

**Penn State Berks Faculty Senate**  
**Monday, March 30, 2020**  
**12:15-1:15pm**  
**Zoom (Meeting Room ID: 659-863-691)**  
**Agenda**

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Approval of the Minutes of the February 2020 Meeting** (Appendix A)
- 3. Announcements and Reports by the Chair**
- 4. Reports of Officers and University Senators**

Vice Chair Ryan  
Secretary English  
University Senator Bartolacci  
University Senator Snyder  
University Senator Zambanini  
University Senator Maurer  
SGA President Steve Filby  
Student Senator

- 5. Informational Reports**
  - Research Productivity Evaluation, Faculty Affairs (Appendix B)
  - Standing Committee Minutes (Appendix C)
- 6. Comments for the Good of the Order**
- 7. Comments/Announcements by Administrators**

Chancellor Hillkirk  
Associate Dean Larson
- 8. Unfinished Business**
- 9. Forensic Business**
- 10. Motions from Committees**
- 11. New Legislative Business**
- 12. Adjournment**

## Appendix A

### Penn State Berks Senate

February 24, 2020

12:15-1:15 PM, Multi-Purpose Room, Perkins Student Center

Attendees: Donna Chambers, Alex Chisholm, Valerie Cholet, Deb Dreisbach, Catherine Dunning Catanach, Colleen English, Maria Fellie, Mike Fianza, Nathan Greenauer, Sarah Hartman-Caverly, Ben Infantolino, Mahsa Kazempour, Jim Laurie, Joseph Mahoney, Lauren Martin, Cesar Martinez-Garza, Cliff Maurer, Catherine Mello, Pauline Milwood, Dawn Pfeifer Reitz, Matthew Rhudy, Marissa Ruggiero, Holly Ryan, Jessica Schocker, Allison Singles, Stephen Snyder, Hartono Tjoe, Bob Zambanini (Faculty); Marie Smith (Staff); Pradip Bandyopadhyay, Kim Berry, Paul Esqueda, Lisa Glass, Keith Hillkirk, Janelle Larson, Belén Rodríguez Mourelo, John Shank (Administration); G. Michael Schott, Jr. (Students).

#### 1. Call to Order

2. **Additions, Corrections, and Approval of Minutes of January 27, 2020** –The Chair called for any additional additions, corrections to the minutes; hearing none, a motion was called to approve the minutes, second; *the minutes were approved.*

#### 3. Announcements and Reports by the Chair –

- A reminder email was recently sent to the faculty senate list-serv in-regard to the Community Survey. To date, the student response rate is low, less than 10% in some units. Faculty are being asked to talk about the importance of the survey and its potential to impact the quality of the student experience on campus. I will forward to faculty again later today. Included in the email will be a link to the survey which also provides rationale for the survey.
- The senate election process at University Park is behind schedule. The number of senate seats open for next year is yet to be determined due to a decrease in the number of faculty. This information will be shared when known. Time is running short but if you have interest you may contact any member of the executive committee.
- The Chair asked Parliamentarian Rhudy to provide an outline for our local senate elections. Any faculty member may nominate themselves or others as well as receive nominations from the floor. As per the Senate Constitution, if there is not more than one person running for a position, the Chair may direct the Secretary to pass unanimous ballot for that nominee. Nominees are announced at the second to last meeting for the year which will be the March meeting.
- It has come to light that faculty are unaware of the role senate officers play more specifically, what they do when they go to University Park each month. Conversations are taking place to have an open forum, Q&A session, for faculty so they may ask questions and learn more about the overall process. Possible meeting dates will be offered in the near future to coordinate.

#### 4. Reports of Officers and University Senators -

- **Vice Chair Ryan** – No report.
- **Secretary English** – No report.
- **University Senator Bartolacci** – Not present.
- **University Senator Dreisbach** – An overview of the FERPA process was shared via a PowerPoint presentation. A FERPA form is required if you are providing information from a student's educational record and this must be provided for each and every institution or place that the student is sending a recommendation to. Several important takeaways were shared. The FERPA process is retroactive. Students must complete and sign the form, and the form must be kept on file for life. It was suggested that a designate be established at each campus location to serve as the file keeper. In order for the electronic form to be authenticated it must come from a PSU email address. A question was raised, what would happen if a student no longer had a PSU email account? The response, this scenario was not addressed. The chancellor inquired if this information was a recommendation from the University Senate or if it was policy. The response, it is under university Policy AD11 noting this is more than a recommendation, it is a requirement. FERPA law has been in place since 1974 but due to the increased sensitivity to sensitive information is the primary reason for this now being addressed. The chancellor shared follow-up should take place with our campus registrar as we go forward in the

process. Discussion followed; scenarios shared. A question was raised, what is the downside to this, what are the legal ramifications? The chancellor replied, in his opinion, some of this is in reflect to the ongoing issues at the university related to risk and having an Office of General Council. This is inline with many other policy changes brought about by the university. He also shared faculty has every right to decline writing a letter of recommendation.

- **University Senator Snyder** – My time serving on Faculty Affairs is winding down. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities committee is the committee that takes care of concerns of tenure and soon to be promotion and fixed-term faculty. According to policy, fixed term cannot sit on the committee; however, the Senate rules say otherwise so work is being done to change this. As long as your ratio of faculty is the majority of fixed term faculty, you have a problem the way you staff that committee. University-wide fixed term is over 50%.

In a recent meeting, the subject of retaliation was addressed among university senators which surprised me. In my time serving, I never witnessed any retaliation from administration towards university senators. If you are planning to run for a university senate seat you should not fear retaliation by your administration. You have to be prepared to speak truth to power, if you cannot do that, do not run.

I also sit on council; we have a meeting tomorrow to approve the next agenda so anything I say now may not occur. A few things I want to bring to your attention, one is to read your senate newsletter. This newsletter contains all pending reports. Also, we are looking into a new policy on campus closures specific to inclement weather. In addition, a report on office space standards is being addressed so that when new buildings or renovations are made, account is made for private offices for fulltime faculty. There will be a promotion flow informational report coming out which sponsored by Faculty Affairs that I encourage all to read, especially fixed term faculty.

- **University Senator Zambanini** – Work remains ongoing within the University Planning committee in-regard to faculty office space issues.
- **University Senator Maurer** – A general overview of what the university senate does is there are about ten sub-committees or more. Four primary meetings are held; one starts Monday night which is a caucus type meeting. This is followed by committee meetings Tuesday morning and a lunch where each committee reports on what they did in a commonwealth caucus type setting. This is followed in the afternoon with a general session where either the provost, president or both are present to provide any updates and any voting takes place. Senator Snyder added there are fifteen standing committees of the university faculty senate and seven other committees that are tied directly to the Senate, and this year there are three special committees which can increase or decrease depending upon the year.
- **SGA President Steve Filby** – Not present.
- **Student Senator** – The SGA has been looking into ways to increase student engagement on campus, more specifically, annual legacy type events. This past fall we did the freshmen convocation, which was a success. Next fall, we would like to do class-specific events such as a sophomore welcome, senior welcome, etc. This spring, the last Saturday before finals week we are looking to host PSU Olympics with physical and cognitive activities being held in the morning followed by a cook-out in the afternoon. All will be invited to participate.

## 5. Comments/Announcements by Administrators

- **Chancellor Hillkirk** –
  - The festivities surrounding National Engineers Week were a success. I would like to thank Drs. Esqueda, Zambanini, Professor Terry Speicher and others for their efforts in organizing the week-long event. Many folks returned back to campus to attend this event which was a success.
  - Construction for the Beaver renovation project is about to get underway and was officially approved by the Board of Trustees last Friday at their annual meeting. Groundbreaking will be held on Wednesday, March 25, over the common hour, all will be invited and an announcement will be sent in the near future.
  - The information surrounding the Coronavirus is a bit troubling. If you have any students who are concerned, worried, please let either your Division Head, Dr. Larson, Joe Webb or I know or immediately refer them to the counseling office. Jonathan Kukta is looking into the possibility of housing any students who may be unable to travel back home in the residence halls over the summer

months. At this time, the feeling is students aren't so much worried for themselves as they are for family members who are located in these affected areas.

- The Strategic Planning Council will reconvene this Friday, February 28 to review our current Strategic Plan and make any necessary recommendations. This council is representative of various stakeholder groups not only including faculty, staff and students but also community and advisory board members. A summary of the meeting will be posted on the Berks Intranet and all are encouraged to be involved to the extent that they can to be involved in these conversations. Changes that are made along the way will be updated and notification will be sent to the campus community via email. The process this time will be different, campuses will produce their plans to University Park who will then come up with their plan. Deadline for submission to University Park is July 31, 2020.
- On April 1, Penn State Berks will be hosting an event what is to be called A Conversation on Innovation Economy at GoggleWorks. All will be invited to attend. Part of that morning will include what's called a Grow PA event which is a collaboration between the University, the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce and the Governor's Office. The focus will be on how to strengthen Pennsylvania's innovation economy which is not very healthy. Also invited is Ariel Coro who is a Cuban immigrant and nationally known speaker on the relationship of innovation and diversity.
- **Interim Associate Dean Larson –**
  - Notification from Starfish was sent today as a reminder to faculty that mid-semester reporting time has begun and will run through March 4.
  - On March 2, Penn State Berks will be hosting a conversation on undergraduate research. If you have students involved in undergraduate research, please encourage their participation.
  - We typically have a teaching colloquium on the morning of the day of commencement, which is May 7. This year, you will be invited to participate in a workshop which will be held around mid-morning on Friday, May 8. Colleen Tillger, Counseling Services Office, will be hosting the workshop for faculty and staff and the topic will be on deescalating conflict. Tips will be shared on how best to handle these types of situations especially as we move into an election year.

**6. Unfinished Business – None**

**7. Forensic Business – None**

**8. Motions from Committees - None**

**9. Informational Reports from Committees**

- **Grading Practices and Grade Inflation, Academic Affairs (Appendix B)** – An overview as well as statistics and results from the faculty survey were provided. The main takeaways from the report include faculty take different things into consideration when determining their grading practices. Our survey is indicating for the most part faculty are trying to avoid any bias in their grading. We encourage faculty to read the report and while we do not have any recommendations to make to administration, this information is valuable for faculty to read, digest and self-reflect. In terms of policy and administration and trying to combat grade inflation, general consensus for the literature is good luck, it's a global issue and extremely difficult to fight on your own. If this is going to be a major effort from Penn State to change, its not going to be a Penn State Berks thing, it's got to be at least a Penn State University thing if not a United State thing but really it should be an Earth thing.
- **Research Productivity Evaluation, Faculty Affairs (Appendix C)** – The Chair indicated Vice Chair Ryan has agreed to postpone her report until the next meeting due to lack of time. No other committee chairs had comments to make on their reports.
- **Standing Committee Minutes (Appendix D)**

**10. New Legislative Business – None**

**11. Comments for the Good of the Order** – Mike Fidanza shared he currently serves on the provost's task force on promotion committee. Currently, there are issues with commonwealth campus faculty getting promoted

to full rank professor status. Associate level faculty at Berks have also been having difficulty being promoted to full rank. This has prompted two questions, why and what do we do about it. During fall semester, the committee worked on a report to share with the provost and is currently in process of making recommendations for Provost Jones' consideration. More details to follow. Discussion followed.

## **12. Adjournment**

## Faculty Affairs Committee Informational Report on Research Productivity Evaluation

### Introduction

The Faculty Affairs committee of the Penn State Berks Senate was given the following charge: *Review and compare how research productivity is evaluated across disciplines and in comparison to other campuses. Prepare legislative report with best practices and campus policies to understand disciplinary differences and value work equitably.* This charge is relevant to our committee because faculty are evaluated by their peers and by administrators, who do not necessarily share the same research fields, and compensation is tied to evaluative decisions that include research productivity. It is therefore of interest to the faculty to be aware of how research productivity is evaluated, both to prepare materials for evaluation to their best advantage and to perform the duties of peer evaluators competently.

### Discussion

The committee gathered information by interviewing the Division Heads at Penn State Berks and from research in the literature available to the non-expert via electronic searches. The nature, volume and field of applicability of the information varies widely from source to source. In the current document, the salient trends observed in the sources are summarized, and some insights about issues that have been studied are shared with the caveat that results from the literature may not be directly applicable to particular cases at Penn State Berks.

The evaluation of research productivity across the disciplines is a multifaceted endeavor which requires criteria developed over time and with careful study and consideration, that are appropriate for the unique faculty at an institution<sup>1</sup>. Few comparative studies of research norms and practices across disciplines are available in the literature<sup>2</sup>. The output generated by individuals in different disciplines, which is considered of value by their disciplinary communities, and which would be the natural starting point for evaluation, is not uniform<sup>1,2</sup>. For example, the value of publishing articles versus books varies greatly across disciplines<sup>2</sup>.

In searching for factors that correlate with higher productivity, it was found that research productivity must be measured in a simple, easily understood, well rationalized and goal-directed manner in relation to each discipline<sup>3</sup>, while a productivity index must not be confused with the goals and values of the institution<sup>3</sup>. Concerns have been raised about bibliometric practices being ineffectual and about the erroneous assumption that productivity is monotonic<sup>3</sup>.

In searching for causes for higher productivity, it was found that more full professors at an institution correlated with higher research productivity, except in social and behavioral sciences<sup>4</sup>. The same authors found that departments in which all the faculty are productive did well<sup>4</sup>, and that research productivity for an institution did not depend on having a “star” researcher. The number of publications produced was found to correlate with the number of faculty and the rank of an institution<sup>5</sup>, in a study that also noted that time off teaching or service may, but does not necessarily, boost publications<sup>5</sup>, and that large grants improved research productivity, but not so small ones<sup>5</sup>.

In work on professional legitimacy, tenure and promotion committees were cautioned to consider achieving a balance between local and cosmopolitan scholars to provide a more dynamic environment, once again highlighting the differences in evaluation of research

productivity from one individual to another<sup>6</sup>. Also focusing on the faculty as individuals, the Education Advisory Board reported that faculty would probably dispute administrators' choices for formulas or composite scores for evaluations, rather than try to improve their productivity scores<sup>7</sup>. In the same work, it was seen that third-party assessment tools were convenient but lacked transparency and should be avoided. Similarly, including external reviewers for yearly faculty activity reports would provide more discipline-specific insights, but would be too costly to be practical<sup>7</sup>.

### **Committee Recommendations**

Although there is no set of "Best Practices" since the evaluation of faculty must necessarily be on a case-by-case basis for each discipline and each career path, there are strategies that may lead to positive outcomes already in place at Penn State Berks:

- Promotion committees should be based on elections rather than appointments by the administration.
- Institution-wide formulas (composite scores) to weigh research productivity indicators should not be considered because of the disparities between programs and subjectivity of such a composite score.

The committee recommends considering the following issues:

- The criteria used to select external reviewers for tenure and promotion should tend to include reviewers from similar four-year baccalaureate degree-granting institutions<sup>7</sup>.
- Administration should ensure mentoring, from working towards a climate in which collaboration is appreciated, to setting up formal mentoring programs as needed, and including generating opportunities for low performing faculty to engage with high performing faculty.
- A deeper understanding as a campus community of the issues of evaluation across the disciplines, as developed for example through periodic seminars given by visiting experts, may be valuable.

In conclusion, there is no set of criteria for the evaluation of research productivity because the output varies greatly across disciplines. Neither direct quantification nor standardized outcomes are appropriate for the diversity of disciplines and career paths of faculty at our institution. However, this informational report discusses research results from the literature and provides recommendations that are amenable to implementation to our college.

1. Summary of input from Division Heads at Penn State Berks  
Khaled Abdou and Lorena Tribe, Spring 2020. Appendix A
2. Comparing Research Productivity Across Disciplines and Career Stages  
Meghna Sabharwal  
*Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 2013 Vol 15, No. 2, pp 141-163
3. Evaluating research productivity - A compilation of papers originally presented at a conference sponsored by The Merrill Advanced Studies Center  
Editor: Mabel L. Rice – MASC Report No. 105 - University of Kansas – June 2001
4. Determinants of research productivity in higher education  
Halil Dundar and Darrell R. Lewis  
*Research in Higher Education*, 1988 Vol 39, No. 6
5. What can university administrators do to increase the publication and citation scores of their faculty members?  
Nabil Amara, Rejean Landry, Norrin Halilem  
*Scientometrics*, 2015 Vol 103, pp 489 - 530
6. From the faculty perspective: Defining, earning, and maintaining legitimacy across academia  
Leslie D. Gonzales and Aimee Lapointe Terosky  
*Teachers College Record*, 2016 Vol 118 pp 1- 44
7. Assessing faculty research productivity at public research institutions  
Kevin Danchisko and Allison Thomas  
Education Advisory Board – Academic Affairs Forum – 2012
8. Variability of research performance across disciplines within universities in non-competitive higher education systems  
Giovannin Abramo et al  
*Scientometrics* 2014 Vol 98 No. 2, pp 777 - 795

Holly Ryan, Chair  
Khaled K. Abdou  
Nathan Greenauer  
Joseph M. Mahoney  
Marissa J. Ruggiero  
Ike Shibley  
Stephen J. Snyder, ex officio  
Lorena Tribe, Vice-Chair



## Appendix A

### **Summary of input from Division Heads at Penn State Berks (Lorena Tribe – 2019)**

The bullet points below are a composite of the interviews carried out in 2019 with Pradip Bandyopadhyay (Science), Belen Rodriguez-Mourelo (HASS) and Lolita Paff (EBC).

- The interviewed DHs all pointed out that there are specific guidelines for the review of research productivity, and these must be respected (ie the green sheets from the rainbow sheets and AC 23).
- Similarly, it was noted that administrators' familiarization with disciplines is a necessary and time-consuming process. Available sources that they consult to develop an understanding of each culture include on-line resources, local colleagues, personal experience, Associate Dean, and Departments at UP and at other institutions.
- A topic addressed by all DHs was quantity vs quality: in terms of produced output numbers are not enough, but a body of research must be documented to be able to formulate an evaluation. Information about most relevant journals or other venues of publication are readily available on the internet including impact factors and other metrics. The DH must consider where value is to be placed and what is universal and what, specific (proceedings vs papers, books vs papers, length of papers, single author or collaborative, position of authors, creative accomplishments, and other categories).
- A consistent research agenda can be inferred from peer-reviews, conference presentations, and developed status as proven by accomplishments. Reliance is placed on the disciplinary umbrella: letters from the Division and from external reviewers, while the role of Associate Dean for a historical, contextual approach and as a route to channel queries, is invaluable.
- Trust colleagues about the information they put forth. Self-reporting is important in terms of framing the information, and in this context, the narrative statement is fundamental. It was noted that formative reviews provide an opportunity for valuable feedback.
- The approach to evaluation and the description of the scope of the challenge to evaluate across disciplines was consistent from one division to another. Nevertheless, in terms of developing a set of criteria for the disciplines in each Division, the response varied slightly. While in Science it seemed somewhat feasible to draw broad strokes categories that could be quantified, in HASS and EBC the DHs pointed out that the large number of highly distinct disciplines involved and, especially in HASS, the number of faculty teaching general education courses that do not necessarily line up with their area of research, did not lend itself to fixed categories. The overall feeling is that there is no single grid, or set of quantifiers, that could ever be applied meaningfully.
- At one point or another of the interviews, every DH expressed their profound respect for colleagues and the importance of focusing on the individual, who is always more than a publication record. There were clear statements of appreciation of diversity, and of the importance of not letting policy be used to discourage individuality. The DHs expressed that they are persistent advocates for faculty and supporters of the process.

---

**Additional comments from Division Head/Associate Dean Esqueda (Khaled Abdou and Lorena Tribe – 2020)**

2019-2020 EBC Division Head Paul Esqueda was presented with the Summary of input from Division Heads at Penn State Berks, and asked for any additional comments he could contribute, given his experience both at Division Head and as Associate Dean, at a meeting with Khaled Abdou and Lorena Tribe on 1/28/2020.

Dr. Esqueda's first point was that beyond the differences in disciplines, there are intrinsic ways in which each individual pursues research in their own field making rigid systems inappropriate for evaluating research productivity across the disciplines. He concurred with the DHs that Penn State already provides a taxonomy of output in the rainbow sheets and in AC23, and that this must be respected.

Another item addressed by Dr. Esqueda was the importance of coaching and mentoring when it comes to supporting productivity in research. For example, having grant writing workshops improves the chances of faculty of accessing external funding. Additionally, workshops discussing the research process and other mechanisms for support could be beneficial, especially when the budget is tight.

A third topic was the importance for faculty to maintain a research pipeline. Dr. Esqueda's perspective as an administrator with years of experience at Penn State Berks is that there is an important number of faculty with doctorates on campus with proven expertise in producing output appropriate in their fields, and that the college is doing well as a whole when it comes to research productivity.

## Appendix C

### **Faculty Affairs Committee Committee Minutes from December 9, 2019 Informational Report**

Present: Holly Ryan (Chair), Joseph Mahoney, Stephen Snyder (Senator, ex officio), Eric Lindsey, Ike Shibley, Janelle Larson (Interim Associate Dean, ex officio)

The meeting was called to order in F 104 at 12:15 PM by Holly. The charges for the committee were reviewed and discussed, with the following outcomes:

**PC Compensation Report:** The committee reviewed the final draft of the PC compensation report. Small edits were made, and the final draft will be sent to Senate for a vote.

**Research Productivity Evaluation Report:** Conversation about the report is tabled until our next meeting where we hope to finalize the report to send to Senate.

**FAR Assessment and Process Report:** The committee discussed how we want to address this charge. Our lengthy discussion primarily focused on the purpose of the charge and how to gather data. We came to a consensus that perhaps this charge would be about transparency of the process and why/how people are scored. The subcommittee (Ike, Joe, Marissa) will draft a survey for the campus community to gather perceptions about the process and assessment criteria from the faculty. The results of this survey will hopefully direct us toward additional data-collection measures.

**Teaching and Advising Assessment in P&T (Charge 11):** This charge will be discussed at upcoming FAC meetings.

**Meeting adjourned at 1:15pm**

**Respectfully Submitted,**

Holly Ryan, FAC Chair

## Faculty Affairs Committee

February 3, 2020

Present: Holly Ryan (Chair), Nathan Greenauer, Joseph Mahoney, Ike Shibley, Stephen Snyder (Senator, ex officio), Lorena Tribe (Vice Chair), Janelle Larsen (Associate Dean of Academic Affairs)

The meeting was called to order in F 104 at 12:20 PM by Holly.

Nathan Greenauer was introduced as an interim member since Eric Lindsey is on Sabbatical Leave during the spring 2020 semester.

The minutes from the previous meeting will be provided by Holly at next meeting.

Holly reviewed the charges for the committee that are still pending:

- **Charge 9.** *Review and compare how research productivity is evaluated across disciplines and in comparison to other campuses. Prepare legislative report with best practices and campus policies to understand disciplinary differences and value work equitably.*  
To be discussed on 2/3/2020 and approved via email prior to Executive Committee meeting on 2/10/2020.
- **Charge 10.** *Building from charge 9, evaluate the process and assessment criteria for the FAR. Prepare informational or advisory and consultative report with recommended best practices and campus policies.*  
FAC will continue to work on this charge during the spring semester.
- **Charge 11.** *Evaluate assessment of teaching and advising, specifically SRTes, in the promotion and tenure process. Prepare legislative report with recommended best practices and campus policies.*  
FAC will also continue to work on this charge. The committee is a little behind schedule since a charge was added, which has already been approved in the Senate.

The Charge 9 report was discussed during the meeting. It was noted that the report was informational rather than legislative, and that a concern was raised about that. Holly will check with the Executive Committee. A FAC note on Charge 12 from 2017 was not included in the report since it was not considered at a Senate meeting. Including the Productivity Interim Report from May 2019 was also discussed. Since that report was not developed or presented by a Senate committee it was deemed inappropriate to attach it to the Charge 9 report without discussion. The content of the Productivity Interim Report was focused more on productivity, rather than the evaluation of productivity, so it was decided to not incorporate its findings into the Charge 9 report. Other items that address productivity rather than its evaluation will also be removed. The format will be adjusted to fit the requirements for an informational report. A draft will be circulated via email for approval before 2/10/2020.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorena Tribe

## Faculty Affairs Committee

March 2, 2020

Present: Holly Ryan (Chair), Nathan Greenauer, Joseph Mahoney, Marissa Ruggiero, Ike Shibley, Stephen Snyder (Senator, ex officio), Lorena Tribe (Vice Chair)

The meeting was called to order in F 104 at 12:15 PM by Holly.

The minutes from the prior two meetings were approved.

**Charge 10.** *Building from charge 9, evaluate the process and assessment criteria for the FAR. Prepare informational or advisory and consultative report with recommended best practices and campus policies.*

An overview of preliminary responses to the survey developed by the subcommittee and distributed to campus faculty were presented. The trends were observed and discussed. The subcommittee will meet shortly to analyze responses and draft a report. A draft introduction was approved. During the FAC 4/6 meeting the report will be discussed and, if possible, approved.

**Charge 11.** *Evaluate assessment of teaching and advising, specifically SRTEs, in the promotion and tenure process. Prepare legislative report with recommended best practices and campus policies. This item will include the use of SRTEs in the faculty activity reports. A document already exists that clarifies how to consider SRTEs and needs to be brought to the attention of the community.*

*([http://www.schreyerinstitute.psu.edu/pdf/EffectiveUseofSRTEData\\_Linse\\_Senate3-14-2017.pdf](http://www.schreyerinstitute.psu.edu/pdf/EffectiveUseofSRTEData_Linse_Senate3-14-2017.pdf)).*

This charge should be addressed in 2020/2021 since there are changes being discussed at the University Senate which may affect the assessment process. The modified timeline proposed was endorsed by the committee, Steve reported on the status of the discussions at the Senate, and common practices in assessment of teaching and advising across divisions were compared.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorena Tribe