben Franklin Technology Partners of Northeastern PA. When operational, the array should provide around 30 kW of electricity to the Peiffer Farm and "overflow" onto the public electric grid. We do not have any information on further progress to report at this time for this project.

The Zimride rideshare service was made available to Penn State Berks students. With this service, riders can either post or search for a ride to share, either as a rider or driver, to other Penn State campuses and any other location.

[^1]
## APPENDIX G <br> Faculty Affairs Committee 2017-2018 <br> Informational Report

## Introduction:

The Faculty Affairs committee had the following charges: Charge \#10 (Review role of PCs, including workload, service recognition, consistency of release policy, and how the numbers of student majors are counted) and Charge \#12 (Review and compare how research productivity is evaluated across disciplines, and in comparisons with other campuses).

For both charges the committee split into 2 sub-committees with three members each, tasked with a specific charge. The sub-committees met individually to generate preliminary findings and the whole committee met a few times during the spring semester to discuss the findings of each subcommittee. In both cases, a lack of information from external sources was a major obstacle towards progress.

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

## Charge \#12

## Information and Discussion:

For charge \#12, the sub-committee was unable to find any publicly available information or rubric on how different Penn State campuses or other institutions outside of Penn State measure research productivity. Informal conversations with colleagues and Division Heads at Berks and other Penn State campuses revealed interest in a rubric to help evaluate scholarly work such as grant reports, blog posts, and encyclopedia entries. Based on a lack of evaluation mechanism at other institutions, the committee was unable to prepare a report of best practices because there did not seem to be any practices to select as best. A survey of colleagues at different institutions (Penn State and otherwise) could be developed in order to provide unofficial information on how individuals perceive how research productivity is measured in their discipline and institution.

## Conclusions:

The committee would like to continue with this charge next academic year to produce a best practices document.
During the discussion it was brought up that the full professor promotion committees (division and college level) are all appointed which is different than the promotion and tenure committees.

The committee recommends that the faculty affairs committee next year investigates the possibility of electing the full professor committees just as the promotion and tenure committees are.

Sub-committee on research productivity
Ali Alikhani-Koopaei
Rocky Huang
Jen Murphy

## Faculty Affairs Sub-Committee <br> Program Coordinator Responsibilities and Compensation (Informational Report)

## Introduction:

The Executive Committee charged the Faculty Affairs committee with the following:
Review the role of PCs, including workload, service recognition, consistency of release policy, and how the numbers of student majors are counted. Prepare an advisory report on current policies and any specific changes recommended. A sub-committee was formed to work on this charge.

## Information:

The sub-committee requested all full-time faculty respond to a survey about concerns and perceptions related to the role of program coordinators at the college. There were 44 total responses. The sub-committee members accessed all of the responses. From those responses, a quick discourse analysis was completed by one of the committee members to identify key issues noted by faculty and was shared at a committee meeting on Friday, April 6 ${ }^{\text {th }}$. Some responses included here have been altered to remove any possible identifying information without changing the meaning of the comments.

## Discussion and conclusions:

This is a very complex and important charge that cannot be completed this semester. Thus, we present this report and suggest the following: First, we request that the Executive Committee once again charge the Faculty Affairs Committee to deal with this issue next year so that we can work on a clear and effective action plan for this charge. Second, we ask that after reading the report, you send any comments/concerns to members of the sub-committee by June 1, 2018 so that we can take your perspectives into account next year.

Sub-committee on program coordinator responsibilities and compensation Benjamin Infantalino
Lolita Paff
Michele Ramsey

# Discourse analysis of responses to the faculty survey on PC responsibilities/compensation 

## Question 1: What, if any, concerns do you have about PC compensation?

The majority of comments (22) addressed PC compensation/workload with most comments noting the compensation is not enough for the workload. Three comments were more specific about compensation/alternatives:

1) One suggested PCs should be paid by the hour.
2) Another notes that summer pay is only $\$ 20 /$ hour, which isn't the correct rate relative to a salary as a whole.
3) One comment breaks down compensation vs. salary very specifically:

If a salary breaks down to an hourly rate of $\$ 50$ and one student requires about 8 hours of work per year, and if a program has 50 students, the value of the PCs work is $\$ 20,000$ per year. The PC is only compensated $\$ 8000$ per year, not even $50 \%$ of what the PC should be earning based on salary. This is a concern, specifically with regard to labor laws.

Eight comments addressed the burden of PC work, specifically noting the impacts of being undervalued/taken for granted, the complexity of the work, the additional time spent on campus, the fact that responsibilities are growing (2), the amount of intangible work done, and questions about why anyone would want the job given the drawbacks (2).

Some comments addressed equity issues such as: PCs for minors needing to be compensated (2); course releases and bigger vs. smaller programs (2)(the same course release for 7 or 49 students, for example); concerns that compensation stops at 150 students; the inability of some PCs to take course releases because of faculty shortages; and that there is more work required for programs that are accredited and education (which has state law to contend with) (2).One comment noted that liaisons to UP majors/colleges should not get course releases and another noted that they do not believe that PCs are compensated equally across the college.

A few comments focused on performance measures with one noting that there is no means of judging PC competence and another noting that compensation models should change or PCs should lose release time for underperformance.

A final set of comments dealt with how majors are counted, with one person noting that it's a concern for them, another noting that without a consistent time frame for declaring, there's too much fluidity in the numbers, and another asking how sophomores are counted now that they can declare their major.

Five respondents said they have no concerns on this topic.

## Question 2: What, if any, concerns do you have about how your majors are counted?

Eleven respondents specifically address that we should count all majors. Answers noted: that all majors should count because they use resources; that pre-majors should count as well; that as a stand-alone college we should count majors like UP does (they count all declared majors) (2); that not counting all majors can cheat PCs out of release time (which can discourage people from the job); and some asking how sophomores are counted (2).

Concerns about workload noted that students who are younger (sophomore) and pre-majors can often take even more time/resources than older students, that dealing with transfer students takes more time than other students and should be counted, and that it takes additional work/time to bother students about the need to change their major.

There were a number of about how majors are counted, with four people noting some mixture relating to the fact that we don't count students who change mid-semester, double majors, or minors. One person noted that numbers are inaccurate because of pre-major, major, and non-major designations. Another notes that numbers are wrong because students who finish ETM requirements and are seniors can still not be declared, so they're not counted. Two responses noted that it's problematic that students don't declare their majors when they should. One noted that we don't count transfer students immediately, and another suggested a consistent time frame for declaration of major. Finally, some comments specifically address counting mechanisms, with one person noting that no one knows how the counting is done, another noting that LionPath and data warehouse numbers don't match, and another suggesting that we only use LionPath numbers.

Some comments pointed problems with equity. One person notes that 50 is an arbitrary number since 40 students take as much time as 50 . Another notes that Berks majors need more support to allow them to grow, and another person suggesting that we should use numbers from the end of the previous year so that PCs know before the fall what their release time will be for that academic year.

Seven people had no concerns.

## Question 3: What, if any, concerns you have about job title/organizational structure at the college?

General comments addressed: PCs get little compensation, little power, but major responsibilities (5); that PCs should make decisions with regard to their areas of responsibility; that PCs should have authority of the budget (2), scheduling (1), and hiring/firing (1); that the PC job is a chair position without the compensation/title/power (9); that calling PCs chairs would be more meaningful to families looking at the college; that we need to better acknowledge what PCs do; and that PCs have no power to make faculty do anything.

Specific concerns included: Power being concentrated in PCs that hold the position too long and that PCs sometimes make bad decisions, such as taking a course for additional comp when other classes in the program are struggling to make.

Some noted concerns about the growing number of non-tenured faculty as PCs: These concerns included having non-tenured faculty as PCs means PCs will have even less power because of a lack of job security; most P-1s and P-3s require "senior faculty" for the PC position, which is happening less and less; and that the excessive work of a PC means fewer tenured faculty will do the work.

Some suggested changes in deciding PC conditions: All tenured faculty should rotate in 3year positions; administrative jobs should be subject to review of work, course releases, and compensation by an outside committee not linked to the position; there should be clearly defined guidelines that apply to all faculty for course releases; that an independent committee should review all course releases on an annual or semi-annual basis and publish the results; and that PCs should be elected by program faculty (which could include nondisciplinary faculty as PCs).

One comment directly contradicts this last comment by noting that reporting to a PC without a background in the program or major can create problems for program success.

One comment suggested that there isn't clarity about the position of PC.
Structural suggestions included the following: We need professional PCs; that we've outgrown PCs; that we need program chairs to mentor faculty in their disciplines; and that we need program chairs because DHs can't deal mentor in all disciplines.

Two other comments were that it "seems adequate" and that "PC is an OK title".
Eleven respondents had no concerns.

## Question 4: What, if any, concerns you have about the role of PC in advertising and retention?

Comments about structural problems included the following: Suggesting that administrative offices on campus should do this work (4); that most PCs have no training in these things (4).

Some comments specifically pointed to relationships with the Strategic Communications department: This department needs more money to advertise our programs; that PCs shouldn't have to reach out to SC to promote—SC should reach out to PCs; that PCs are responsible for recruiting/retention but aren't part of larger college discussions of strategy; and that UP regulations on our advertising puts us in a stranglehold.

Comments also talked about the burden this work puts on the PC: Six responses suggested additional compensation for this work and two others added that this should be a PCs responsibility but that they should be compensated for it; it is too much work for PCs (2); it should be the responsibility of all faculty; we should minimize this burden, which is an especially big burden for larger majors; PCs shouldn't be doing this if they're not considered chairs, that this work is the only work that administrators focus on with regard to PCs, ignoring their teaching and research concerns and only being concerned with the numbers of students; having PCs go to open houses and calling students is going above and beyond; that this seems to be working well but needs additional compensation and a better title; and it is time consuming.

Specific concerns include: PCs discouraging students from enrolling in other programs; that advertising on and off campus seems to favor Business and Engineering; that the climate around recruitment and retention creates unproductive competition between programs; that families need hear the term "department chair" at events; and that administrators regularly point to failing and succeeding majors at meetings.

General comments included that the PC should be responsible for these things (2), that PCs should go to high schools, and that retention work seems reasonable.

Seven people had no concerns and one noted that they didn't know the expectations of PC.

## Question 5: What, if any, concerns do you have about the role of PC in scheduling?

Some comments dealt with process: the planning of schedules should happen sooner; we need to make sure that classes don't collide; we need consistency in the process; it should be done to benefit students; the PC should ensure coverage; it is difficult to coordinate instructors/courses/rooms to the satisfaction of faculty and students; PCs should coordinate with other programs that cross-list.

A good number of comments pointed to conflicts in the current process: faculty shouldn't have to amend their schedules to appease PC preferences; PCs should take into account FT faculty preferences; PCs need to have this authority (5); PCs do the work and are then overruled by the registrar; if DH and Academic Dean want to have a big role in scheduling, they should do it themselves; PCs create schedules and then faculty schedule themselves with registrar or administrators (3), causing headaches for the PC; no one knows who's in charge or who has the final say; and happy with the way the registrar helps.

General comments included: It's fine; there are no problems if the PC submits the schedule on time; a professional PC should do this work; this is a big task; and PC is not adequately compensated.

Twelve respondents had no concerns.

## Question 6: What, if any, concerns do you have about the role of PC in maintaining program integrity (e.g. faculty/course evaluation)?

A number of comments addressed the desire to have (more) PC control in this area: Six noted that PCs should be able to see teaching evaluations. Reasons for this included that they can't deal with problems if they don't see them (2), that they can't maintain program integrity without seeing them (2), that PCs should be involved if they're chairs, that PCs can't schedule who teaches what effectively without seeing evaluations, and that PCs have experience in the discipline.

Other comments dealing with control note the following: That this should be under DH and Dean control; that PCs don't have enough authority; that PCs for minors should be able to see evals, that this should be a PC duty but also compensated, that PCs shouldn't be seeing evals unless they are mentoring faculty, that the PC has no power to maintain program integrity, and that this should be the PCs should have this role. One person asked if PCs saw evals or not.

Time issues included the following: That this is the responsibility of the PC, but that it is time consuming and there is no guidance and that it takes more time each year.

Process issues included: A lack of guidance and policies concerning minimum standards of program integrity; inaction of administrators when problems regarding faculty are brought up by PC can cause big problems for the program; and that regular teaching evaluations should happen by PC and DH more than just every five years.

General comments include: We should get feedback from advisory councils and other sources and one person "loves" that the PC has a role in hiring adjuncts, assessment, and overall program integrity.

Nine respondents had no concerns.

## Question 7: What, if any, concerns do you have about the role of PC in advising students?

General comments included: One person "loves" that PCs advise and work with the registrar as well; that some are better than others; and that is "seems appropriate"

Comments regarding time and compensation include: It is extremely time consuming without equitable compensation (2); LionPath causes problems; PCs seem overburdened; there is disparity among majors because of program size; PCs for UP programs should not get releases; Saturday programs are ineffective because usually general questions are asked that don't require a PC; PC should be central adviser for extra compensation; and transfer students take up a lot of time.

Comments regarding the role of PC include: they should do some advising; the PC should be able to substitute courses; they should only advise transfer students; they should be available to advise and direct students; why do PCs advise transfer students on non-major courses when we have a transfer counselor in admissions?; PCs do this well; PCs and faculty should not review degree audits and syllabi for articulation agreements; PCs shouldn't advise transfer students.

Comments linked to balancing workload include: Advising should be handled by other faculty; the advising load should be shared more; PCs often advise students not on their list because they are required to sign things, etc.; PCs shouldn't have to pick up the slack for other faculty (3); and the advising center shouldn't be advising students that transfer into our majors.

Eight respondents had no concerns.

## Question 8: What, if any, concerns do you have about program budgets/spending?

Issues of transparency include: There needs to be more transparency (4); it would be helpful to know what each program has; there is a lack of discretion when it comes to PC spending; budgets and costs related to course releases should be available; the budget created at the beginning of the year isn't real and everything should be approved throughout the year; PCs should be able to see what they have in their budgets at all times; the parameters for using money aren't clear; and the PC needs authority over who spends money from program budgets.

Issues of equity include: The budgets for different programs aren't equal (2);our programs don't have enough money (2); Our budget is cut, but where does the money go?; to protect their budget for the next year, programs must spend all of their money; we have an adequate budget; budget is sufficient but should roll over; budgets are equal even though some programs need more; we shouldn't give money from one program that spent wisely to another program that didn't; and when divisions don't have equal budgets the divisions with bigger budgets have programs with more money de facto (e.g. science has money from the DH for student conference travel).

Concerns about authority over budget: It's top down; the DH should be in charge of budgets; PCs need more authority; if a PC is using money according to UP rules, administrators shouldn't be able to deny that spending (2); PCs know best how to spend money for their programs (3); since only one administrator has been a department chair, there's no reason to micromanage PCs; different programs need to spend money on different things (e.g., discovery majors vs. highly recognized majors); and the PC is responsible for the budget but the DH decides?

One respondent noted that this work should be shared with an administrative assistant.
Ten respondents had no concerns.

## Question 9: Are there any other concerns not listed above that you'd like to make the committee aware of?

Comments about PC compensation/respect: PCs should be chairs with more power (2); PCs are overworked (2); We should compensate PCs more (3); PC duties shouldn't increase without an increase in compensation; PCs are not respected; and fear that we will lose good PCs.

Some comments pointed to impacts on faculty: Four suggested that PCs need administrative assistants (4); duties should be clear and narrowed; there are too many unnecessary meetings; we should alleviate issues from transfer students; being a PC hurts progress to full professor.

The parameters of PC were addressed in these comments: The PC should determine study abroad credits (a very arduous process occurs now); the PC has no say in how labs are rundifferent faculty run them differently; PC must deal with transfer errors by admissions staff; and the PC needs direct and easy access to every major via LionPath.

Comments linked to inequality include: Variation of duties depending on program; programs with accreditation and state laws to deal with have more work (1) and there is no means for a PC to make faculty do the work (1); PCs with 7 students get the same as PCs with 47perhaps we need a sliding scale; most accreditation work is done during summer for only $\$ 20$ an hour.

Other comments include: Faculty without programs are isolated and left out; this is a waste of your time and mine; and we should support low enrolled majors with more advertising by professionals.

Five respondents had no concerns.

## Question 10: Are there elements of how we run programs at the college that you think are working well? That is, are there things that you think don't need changing?

Comments regarding PCs: PCs need to be chairs or heads of departments; PCs need more power/prestige; clear guidelines would improve efficiency; we need to shift power away from administrators and have less micromanaging; PCs should chair any tenure-track search (2); Fine if nothing changes, but more compensation is needed; and the PC should be in charge of defining faculty needs and hiring.

PC workload comments include: PCs are overextended; We get a lot of the same information over different meetings-this information could be in newsletter or email; and advisory councils may not be useful at the program level.

Other comments include: Our division functions as a team; Our PC is amazing-I don't know how she does it all; Scheduling of courses works well (2); we need regular assessment projects; campus support is fantastic; it's not a transparent process so it's hard to tell; define "working well"; having external evaluations of programs works well; having PCs schedule and advise new and transfer students is efficient; more shared authority with faculty and programs; administration is supportive of my program.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ https://www.sustainability.bk.psu.edu/2017/07/04/paper-waste-reduction/\#more-668

[^1]:    1 This is actual to actual comparison and may not reflect the actual energy savings or efficiency. The drop in KW Hour usage may be due to weather conditions. More analysis is required.

