

Penn State Berks Faculty Senate
Monday, January 25, 2020
12:15 – 1:15pm
Zoom (Meeting ID: 924 9240 7749; Passcode: 280794)
Agenda

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Approval of the Minutes of the November 2020 Meeting (Appendix A)**
- 3. Announcements and Reports by the Chair**
 - Updates to [32-00 Advising Policy](#) (Appendix B)
- 4. Reports of the Officers and University Senators**
 - Vice Chair Ryan
 - Secretary English
 - University Senator Bartolacci
 - University Senator Synder
 - University Senator Zambanini
 - University Senator Mahoney
 - SGA President Michael Shott
 - Student Senator
- 5. Comments/Announcements by Administrators**
 - Chancellor Grant
 - Associate Dean Larson
- 6. Unfinished Business**
- 7. Forensic Business**
- 8. Motions from Committees**
 - Clarification of the Formation of Ad-Hoc Committees in the Penn State Berks Faculty Senate Constitution, Executive Committee (Appendix C)
 - Remote Working, Physical Facilities and Safety Committee (Appendix D)
- 9. Informational Reports**
- 10. New Legislative Business**
- 11. Comments for the Good of the Order**
- 12. Adjournment**

Appendix A

Penn State Berks Senate

November 30, 2020

12:15-1:15 PM, via Zoom

Attendees: Khaled Abdou, Jennifer Arnold, Deniz Aydemir-Doke, Amir Barakati, Mike Bartolacci, Tara Beecham, Mike Briggs, Flavio Cabrera, Catherine Catanach, Donna Chambers, Alex Chisholm, Valerie Cholet, Jennifer Dareneau, Justin Desenso, Justin DiAngelo, Deb Dreisbach, Bertrand Eardly, Colleen English, Azar Eslam Panah, Maria Fellie, Bob Freeman, Andrew Friesen, Nathan Greenauer, Kathleen Hauser, Ben Infantolino, Erin Johnson, Samantha Kavky, Mahsa Kazempour, Abdullah Konak, Jim Laurie, Joe Mahoney, Michelle Mart, Lauren Martin, Zohra Melaouah-Shaffer, Catherine Mello, Pauline Milwood, Tami Mysliwiec, Rungun Nathan, Shannon Nowotarski, Meghan Owenz, Dawn Pfeifer Reitz, Matt Rhudy, Jeanne Rose, Brenda Russell, Holly Ryan, Marietta Scanlon, Jessica Schocker, Jeane Serrian, Stephen Snyder, Francisco Torres, Rosario Torres, Hartono Tjoe, Lorena Tribe, Praveen Verrabhadrappa, John Weber, Bob Zambanini, (faculty); Alexa Hodge (staff); Pradip Bandyopadhyay, Kim Berry, Lisa Glass, Keith Hillkirk, Elyce Kaplan, Janelle Larson, Lolita Paff, Belén Rodríguez-Mourelo, John Shank (administration).

1. Call to Order

- 2. Approval of the Minutes of the October 2020 Meeting (Appendix A)** – The Chair called for the approval of the minutes; a slight typographical correction was noted and changed. A motion was called to approve the minutes, second; *the minutes were approved.*

3. Announcements and Reports by the Chair

- The Chair announced that the Executive Committee has charged an ad hoc committee to look at past Senate policy votes. Bob Zambanini has volunteered to chair the committee. This comes out of faculty concern that it is difficult to find previously passed policies, as they are not in one central location. The committee will search Senate Binders and create a PDF or website. Those interested in serving should contact Bob or Jessica.

4. Reports of the Officers and University Senators

- Vice Chair Ryan—The current system that we use for elections (P&T committees, Faculty Senate elections) is being sunsetted by the University. Other campuses use Qualtrics to conduct their elections. Berks will need to explore other available options.
- Secretary English—No report
- University Senator Bartolacci – (recording starts here)... we'll meet tomorrow morning, as well as all the other senators and committees, but tonight I'm co-chair, I might have mentioned this before, co-chair of the Commonwealth Caucus, which is all senators, outside of University Park. When we met in person, we always had a Monday night get-together, we'd invited speakers, and then on Tuesday, we'd have a luncheon where we discussed what went on in the mornings' different committees. Tonight, we're having a discussion of promotion to full professor. The stats have been around a couple of years that University Park currently had, believe it or not, as their tenure track faculty, 62% of their tenure track faculty are full professors, as compared to 31% of the campuses. My colleague, the co-chair of the Commonwealth Caucus has been emailing and trying to dig into that stat, and actually found out that the number is probably lower for the University Park, because that number includes faculty who were already hired at the highest rank of full professor. Meaning, any new administrators, deans, etc. that are hired at full professor are in that number. So, we're trying to dig into the real difference. So, the difference is not double, it's more like 51-52% to 31%, but we're still trying to dig into that. And some folks this evening, from Kathy Bieschke's office, I believe are going to be there and some who were actually involved in generating some of those statistics I just gave you are going to be at the Commonwealth Caucus tonight. So, I should know a little more for our next meeting what the true numbers are, but it appears to be a huge disparity when in reality it's probably not that bad.
- University Senator Snyder – Can I take a moment just to respond to Michael. There's a number of points that you need to consider when you're looking at full professor rank and what looks like a disproportionately low percentage at the campuses. If you were to take out the campus colleges out of that group, I think you would find that our numbers, our percentages are considerably higher than the university college, overall. And the number of other things you have to consider- you know what is the

percentage of faculty that are new faculty still in the process of assistant professors moving forward. So, I wouldn't be too alarmed by that number until you see more of the data. So, again, I'm the council rep. We set the agenda for the meeting and the meeting is tomorrow, as Michael said. It's going to be kind of uneventful because there's really only one, there were two legislative reports, but one was pulled. They were both coming from the Committee on Rules which has been dominating our legislation. And again, it seems a bit more of housekeeping than anything else. We have a couple of forensics, but I don't know what they will be accomplishing except some discussion. The important thing on the agenda seems to be the informational report on Title IX changes, which has been given half an hour for presentation and discussion, and that's quite a bit of time carved out of the meeting for that. Basically, changes from the current administration that were moved forward earlier this year. And, what Old Main has done to revise our policies in accordance to those rules. So, if anybody is interested, if you go to the main university senate page, and you click on the agenda for tomorrow, you'll get a Zoom link and I think anybody can join. So that is all I have to say.

- University Senator Zambanini – Hi everybody. We meet tomorrow, our committee as well, and we have, other than one document we were revising, we haven't really done anything so far. I'll have a bigger report in the spring, after we meet tomorrow. I do have a question though. Did anybody, has the announcement been made about what's going to happen with next semester? From the Provost? Alright.
- (Chair) In regards to online vs. the same model? (BZ) Yes, because I thought today was the day they were making an announcement. (Chair) I have not heard anything or seen anything in my inboxes. Looks like I see others shaking their heads too, so I guess we're still waiting on that. It's a good question.
- University Senator Mahoney- I have no report. Also, we have not met since our last meeting. Mostly just approving course changes and curricular changes.
- SGA President Michael Shott – not present
- Student Senator – not present

5. Comments/Announcements by Administrators

(Chair) Before calling on him, I'd like to recognize this will be Chancellor's last address to us as Chancellor, so thank you Keith for everything you've done for our Senate, and yeah, wow. I can't believe it.

- **Chancellor Hillkirk**- Well, thanks Jessica. I guess the main thing I want to do is a thank you to all of you. It's been an interesting way to end my career, thru this pandemic. It's been 9 months since everything fell apart, at least in terms of having to change to remote teaching back in March. I think you have done a phenomenal job. I am so proud of what everybody here at Berks has done. The students have been, I think, remarkably cooperative, as well as strong. As well, the staff and faculty, what you've accomplished, in terms of being able to complete a semester, really is, in my opinion, an outstanding achievement and I think all of you should – we should rejoice that we made it through this difficult semester. Bob asked about next semester, what I'm hearing, I've not heard anything definitive, but what I am hearing is that there is a great deal of uncertainty, which is not surprising. Just given everything that is going on. I hope the vaccine comes as quickly as possible, and I encourage everybody to take advantage of that opportunity. And, I don't think I've said this before to this group, I know I've said it to a couple of other groups, one of which is the Planning group that's been meeting for the last few months thru the pandemic- there is a Pandemic Planning Group that meets every Friday via Zoom here at Berks- and they too have done a really exceptional job of managing and the changing circumstances almost on a dime, they've had to adjust so quickly, and yet they've done it very, very effectively. But I guess my last comment is, just remember it aint over 'till Dr. Fauci sings. Thank you all, it's been a great time. I've really enjoyed this. I know that on occasion, as good colleagues should, we've not always seen things exactly the same way, but I do appreciate the collegiality and the concern and support for one another that is so deeply embedded in the culture here at Penn State Berks, and I hope that will always be the case. So, thanks to each and every one of you, I wish you absolutely the very, very best as you move forward as individuals and also as the campus moves forward.
- (Chair) Colleen, may I ask you to stop the screen share for a second, and do a silent applause in our little boxes...a bit of a nicer thank you and farewell to Keith.
- **Associate Dean Larson** - I actually have very little to share today. I guess it's my post-turkey stupor or something. I just wanted to let you know that, under Madelyn Haynes office, they, HR has developed a new guidelines for paid faculty leave. It's really no different than our current practice, and I'll send that out as an email later today when I get around to it, so you can check it out, but it's nothing dramatically

new, it's just sort of ensuring consistency across locations. Following up on Bob's question, I don't have any insight on the spring. I'm hoping we'll get confirmation of one way soon, and I would also encourage people to be thinking "Plan B". I think that's one of the themes of 2020, is have a Plan B and maybe even a C or D. So just prepared that there's a possibility that things won't go as planned. So, and I'll just put in a commercial for Wednesday's faculty meeting at 12:15, and we haven't yet sent out the Zoom link or the agenda. We're still pulling that together. And that's it.

6. Unfinished Business - None

7. Forensic Business - None

8. Motions from Committees- None

9. Informational Reports –

- Clarification of the Formation of Ad-Hoc Committees in the Penn State Berks Faculty Senate Constitution, Executive Committee (Appendix C)

The Chair identified that as an exec committee, formation of an ad-hoc committee, was being discussed and realized the policy on how ad-hoc committees should be formed was fuzzy. The Chair asked Matt Rhudy if he'd discuss the report findings.

Matt Rhudy - Yeah no problem. It's pretty straight forward, at least I think the idea was, and we looked at what was in the constitution and saw that ad-hoc committees are mentioned but only in the 3 highlighted places shown. So, clearly there's supposed to be a thing, but nothing says how they should be formed. So, we looked at the duties of the executive committee which lists that that is who is responsible for forming the standing committees and charging those committees, so logically we thought it made sense that ad-hoc committees should also be formed by the executive committee. So, because this is the constitution of where the duties of the executive committees appear, this requires a 30 day's notice cause it's listed –I'll have Stephen list this in the chat if anyone's curious, but we need to have 30 days before we can actually vote on it, but at the next Senate meeting, what we would be voting on is a motion to add an additional item to the list of the executive committee responsibilities, which would cover forming and charging of ad-hoc committees. So basically, this is formally listing that the executive committee decides when and how ad-hoc committees should be formed. So, that's my summary of this report. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

- FAR Process and Assessment, Faculty Affairs Committee (Appendix D)

(Chair) Thanks Matt. Just pausing a moment for questions. Holly, there's a Faculty Affairs Committee report next.

Holly Ryan - So this was a committee we had charged from last year, that, because of the pandemic, got rolled into this year's charges, we were asked to evaluate the process assessment process for the FAR and there was a sub-committee that worked on it who were wonderful and that I appreciate all of their work, and I'm actually going to turn it over to one of the members of the sub-committee, to Joe Mahoney, who will talk you through this report for a moment. We don't have any motions or anything to vote on but we wanted to let you know what we found. So Joe, it's all you.

Joe Mahoney- Thank you very much Holly. This is a charge actually from last year that we took up and as I look in the report, I don't see the actual charge itself, but I believe it was evaluating the process and procedure of the FAR. Maybe there was a little more detail, but the charge that we were given was very vague and you'll see the responses we got and the analysis that we did is a little bit vague as well. So, I'll walk you through a little of what we did. Basically, what we tried to do was an information gathering survey that we could see, do people have a general issue at least with how FARs are conducted or is there confusion about how FARs are conducted. And then maybe in the future, we'd be able to drill down

further. But anyway, in February I sent out a Qualtrix survey to all full time faculty, and we had 74 responses, so almost 60% of faculty at that time responded. And you'll see in the table, it was a good mixture of tenure and non-tenure, tenure and teaching-track faculty, all ranks and all divisions were pretty well represented. And we asked questions about, in 3 categories of research, teaching and service. One, how well do you feel the criteria used in the FAR represent your efforts in the research, service or teaching and how much influence do you feel you have in the areas of research, service and teaching and follow-ups at the end. So, before we talk about the results analysis, I just want to state the limitations of what we have, to have sliced the data, we don't have a lot of power because we have so many divisions that we can separate out respondents into that we lose basically, most of our statistical significance. Like if we look at tenure vs. non-tenure, or especially tenure vs. non-tenure track within a division. We don't have enough participants to do a good job there. Also, the data are not well distributed which you can see from the graphs, so we are somewhat limited in the inferences we can make. So we are really looking at a qualitative assessment at the moment of the general feelings of about the different questions here. If we go to the results, for example the histogram, for example, how well do you feel that the criteria used in the FAR represents your efforts in research?- this was on a numerical scale from 0 to 100, 0 being a poor representation to 100 being excellent and that carries through across teaching, service and research there. We see where respondents align, so those were our only anchor points there was the 0 vs. 100. So again, pretty vague in what we were asking of the survey respondents because we didn't really know exactly what we were looking for, I suppose. So you see, where in the bins where these different responses are. In all the histograms the y-axis is as a fraction of the total respondents and I'll point out for the research questions, only tenure line and tenured faculty's responses were included in these numbers, whereas all faculty responses were included for service and teaching, and then the other questions at the end. So, generally, the responses we got were highly skewed, left skewed responses. But here we see the red bar indicating where the median response was from the respondent in terms of all of the categories. And then down to how much influence do you feel you have on the area of research, teaching and service, we saw generally there was a good to very good correlation to how well a faculty felt the FAR representation was to their efforts vs. how well, how much they felt they had an influence on that area during the FAR meeting or evaluation. So I guess, qualitatively, we saw that the medians were all relatively high on these types of questions, in the 60s through the 80s, if I remember correctly across research, service and teaching. Which, if you can scroll down a little bit further to the teaching one, we did see the lowest median of the three areas, so at least it seemed, generally speaking, faculty felt the FAR represented their representation of teaching was poorest of the areas on the FAR. Again, maybe a little bit ahead to some of the written results that people provided, in addition to the numerical results, we think that a lot of this has to do with general feelings that SRTEs are used in large part or solely to evaluate teaching efforts and quality of teaching, and a lot of faculty feel that either only using SRTE's is not a fair representation alone, or just the SRTEs themselves, are a biased measure and need to be considered among other measurements of teaching quality. As far as written responses from the faculty. So, that had the lowest median, 60, so still above 50, whatever that's worth, in terms of the statistics we gathered. And if you could scroll down one more, to the service I guess, there median around 70. Again, we see the pretty high variability, pretty high left skews, in the different responses there, so we want to be cautious of making too powerful an inference from the numerical data we collected. And if you could scroll down to the last histograms, so here, how people felt about the rationale for what their score is, generally pretty high, matching the expectations and generally high of faculty in good guidance in conclusion of their FAR and how they can maintain or improve their scores for the next year, but again we see that these are, some of these bi-modal distributions definitely cluster faculty feeling pretty strongly that their expectations are not met, they're not getting good guidance and that's part of where, the last part of our discussion will kind of address some of those clusters, some of those second peaks we're seeing to the left of the main peak of those distributions. If you could scroll down just to the discussion points, a couple trends we noticed, again from the written responses that we think are worth talking about more, investigating more, following up work on, especially on the teaching SRTEs weighting very heavily in on that, and investigating should they, which I think which we had previous reports, that they should be part of the mix, and definitely that's part of the, like when we consider P & T, what we're looking at there. So, how we can make sure we're getting a more holistic measure of teaching success than just an SRTE response or how faculty can respond to their SRTE more effectively during the FAR process. Another common issue here, concern, was things not being captured by the FAR especially, like being a program chair, which does not fall under service teaching or research and the time that's being diverted and not

really reflected in the FAR. Ok, I'll also mention, we don't have control over what is on the FAR, that's a university-wide procedure, we can't change, we can't add or modify sections, so it's really about how we are assessing the sections and the criteria that are given to us. And then faculty concerned with or confused about the FAR process itself. So as far as recommendations go, we think maybe .3 first confusion about the FAR process. We want to let faculty know that the FAR meeting with, at least the division head, should definitely be a conversation or discussion or a negotiation to some degree, about your efforts throughout the year in those 3 areas allow faculty, myself included, earlier on kind of felt or thought that the FAR meeting was just kind of comparing your checklist of what you did with the division head and then it was over from there. But really it should be a back and forth and talking about it and kind of together, coming up with a numerical assessment of where your efforts, in each of these areas was. It could also just be education by the division heads if just there was a little bit about during a faculty meeting or Senate meeting, sometime carve out on the explanation of what the FAR meeting is intended to be for new faculty especially but also veteran faculty, to remind them of what should be taking place at the meeting, and how to prepare to it, and what your expectations before, during and after the meeting should be. And as far as follow-up for this committee or future committees, looking into more SRTE how it relates to the FAR, is always, I think on our minds and should always be thought about. And some talk about how can, some roles like program chair be properly assessed, as far as something we've been putting a lot of effort into and it's not showing up at least on the yearly FAR. So, I think that's all the remarks I have about this. If there any Q & A time, or if any other members want to interject on this.

Michelle Mart- Are we allowed to ask questions at this time? So, Joe, I appreciate the tremendous amount of work put into this, and there's a lot of data in here, and so, thank you for your work on this. Based on your comments and then the qualitative analysis, the 2nd paragraph of the qualitative analysis and the points you bring up in the discussion, do seem to be pretty clear on the majority of faculty expressing that their teaching is based on their SRTEs. So, I'm wondering and since it's not supposed to be the policy, if you guys discussed making a motion to that effect, an advisory motion to administration in terms of the process and reiterating how there should be multiple evaluation measures of our teaching. So I guess I'm just confused that you're thinking we should go back and discuss this more, as you just said a minute ago, we've had numerous reports where this keeps coming up, that people feel the SRTE 's are used to a disproportionate extent. So, I'm wondering if you've considered making a motion to advise administration about the majority feeling of the faculty in this regard.

(JM)- Thank you for the comments and, yeah I think that's part of what's coming out of this, is things to think about that could have legislative motions we could have, or something stronger. I want to caution again, on the data we have collected, it's based on faculty perception and not necessarily how they are actually being evaluated by the division head, just to temper it a little bit. Holly, maybe you would be better answering the rest of this.

Holly Ryan – Yes, Michelle it's a great idea and we had not consider making a motion because our data was so limited. So the comments that we are seeing here are from the people who commented, which clearly was a small number, who wrote comments. If you look at the people who were satisfied across the distribution, that Joe put up there, there's quite a few who are quite satisfied with the way things are going. So it's not clear. That's why we wanted to dig further and we wanted to recommend to this committee for next year, like to the executive board to charge this committee again, with potentially looking at that teaching more in detail. We do have another committee- another charge for our committee right now, that's looking at how SRTEs are being used in promotion and tenure--advising and teaching are being used in promotion and tenure but not specifically in the FAR. So, I think we were tempered in our response because we had so many people replying that they were quite happy with the way things were, and the group of people who were vocal about being not very satisfied with the way teaching was going, who said there were SRTE issues, it was not enough information for us at this time. That's why we wanted to dig even deeper into that issue in the coming year. That was our thinking, anyway to answer your question.

(Chair) I think I saw Nathan's hand up, did you have a question or was that a mistake?

Nathan Greenauer – I was just going to clarify, there might be some ambiguity in this sentence. It's not about the majority of faculty, it's about the majority of faculty who gave responses, so it's not the majority of the 74, it's of the majority of who participated.

(Colleen English) I have someone from the chat who wanted to ask an anonymous question. So, I'll just ask it for them. Does faculty Senate making a motion have any impact on how the administration carries out the FAR process and is it written down if FAR should be used in determining salary increases.

(HR) – I don't know if I should answer this, but I think when we make motions, the administration reads them, and we ask them in the summertime and they write us a response to all of our motions from the year, and so we hope they will consider it and to take our recommendations seriously. And that's that.

(Chair) Exactly what I would have said, Holly. In terms of how FAR impacts salary increases, I'm going to say, yes, but I'm going to ask Janelle or Keith to clarify.

(KH)- That's true Jessica that the FAR, the Associate Dean and the Chancellor meet whenever there is a GSI, and there is considerable amount of time in discussion, a review that goes on, and also of comparative salaries from the Senate report that many of you are aware of..... Yes, GSI stands for General Salary Increase, thanks Joe.....and the FAR provides the way the Associate Dean and the Chancellor make decisions about salary increases. So, in terms of if motions come from the Senate, we certainly do, it would be advisory, we do take those very seriously. Janelle and I, for almost the last 3 years, previously Paul and I, will work together on these things . It's also important to understand that there are of course, university expectations in terms of faculty and staff annual evaluations, so there has to be a reasonable degree of consistency across the university, but at the same time, any motion that would come from the Senate would be viewed and considered and taken very seriously by administration. Janelle, do you have anything to add?

(JL) – Not really, I would have to look at the policies, but I think there is a requirement that all faculty have an annual review , I know that across the university that happens –every unit reviews faculty annually, using digital measures and something very similar to our FAR. You can only kind of tweak it at the margins. The broad parameters are consistent across the university. I would reiterate what the Chancellor said that is a basis for AC40. That is the basis for raises when we get them.

(HR) – The line that specifically says, it's in the introduction and background of the report, it says “performance reviews are not only necessary for the process of determining merit, salary increases, they also provide occasion for self-evaluation and re-assessment of the role the faculty member is playing in their career...” So it is spelled out in AC40 that it is directly tied to merit raises or merit salary increases.

(JS) I see we have a hand from Rungun.

Rungun Nathan – Keith, I have a specific question. First, let me be honest, I have not read this word for word, and I do not understand the policy completely, having said that, I have one simple thing, like in most industries, you have salary negotiation, does the FAR allow for that in the university process as it is laid out? Is there any room for salary negotiations as part of FAR, or is it just a one-sided thing? You go through the FAR and the numbers are given and you are given an increase. Can you clarify that for us Keith?

(KH)– To my knowledge and experience Rungun, I can't think of a situation where there is a negotiation process that goes on in terms of annual evaluations. Are there, there is a review that's made each time there is a GSI, in terms of a market analysis and also an equity analysis and that applies to both faculty and staff, and there are increases at times that are adjustments or increases that take place that are sparked by those analyses. There are also, when you ask about negotiations, there are also times when a faculty member, frankly I don't think I can think of a staff situation, there may have been and I may be forgetting something, but there are situations when a faculty member has requested a meeting with me or with the Associate Dean, to talk about salary and there can be individual reviews that take place, but I've never

seen anything that's been tied to the annual evaluation process. Janelle, can you think of anything or any other thoughts on that?

(JL) – In the 3 years that I've been here, one person came with a question and I worked with Valerie Henne-Hallman to get a larger data set, and looked at disciplinary, years of service, an overview of evaluations to determine if this person was below par, based on our peers within the university, so that has been done, but it's not usually specifically part of the FAR process, because that's like the first step of several steps that go into the annual raise. I don't know if that adds a lot or not, but...I would just throw out there that there are reviews for equity by the time we get to the raise issue. We sort of look across programs, university-wide, especially in the commonwealth system to see where our faculty fall. And every now and then, I don't think it's happened since I've been Associate Dean, however, every now and again there are equity compensations that have been made. It has happened.

(KH) – It has happened Janelle.

(JL) It has happened, I now remember. There have been times where we've identified individuals who look like they are below their market comparisons and their salaries were adjusted.

(Chair) Holly lost internet due to the storm and wanted me to just quickly add that if you look at the background of the report that they submitted today, they referenced this saying that performance is based on the FAR report and the meeting with your division heads or supervisor. So in general, if a faculty member, I guess this is just general advice, particularly for newer faculty, if you ever feel your FAR report is not representative or not fair, if you're in the percentage on their survey for example, where the percentage of confidence or fairness was lower, it's in the FAR meeting that you should talk about this with your supervisor or division head.

(JL) - Just one more thing I can throw in there for the process, I think sometimes people think there are these disparities among the divisions, but each division head meets with the Associate Dean to go over the letters, and also at the beginning of the process the division heads talk and try to come up with a , it's obviously not going to be a, completely consistent process, but there's discussion and conversations among division heads and with the Associate Dean to try to minimize any grotesque variation on how individuals are assessed across divisions

(Chair) Belen.....

Belen Rodriguez- I was just going to say that in the March conference, it is indeed a conversation between the division head and each faculty member, viewing all the activities of the previous calendar year and also looking into the future. So, there are many things that are considered in these conversations, it is not one-sided. We go over several things related to the assessment of teaching, not only SRTEs, but advising and instructional improvements, maybe undergraduate research, you know several things in addition to research and service. For instance, the point of being a program chair is also considered and discussed and noted, in the service section and not only there, but also in the teaching section because there could be additional advising responsibilities that are carried as such. So, I just want to say it is not a one-sided process, that it is always a conversation. For instance, at the end of every conversation, we are asking for even more input from the faculty member, not only regarding to their performance but to up ours. So, it is indeed a comprehensive process.

(Chair) Ben.....and I just wanted to say something, in the good of all comments that I want to get to, so if we could keep this conversation to just maybe 3 to 5 more minutes, max, that would be great.

Ben Infantolino – I'll try to talk fast, so just, if the FAR is closely linked to the GSI, in theory there would be some sort of equation, if you will, that you get a certain FAR score and it would relate to a certain percentage GSI, I guess, and the question is, (A) does that exist; and (B) if that is something, at some time that would be shared since it is a fairly objective measure, I would think that sharing wouldn't be a huge problem.

(JL) - That's usually in the letter. It's not something standard up front, because we don't know how much we're going to have in the GSI until the very last minute, so it varies year by year depending on how much is allocated. But that's typically in the letter. If you pull out one of your old letters, it will say ...faculty who will received whatever, received an X level of raise.. and it's usually a broad bandwidth, it's not like a difference of .001 is going to make a big difference in your raise. It's usually pretty chunked.

(BI)- Right, but I guess I meant the entire equation of what was available as opposed to just what was in your letter.

(JL)- Like I said, it varies year to year so there's not much value to putting something out because what works one year will not be valid the next year.

(BI) I suppose, I guess that equation to be published every year though, in the letter. I understand it varies year to year, but every year, that equation could be put out.

(KH)- I think it depends, Ben. I'd have to, I won't be doing this anymore, but I'd have to it would depend on how it would be shared. If sharing the information you're requesting could lead to people being informed about other people's salaries, relative to theirs, than I don't think that would be possible. I think that would be inappropriate. But, in terms of what Janelle is describing, there is a ranking that takes place, it does vary from year to year, depending on the amount of dollars that are available. So, that's something we could certainly take a look at. We'd have to make sure, as I mentioned earlier, there does have to be consistency across the university in terms of how generally, the process unfolds. I'll make one other quick comment, because this has come up, not every year, but if comes up quite often. Over the last ten years here, and I remember when I was at Schuylkill it happened there, that the appropriate comparisons for faculty salaries at Penn State with other campuses are between our campus, PS Altoona, PS Abington, and to a certain degree University College, because all of them are undergraduate campuses, where we get ourselves sometimes, into some difficulty when we compare ourselves to other PS campuses that have graduate programs. Because, where there are graduate programs, salaries are higher, there's no question about that. They're higher at Harrisburg, they're higher at Erie and they're certainly higher at University Park. It just adds to the complexity of the university, but sometimes people are, that sometimes folks are comparing their understanding of salaries at locations that are quite different from PS Berks, for example.

(Chair) Steve, I see your hand up but I want a hard stop at 1:10, like I said, for something that's important. So, go ahead, but I'm asking Colleen to mute everybody at 1:10.

Steve Snyder- Just wasted all that time unmuting. I wanted to respond to Rungun but I couldn't figure out how to raise my hand, so I'm sorry about that, but, Rungan, I do not think anywhere in HR40 there is a provision for negotiation or discussion of negotiation, however, there is no prohibition against it. And that's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

- Minutes of Standing Committee Meetings (Appendix F)

10. New Legislative Business- None

11. Comments for the Good of the Order

- (Chair) Thanks Steve. I'm sorry for being a little militant here, but if you look at the informational reports they include minutes from committees, and at the end, student life is acknowledging that we need a HOS volunteer to fill the spot of Dave Bender, who has been serving on that committee this year. And I want to take a moment to honor Dave. I've already done this personally in my email to the listserv, and I enjoyed

reading all of yours as well. I know we all have our own special connections to Dave, and I'm not going to use this time and space to talk further about my relationship with Dave, but I did want to talk about his role in this Senate. I've only been at Penn State for 10 years, but he has been at every Senate meeting I've been to, I'm pretty sure. He volunteered to serve on the Student Life Committee, even though he didn't have to serve on Senate any longer, this year after having been in the official Registrar capacity in Academic Affairs. Which is just another example of his remarkable commitment to this college through Senate. So, as we often say, "may his memory be a blessing", I hope that continues throughout the various arenas that he left his mark on campus, and in this moment, I just want to take some time to reflect, have a moment of silence and appreciation for Dave's commitment, specifically to our Berks Senate. So, I want to take a moment here. Thank you all so much for that moment. And I'd like to, again, just reiterate that we are looking for a HOS representative in the Student Life Committee, so if you'd like that role, please let me know and we'll go from there.

- Chair asked if there were any other comments for the Good of the Order before adjournment.
- Rungun Nathan – I have one question that probably Keith or Janelle could answer for us, do we have any thought how we are going into the summer, are we going completely on-line or is it still being debated how it might be done?

(KH) Before I answer that question Rungun, I wanted to say it's so appropriate that my career with the Berks Senate ends with a question from you!

(RN)- I'm sorry Keith.

(KH) You always come up with great questions Rungun. Rungun, there's just a tremendous amount of uncertainty right now. I think that people just – you know we're so fortunate that we've been able to make it through as a campus, but as you know, once you leave the campus, it's a treacherous place. Based upon the data, the statistics we're seeing right now. So I think the university, I think there are two things causing the uncertainty. First one, is just the reality of the virus out there, and the second, and probably you're the same as I, what they are saying about vaccine availability. If the vaccine availability happens as fast as some people say it may, then things might look up, but if it doesn't? I think we're going to just have to live thru and see what happens through this period of not knowing for sure. I know the University, there's been a tremendous amount of planning that's gone on, and just as we have demonstrated here, the capacity to adjust quickly, we'll see if we have to do that again.

- (KH) Jessica, I have one more comment, I want to thank you for asking everyone to pause and take a moment to remember Dave, and I just want to say, the thing I personally miss is his wonderful, wonderful sense of humor.

12. Adjournment

Appendix B

Berks Advising Guide synthesized from University Policy 32-00 (revised Jan. 2019)

<https://senate.psu.edu/policies-and-rules-for-undergraduate-students/32-00-advising-policy/#32-00>

Academic advising is a collaborative relationship among academic advisers, students, faculty, and other units that support student success at Penn State. Advisers advocate for students, as needed, but empower them to be self-directed learners. With the change to the advising policy, there are more clearly defined expectations about the role and responsibilities of academic advisers.

1. Be accessible and responsive to students
2. Allow time for conversations about the student's current academic progress and plans and future goals
3. Review student records to provide supportive resources as necessary, but to also help students complete their coursework in a timely way.
4. Provide guidance to students to help them enhance their educational experiences
5. Stay informed of the policies and procedures which impact student advising
6. Document student interactions and outreach in the University's notetaking system (Starfish)

Important Websites for Advising Information:

Berks Academic Advisers Team files

Advising at Penn State:

<http://advising.psu.edu/>

Berks Academic Advising Center website the Resources link:

<https://berks.psu.edu/advising-resources>

Lionpath:

<https://lionpathsupport.psu.edu/>

Starfish:

<https://sites.psu.edu/starfishinfo/>

Berks College Academic Advising Plan

Academic Advising

The foundation of the philosophy of academic advising at Penn State University, and at the Berks College, is that it is a shared relationship between the adviser and advisee which is characterized by mutual respect, trust and ethical behavior. Further, this relationship is considered to be an important component of the student's educational experience. Students are ultimately responsible for course scheduling, program planning, and the successful completion of graduation requirements. Therefore, it is important for advisers to be accessible, approachable and knowledgeable about the student, university and college policies, major policies and requirements, and career development. In this way, advisers are able to provide advisees the guidance and resources necessary so advisees are able to make educated decisions about their academic trajectory.

Academic advising programs at Penn State will create opportunities for students to actively engage with academic advisers so that they are able to (from advising policy 32-00): *(based on CAS Standards, 2015)*

- Articulate their educational decisions and plans in the context of their interests, abilities, and values;
- Synthesize information from various sources to set goals and make decisions;
- Assume responsibility for meeting academic program requirements;
- Articulate the meaning of higher education and the purpose of the curriculum;
- Cultivate the intellectual habits that encourage life-long learning;
- Function as global citizens who engage in the world around them;
- Demonstrate integrative learning by making connections across all parts of their educational experience;
- Identify and participate in engaged scholarship opportunities.

All students are assigned an academic adviser. Academic advisers' help students evaluate their educational plans, answer questions about major fields of study, provide general information about academic policies and procedures, and assist with career preparation through the advising process. Good academic advising helps students to achieve academic and/or personal success.

Responsibilities of the Adviser and Advisee

Responsibilities of the Adviser

The Adviser Will:

1. Engage students in active discussion of their educational and career objectives with the intent of helping students to understand the range of educational opportunities available at Penn State.
2. Help students to better understand the logic of the curriculum and the relationships among educational opportunities such as General Education courses, University requirements, programs, undergraduate research opportunities, internships, study abroad programs, and other academic experiences.
3. Help students to understand the nature of the University's academic programs and to understand the expected standards of achievement and likelihood of success in certain areas of study.

4. Assist students in addressing concerns affecting their academic progress and make referrals to appropriate support services.
5. Ensure that students are aware of appropriate University procedures and policies, and help students understand their purpose and rationale.
6. Help students to plan a course of study and give advice about courses and the adjustment of course loads.
7. Complete consistent electronic documentation of advising interactions in the “student advising system” as Penn State is based on mobility within the institution. A cohesive record of students’ movement through the institution is necessary to provide a consistent and strong advising experience.
8. Actively reach out to students as interventions are needed and provide timely responses to concerns raised by the student or others in a student’s support network.
9. Create an inclusive environment that welcomes and supports all students.
10. Participate in ongoing professional development to keep informed of and current with advising practice and University policies.
11. Where appropriate, contribute to and engage in the scholarship of teaching, learning, and advising.

Responsibilities of the Advisee

Advisees will:

1. Acquire the information needed to assume final responsibility for course scheduling, program planning, and the successful completion of all graduation requirements.
2. Explore educational opportunities at Penn State by learning more about their [intended] major and evaluating the fit of their interests and abilities with their [intended] program.
3. Engage in planning prior to meetings with academic advisers using relevant tools and resources, such as the University Bulletin, Suggested Academic Plans, and degree audits.
4. Meet regularly with assigned academic adviser to discuss goals, plans, suitability of other educational opportunities provided by the University, academic progress, challenges, and concerns.
5. Seek a variety of opportunities and information needed to set and achieve educational goals.
6. Become knowledgeable about the relevant policies, procedures, and rules of the University, college, and academic program.
7. Use the logic of the curriculum to integrate learning across all educational experiences.

Structure of Advising

The Advising Center staff meets with all new students (except transfer students who are going into Berks majors), Division of Undergraduate Students (DUS), and Provisional (PROV) students. The Advising Center staff also meets with non-degree (NDEGR) students who request or need advising assistance based on their intended goals.

Faculty advisers meet with all students in pre-major and major status and with transfer students. These students may plan to remain at Berks or transfer to other Penn State campuses.

The Advising Center provides academic advising, information, and referral services to Division of Undergraduate (DUS) students as well as to anyone who requests assistance, including students enrolled

in other colleges in the University, prospective students, faculty, and staff. Academic advisers are typically available on a walk-in basis or by appointment.

Support for Advising

The DUS unit is staffed by a working coordinator, 3 full-time advisers and 1 part-time adviser and 1 administrative assistant. Students can contact the Advising Center to schedule an appointment or meet with an adviser. Students can also call or email their adviser to schedule an appointment or get their questions answered. Individuals can also contact the advising center electronically at BKAdvisingCenter@psu.edu.

New faculty advisers work with experienced faculty advisers within their department and are also assigned to a DUS adviser for adviser training and mentoring. In this way, these individuals have access to information which is program specific as well as information about the broader tools and strategies needed for sound academic advising.

Professional Development

DUS staff and Berks College faculty members are invited to attend the annual advising conference at University Park sponsored by DUS, as well as, conferences, seminars, and workshops as needed that fall within budget constraints. The DUS staff participates in an annual retreat for professional development as well as unit strategic planning.

Faculty advisers receive electronic tips and strategies with recommendations for timely outreach to their advisees several times throughout the semester. Faculty advisers are encouraged to attend advising training workshops which are designed to develop advising skills and behaviors while cultivating a comprehensive approach to educational planning. Workshops are offered throughout the year.

Delivery of Services

Large group, small group and individual advising sessions are all part of the process. Each semester, prior to course registration, colleges have an advising meeting for all students. Information is provided based on a student's individual semester standing as well as college specific information.

Recommended Practices for Advising

1. Advisers will communicate with their advisees at least twice every semester:
 - Electronically at the start of the semester; an email communication of welcome, important dates, adviser contact information and information about how to schedule an appointment
 - An advising appointment prior to student registration, to review academic plans, entrance to major requirements and to review the student's degree audit to assist with program planning and scheduling
2. Advisers will enter electronic notes, to record advising interactions, into the Universities electronic note-taking system.

3. Additional outreach is strongly recommended. Information about recommended timing, topics, and messages for contacting advisees can be found in the files on the Berks Academic Advisers Teams folder.

First-Year Student Advising

During NSO, new students meet with a professional adviser or a faculty adviser. Information pertaining to the university, college and majors are reviewed either in a group presentation or individually.

DUS students are informed during group meetings, advising appointments and at the time of academic reviews of the maximum allowable time in DUS. This is important so that these students proactively work to find a major that is compatible, realistic and attainable. Additionally, the first-year seminar course is designed to assist students as they transition to Penn State.

All faculty and staff advisers are encouraged to be in email contact with their advisees, to meet with each of them at least once per semester, and to enter meeting notes in the University note-taking system.

Second Year Student Advising

Advisers should review their advisee's What-If/Academic Requirement reports to ensure that students are making adequate progress toward meeting graduation requirements, are prepared for the Entrance to Major (ETM) procedure, and to provide guidance in choice of major and campus.

After the decisions of the ETM procedure are known, advisers should provide guidance to students who have not been accepted into their first choice of major and campus. Follow-up with students in DUS is particularly important because they are likely to be reaching their max time and will need to choose a major.

Advisers should discuss the importance of involvement in out of class experiences, whether work or volunteer related, and how these experiences can complement their academic curriculum. It is also important to encourage membership in campus organizations.

Third Year Student Advising

Advisers should review their advisee's What-If/Academic Requirement reports to ensure they are making adequate progress toward degree completion. They should also discuss topics including career goals, club and activity membership, volunteer experiences and the importance of internships or job experience. Referrals to Career Services for assistance with career or graduate school preparation are also important during this time period.

Fourth Year and beyond Student Advising

For Seniors, advisers should review their advisee's What-If/Academic Requirement reports to ensure the students are making progress toward completing graduation requirements. Referring students to Career Services for assistance with seeking employment or providing guidance for applying to graduate school can also be beneficial.

Advisement of New Transfer Students

Transfer students who plan to obtain a Berks degree will meet with the Program Chair. New transfer students who are University Park bound will meet with an Advising Center staff member or the College Representative.

Recognition and Reward

1. Each year a faculty member is recognized for outstanding advising by the Annual Academic Advising Award. Faculty members are nominated by their department head based on their academic advising during the past year.
2. Additionally, Berks campus has a committee whose purpose is to oversee orientation and the students' first year experience. This committee offers an annual award, the criterion of which includes "helping students to achieve academic and/or personal success."
3. There is also an Excellence in Advising Award that was established by the Undergraduate Student Government (UPUA) and the Office of Undergraduate Education to recognize outstanding advisers for the work they do in support of students at Penn State. Each year one professional and one faculty adviser are the recipients.

Assessment

Assessment of Academic Advising is an ongoing task for the campus.

PMP5 January 2021

Appendix C

Clarification of the Formation of Ad-Hoc Committees in the Penn State Berks Constitution Executive Committee

Introduction

Currently, there is no content in the Penn State Berks Senate Constitution which indicates how ad-hoc committees can be formed. However, ad-hoc committees are mentioned three times across Sections 6-8 of Article V Committees. This content has been copied from the constitution and pasted below for reference, with sentences including “ad-hoc committees” highlighted.

SECTION 6 MEETINGS

- (a) All standing committees of the Penn State Berks Senate shall meet at least three (3) times each year. **Ad-hoc committees shall meet on an as-needed basis.**
- (b) All committees or committee chairs may invite resource members to their meetings with the agreement of the majority of committee members prior to the meeting.
- (c) All meetings shall be open to observers who are students or employees of the campus. A majority vote of the members present may restrict attendance and/or speaking privileges.

SECTION 7 REPORTING OF PROCEEDINGS

All standing and ad-hoc committees of the Penn State Berks Senate shall keep minutes of their meetings and provide a copy to the Secretary for the official records.

SECTION 8 QUORUM

At least fifty-one percent (51%) of the membership constitutes a quorum for standing committee and ad-hoc committees, provided that a majority of those present are faculty members. Proxy voting is disallowed but the Executive Committee shall establish policies for secure absentee balloting consistent with the Standing Rules.

Since these three sentences are the only mention of ad-hoc committees in the constitution and standing rules, it is necessary to clearly define how these committees are formed.

Discussion and Rationale

Article IV, Section 1 of the Penn State Berks Senate Constitution details the duties of the executive committee. This list of duties is copied below for convenience:

Article IV EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SECTION 1 DUTIES

- (a) Consult with standing committee chairs to develop and prioritize agenda items;
- (b) Charge each standing committee for the upcoming year (and revise that charge as necessary);
- (c) Call Senate meetings;
- (d) Set agenda for Penn State Berks Senate meetings;
- (e) Call meetings of a Campus Faculty Assembly;
- (f) Act for the Senate in all matters, except changes to the Constitution, and Standing Rules,

- (1) when a Penn State Berks Senate meeting has been appropriately called and a quorum has not been obtained;
- (2) in the case of a special concern or an extraordinary emergency circumstance.
- (g) Appoint standing committee members based upon expressed interests of faculty, and a diversity of disciplines and functions in the campus.
- (h) In consultation with the Senate Chair, the Executive Committee shall appoint the leadership (Chair and Vice-Chair) of all Standing Committees of the Berks Senate.
- (i) Nominate faculty to administrative committees and joint Senate/administrative committees on which faculty are asked to serve.
- (j) Serve as nominations and elections committee for elections of officers, University Senators, ombudsman, advisory board members, and any other campus or campus wide offices under the auspices of the Senate.
- (k) Serve as liaison between the Penn State Berks Senate and Administration.

Items (b) and (g) indicate that the Executive Committee is responsible for charging standing committees and appointing standing committee members, respectively. Since the Executive Committee is responsible for forming and charging the standing committees, it is reasonable to conclude that the Executive Committee should also be responsible for forming and charging any ad-hoc committees.

Recommendations

Motion to add the following item to Article IV Section 1 of the Penn State Berks Senate Constitution:

- (l) Form and charge ad-hoc committees as needed to perform specific tasks not covered under current charges of the standing committees

Effective Date

November 30, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

Executive Committee 2020-2021

Mike Bartolacci
Colleen English
Keith Hillkirk
Janelle Larson
Joseph Mahoney
Michelle Mart
Matthew Rhudy

Holly Ryan
Jessica Schocker (Chair)
Steve Snyder
Bob Zambanini

Appendix D

Physical Facilities and Safety Senate Committee

Advisory and Consultative Report Fall 2020

Charge: Investigate faculty needs while working from home and ways that the administration can better support faculty productivity in the work-from-home environment. Prepare an advisory and consultative report with recommendations.

Introduction

According to a list provided by the Academic Dean's office, we have 175 instructors, part-time and full-time, teaching in Fall 2020. To investigate what has been provided to faculty already in terms of physical equipment and support, our committee consulted with major departments on campus, including the IT department, Center for Learning and Teaching, and Human Resources. The data provided by those departments are included in the appendix.

Our committee also conducted a faculty satisfaction and needs survey. As the physical facilities and safety senate committee, our survey and background investigation focused on physical equipment, software, and training regarding that software that was new to faculty engaging in remote working from home. Fifty-two faculty responded to the survey. The survey results are summarized below. The full survey responses, including all comments to open-ended questions can be found in the appendix.

As can be expected given the diversity of home environments, there is notable variability in faculty satisfaction working from home. However, the majority of faculty who responded to the survey (67.3%) indicated they are either "extremely" or "somewhat" satisfied with their work from home arrangements. Survey respondents identified challenges working from home were also diverse, with the most commonly identified challenges being physical workspace, childcare, stress, social isolation, communication with coworkers, and internet connectivity.

The majority of survey respondents have utilized IT support (69.2%) and CLT trainings (75%), suggesting that these services are needed and highly utilized, which matches the data provided by both IT and CLT. Particularly with regard to CLT, many faculty have noted that they utilized the trainings provided and were satisfied with them. There were some faculty that mentioned the need for training that moves beyond the technology to pedagogical strategies that encourage community and engagement. The survey results suggest these services will continue to be utilized highly by faculty, with 71.2% of faculty indicated they would use remote teaching trainings and 77% indicated they would use IT support.

Most respondents have not utilized stress management programs (only 3.8% have utilized). With regard to stress management, only 11.5% of faculty said they would utilize stress-management programs if they were provided. Faculty identified personal stress management strategies like walking and yoga. Notably, the only administrative related suggestion was that they would like more boundaries around faculty response times (to e-mails).

While a minority of respondents indicated they have already utilized equipment borrowing (38.5%), the majority of respondents indicated they *would use* equipment borrowing in the future (51.9%). Based on faculty qualitative responses, many respondents would like to be able to

borrow equipment to allow them to do their job remotely, including tablets, printers, laptops, monitors, wireless internet boosters or hotspots, external hard drives, desks, and chairs. Some respondents noted issues paying for this equipment personally. Additionally, several respondents identified the need for software to support teaching and research activities.

The majority of respondents have utilized opportunities to connect with colleagues (67.3%) and the majority (65.4%) of faculty indicated they would continue to use opportunities for interaction with colleagues. Given our physically disconnected status, different software attempts have been made to allow faculty connect and collaborate. The BK Lounge Team group has 164, but it has only been used by 11 individuals since the semester began, with a majority of those conversations occurring between 3 individuals. In contrast, a two-hour virtual faculty social utilizing Spatial Chat was recently piloted, attended by 20 individuals, and was reportedly well-received. This appears to demonstrate that participation using a new virtual platform designed for multiple simultaneous informal conversations effectively doubled faculty interaction.

Discussion

The CLT and IT have already provided a great deal of support, physical equipment and training. These services are highly utilized by faculty and faculty anticipate continuing to use these services. For faculty who have been unable to attend previous sessions, but need assistance with teaching, they are recommended to review the CLT website, which links to all previously hosted and recorded webinars: <https://sites.psu.edu/berksclt/>.

The majority of faculty comments surrounded around physical equipment and software needs. From our survey and background investigation, this appears to be one of the most pressing needs for faculty.

While it only existed within one qualitative comment, we recognize the importance of the comment about faculty research. Therefore, we include software for research within our recommendations for the administration. Additional information regarding research in the time of COVID-19 can be found on the following two Penn State research sites: <https://www.research.psu.edu/covid> and https://www.research.psu.edu/COVID_sustaining_research. The qualitative comment suggests there are additional difficulties with research policies and processes during the pandemic that may be outside of the scope of the physical facilities committee and may need to be explored by faculty affairs.

Advisory Proposal

Based on the background investigation and survey responses, we offer the following recommendations:

1. The campus administration provides research-related information during COVID-19 in one centralized website location, as is currently done for teaching.
2. The administration will make every effort to provide faculty working at home. This support should include the physical equipment (such as laptop, tablet, and

webcam loaners if available) and software necessary to complete the required duties of their job, inclusive of research, teaching, and collaboration with colleagues. Additionally, the administration will give due consideration of work-from-home realities during the annual review.

Ending

Report Prepared by the Physical Facilities and Safety Committee Members Valerie Cholet, Jinyoung Im, Mahsa Kazempour, Ada Leung, Meghan Owenz, Jeane Serrian, and Allison Singles.

Appendix

Section I: IT Equipment and Support

64% full-time faculty have PSU-owned laptops. 36% have desktop computers.

91 faculty have PSU-owned iPads and tablets in addition to the laptops and desktops already mentioned.

Requests for Loaner Technology from Faculty

- 9 full-time faculty have loaner laptops. In Spring 2020, 2 adjunct faculty had loaner laptops.
- 7 headsets
- 12 webcams
- 2 monitors
- 2 Wacom tablets
- 8 moved equipment (monitors, etc.) from campus office to home. Desktop computers will not function at home.

IT supplies are limited. Some items such as webcams are very difficult to get as there is a worldwide shortage.

Remote Support

IT has enhanced the website, berkstech.psu.edu, to address remote resources for students, faculty and staff and changes to classrooms.

Remote support is very similar to support on campus. IT uses Teamviewer to remotely assist with issues on PSU-owned computers. IT can push software and security updates to PSU-owned computers, even while off-campus. If a problem cannot be solved remotely, IT will schedule a time to address the issue with an on-campus, in-person appointment.

- Requests from faculty and staff can be emailed to BK-ITRequest@psu.edu or call us at 610-396-6464. We are available Monday through Friday 8-5.
- Requests from students can be emailed to BK-HelpDesk@psu.edu or call us at 610-396-6195. Monday through Thursday 8-8 and Friday 8-2. Off-hours calls to this number go to the IT Service Desk at University Park (814-865-4357).

IT Requests

This chart includes student, faculty, and staff requests. Not every request is captured. For example, a phone call to report an issue that is resolved during the call in a relatively short time is not recorded in the system.

2019	Total IT Requests	2020	Total IT Requests	Difference from Previous Year
March 2019	31	March 2020	264	+223
April 2019	198	April 2020	136	-62
May 2019	152	May 2020	97	-55
June 2019	110	June 2020	120	+10
July 2019	142	July 2020	144	+2
August 2019	170	August 2020	262	+92
September 2019	178	September 2020	204	+26
October 2019	147			
November 2019	138			
December 2019	89			
January 2020	216			
February 2020	179			

Section II: Center for Learning and Teaching Support

The Center for Learning and Teaching of Penn State Berks plays a critical role in supporting faculty, students, and staff in successful remote learning and teaching.

During the spring break including that weekend, CLT conducted 8 workshops on teaching with Zoom to help faculty with the abrupt switch from campus instruction to remote instructional delivery. The CLT team offered **21** on-demand workshops in **5** weeks starting from the spring break, quickly set up a remote teaching website to curate all the resources from the University and other commonwealth campuses as well as those created by the CLT team, and has been providing individual and group consultation via Zoom meetings, emails, and phone calls. Below are some numbers:

CLT Remote Teaching & Learning Support March 1 - September 24, 2020

Number of workshops/seminars	Number of individual consultations and assistance	Number of Unique Faculty and Staff that CLT provided consultations and assistance for	Number of Unique Students that CLT provided consultations and assistance
31	1189	164	28

Topics for individual consultations and assistance

- Course Design for different instructional delivery formats: course structure, identify learning objectives, comprehensive syllabus, communication and interactivity, learning materials, activities, assessments.
- Canvas - best practices for course design, content design, create online exams, course reviews, creative approaches, how to's, investigate issues
- Design/develop Instructional video: identify best approach, strategy or workflow to align with course/instructor/learning goals, best practices for planning, design, development
- Design Multimedia Assignments/assessments to meet learning objectives - plan, design, train, implement
- Instructional Technology Integration: brainstorm, identify custom approach, planning, implementation, strategy (i.e., Adobe Creative Cloud applications, Sites@PennState, i>clicker, FlipGrid, 360 video, One Button Studio, H5P, TurnItIn, Respondus, Qualtrics, Articulate Storyline, Adobe Spark, teaching with iPad, Voki, Think link, Kahoot, Poll everywhere, Screencast-o-Matic, Packback, audio recording, video editing, document sharing, collaborative tools, other survey tools.
- Research: partner with faculty on research projects of mutual interest
- Zoom - strategies for effective teaching and creating engagement, how to's, investigate issues
- Kaltura - Options/best practices for recording instructional videos, creating or submitting a media assignment, creating interactive video quizzes, integrating a Kaltura assignment into Canvas; how to's, investigate issues, managing recordings, sharing recordings

- Alternative Assessment Design - customized redesign of traditional assessment for remote learners OR to meet new learning objectives, draft customized text- or video-based instructions for students
- Classroom visits, co-teaching: - Present customized classroom presentation to students (i.e. WordPress/Sites@PennState, Adobe Spark, video storyboarding, graphic design, Kaltura Capture...)
- Video editing projects for campus: manage students' work on video projects to support campus initiatives and projects
- Accessibility of Digital Content: provide guidance to faculty to address accommodation requirements, or to proactively design accessible course content

Faculty development programs

In addition to the services mentioned above, CLT continues to offer a variety of faculty development programs:

- **Teaching and Learning Innovation** program (project-based)
- **E-Learning Academy** (15-week long, online and hybrid course design)
- **Online Course Quality Assurance** program (course-based, focus on online course design quality)
- **Teaching with Technology** Faculty Seminar (twice a year, faculty showcasing their innovative teaching)
- **Innovation in Teaching Excellence** (7-9 workshops per semester)

Workshop session topics

Between March and September 2020, CLT offered workshops on the following topics through collaboration with the Thun Library and Berks faculty:

- Teaching with Zoom (9 sessions, 8 of which during spring break)
- Teaching with Canvas (2 sessions)
- Creating Prerecorded Lecture Videos with Zoom or Kaltura Capture (2 sessions)
- Creating and managing assessments in Canvas
- Canvas Gradebook Overview
- Using polls and breakout rooms in your Zoom class
- Alternative Assessments: Kaltura and Canvas for video-based student submissions (2 sessions)
- Transforming On-paper Test to Online Quiz and Tips for Preventing Cheating Online
- Teaching with iPad
- Remote Teaching at Berks faculty webinar
- Instructional videos need to be captioned, but how exactly can I make that happen?
- Add Interaction to Class with a Collaborative Digital Whiteboard
- Kahoot! Engaging Students with Games

- Fair Use to TEACH_ Copyright Basics for Instructors
- Two Heads Are Better Than One - Designing Group Projects (Online via Zoom)
- OER Audit
- Promoting Digital Literacy Across the Curriculum with Adobe Creative Cloud
- Guidance, Tips, and Tricks of Using Canvas
- Best practices for online exams in Canvas
- Best Practices for Course Design in Canvas

Section III: Human Resources Support

Human resources summarized the programs they are providing to assist employees.

- [Health Advocate](#) – Employee Assistance Program
- Monthly Health Advocate newsletter distributed by HR
- [Teladoc](#) service for those enrolled in a PSU health plan
- [Professional Development](#) courses offered by HR/Talent Mgmt on various topics
- LinkedIn Learning courses available in the [Learning Resource Network](#) (LRN) on remote work topics
- PSU “[Return to Work](#)” website lists available training and resources

Faculty Survey Results

1. How satisfied are you with your current work from home arrangement?

(n=50, missing value= 2, mean= 3.68, SD= 1.08)

Extremely dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor unsatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Extremely satisfied
2 (3.8)	7 (13.5)	6 (11.5)	25 (48.1)	10 (19.2)

Note: frequency (%)

2. What is the biggest challenge you are currently facing while working remotely? (select up to three)

Challenges	Frequency	Challenges	Frequency
My physical workspace	14	Social isolation	15
Too many distractions at home	8	Communication with coworkers is harder	14
I'm sick or caring for sick others	2	Internet connectivity	14
Childcare	13	I don't have access to tools or information to do my job properly at home	5
General stress and concern related to the impact of coronavirus	13	Others	16

Others

- Outside noise
- Lack of proper desk and chair
- Converting courses to remote
- Could use a more powerful computer for video rendering
- Honestly, no challenges...a little more work since I have to create exams that are taken on canvas now, but that that time is kind of made up since I generally have time between classes to do things around the home when I would have otherwise been in my office talking to my colleagues (which is also a trade off now...I like and miss the social interaction we had on a day to day basis...just not the same over zoom). Also, I suppose it is a challenge in dealing with students who are probably making up excuses with exams online...there's no way to tell if they are telling the truth, and so we just have to take their word...
- None of these apply to me
- Working on home computer would prefer a psu laptop... a new one
- More time spent AT WORK - emails take longer than face-to-face comm, more work to get basic supplies (purchases), spending our own money on electricity/office needs.
- Printer/supplies
- Lack of library access

- Inefficiency--collective classroom conversations become individual Zoom meetings
- Student engagement
- Technology
- I enjoy working from home, it's doing half at school and half at home that is difficult.
- Online fatigue. Too much Zoom time, too many e-mails to read
- I received permission to teach from school.

Q3. The use of resources provided by the campus

“Have you utilized...”

Categories	Yes	No
Equipment from campus (e.g., laptops, webcams, headsets, pen tablets)	20(38.5)	32(61.5)
IT tech Support (e.g., remote trouble-shooting, assistance with updates, etc)	36(69.2)	16(30.8)
Trainings related to remote teaching (e.g., CLT consultations and webinars)	39 (75)	11(21.2)
Stress management programs (e.g., Health Matters, Employee Assistance Program)	2 (3.8)	50(96.2)
Programs, events, or tools for social interaction with colleagues (e.g., Microsoft teams, administration office hours)	35(67.3)	17(32.7)

Note. Frequency (%), missing value =2 (in trainings related to remote teaching)

Q4. The likelihood of using the resources provided by the campus

Category	Equipment	IT Tech support	Remote teaching trainings	Stress management programs	Social interaction programs
Mean	3.23	4.14	3.98	2.28	3.69
SD	1.50	1.04	1.12	1.07	1.09
Extremely unlikely	9 (17.3)	1 (1.9)	2 (3.8)	15(28.8)	1 (1.9)
Somewhat unlikely	11 (21.2)	4 (7.7)	4 (7.7)	13 (25.0)	9 (17.3)
Neither likely nor unlikely	4 (7.7)	6 (11.5)	7 (13.5)	16 (30.8)	7 (13.5)
Somewhat likely	13 (25.0)	16 (30.8)	17 (32.7)	5 (9.6)	22 (42.3)
Extremely likely	14 (26.9)	24 (46.2)	20 (38.5)	1 (1.9)	12 (23.1)
Missing values	1	1	2	2	1

Note. Frequency (%)

Q5. Suggestions for additional resources and improvement (comments)

Equipment, IT support, Remote teaching trainings, stress management trainings, Social interaction/connection programs

Equipment

- Printer and monitor
- My computer is perfectly fine -- it's software I have the issue with. Specifically MathType, ChemDraw and a physical copy of Microsoft Office.
- Tablet
- I purchased a monitor for my laptop (personal use), and it has made a huge difference. I already owned a USB headset and mic, which has been very helpful, too.
- Desk/chair-extra monitor/docking station
- Too late now. I bought (and paid out of pocket) for what I needed
- Laptop
- Printers (if possible)
- Better computer (desktop or laptop) with webcam; better headset for voice recording; better internet access
- I already have an ipad for teaching instruction that was awarded to me before Covid, but if I had not been given that, it would make some of my classes a bit challenging to create material that is facilitated via an ipad
- Computer
- Wifi signal booster or hot spot
- Some kind of notepad/whiteboard
- Monitor
- Double screen, mouse, printer
- Tools for Zoom-microphones, lighting, etc
- I bought myself a second monitor
- Hot spot
- I borrowed an extra monitor for zoom teaching
- External monitors
- Microphone (PSU laptop sound is not great)
- iPad, Pen, Headset, Monitor, Webcam
- An apple tablet that allows writing with a stylus
- I'd like their T3 line. That possible?
- N/A- I already bring my laptop home
- A second computer screen that will allow me to use one screen for course content that students and I see and a separate screen for me to interact with students
- Calculator software
- Large writing tablet. I had to purchase a 21.5" monitor for artists because as a left-handed individual, smaller tablets are cumbersome, uncomfortable.
- Headset, laptop, tablet, monitor
- A desk chair

IT Support

- Better internet connection
- Software issues with students
- Canvas issues
- Zoom and canvas issues
- Getting set up with some writing system
- A lot of help/support already being given
- Better internet connection
- It depends on the problem
- Ability to have an administrator provided a password so I can update software
- They've been great!
- None at the moment-they are doing a great job!
- Connecting home printer
- Installing and updating software
- Availability

Remote teaching trainings

- Using Zoom
- None right now
- Remote teaching strategies
- Tools to make remote easier and more interactive
- Learning how to use a notepad or whiteboard
- More Canvas and other like Loom or Camtasia
- I would like to go to more trainings but do not have time for them
- Canvas and Zoom training has been helpful
- Encouraging discussions, creating community. Basically, beyond the tech. I understand the tech and would benefit from more pedagogical discussions of how to engage students.
- Managing student accountability and participation on Zoom; tips for making the pre-class sign in more pleasant (i.e., music, casual activities for student interaction)
- Student engagement in remote learning spaces
- Zoom, Kaltura, Student Engagements, Assessments, etc.
- Unsure
- Maintaining a balance btwn work demands and home
- Making online learning more engaging for students and help with using Zoom more effectively (including taking attendance and doing polls).
- Innovations in remote instruction
- Faire engagement strategies for math students

Stress management programs

- I can manage my own mental health, thanks!
- Not sure
- N/A
- Time to exercise
- I do yoga and take walks
- Wine (after work)
- None. It's the extra time on the computer that is stressful!
- Access to yoga or meditations
- Outdoor physical activity
- Anything they provide
- Yes
- I am open to anything related to this topic
- Not sure
- "no unnecessary e-mail for a day" day
- Yoga, routine exercise regiments
- Dealing with computer knowledge or lack there of stress
- Placing more value on healthy boundaries for faculty that would be beneficial

Social interaction/connection programs

- Seminars and talks
- Faculty "happy hours" on Zoom, MS teams
- What is available is fine
- N/A
- Not sure
- Zoom meetings are sufficient I THINK
- Zoom
- Email continues to be the best for me
- Anything program that can give me more time?
- Office hours
- I haven't felt this need
- Our existing meetings are fine
- Informal Zoom meetings
- Social events
- Teams and Zoom
- Zoom
- Teams, physically distant but in the same space meetings
- More buy in from other faculty

Q6. Best practices shared by faculty

- When used properly, Zoom is an amazing tool.
- Being alone at home during business / work hours.

- Pre-assigned zoom breakout rooms, Zoom chat feature
- iPad instruction...i mean, there's a ton of different ways to structure remote classes...I don't think this is really the place to delve into that.
- Zoom meetings, email
- Active learning, guided inquiry, small groups, discussion boards all seem to adapt quite well to the remote environment
- I get to spend more time at home with my spouse - even if we are busy working
- Everyone at CLT, IT, and the library have been AMAZING!
- Keeping my class as similar to the way I teach in person - with adjustments of course!
- Teaching hybrid course so that I am on campus regularly
- Flexibility, ability to join meetings via Zoom, getting a lot of work done via e-mail and eliminating some extra meetings has been helpful. Finally, I appreciate all the teaching support in terms of trainings and consultations provided by TLT and CLT. Those have been great.
- Office 365 is useful for teaching remotely.

Q7. Additional areas for improvement

- Software, software, software!!!!
- Yes. Administrative work such as hiring students and etc.
- Outside noise (my neighbor is building an addition) and internet connectivity are sporadic issues, but I think that comes with the territory.
- How robust my work-from-home setup would be if a family member's school or workspace were to close, such that someone else would be at home during business hours.
- N/A
- This survey seems biased toward showing that PSU is doing a good job of offering support (e.g., CLT, IT, etc), but with the exception of the first item doesn't really seem to focus on identifying problems. For instance, software that is freely available on campus (e.g., SPSS) has to be purchased by faculty to work from home (it is possible to access remotely, but the connection laggy and crashes). It is worth noting that PSU has provided free, limited, downloadable versions for students, but nothing for faculty who teach those classes. Additionally, all(?) of the support seems to be directed at teaching. I have seen nothing related to, e.g., human subjects research. No support/funding for, e.g., accessing online subject pools or help navigating the additional, cumbersome approvals necessary for conducting face-to-face research.
- Can't think of any. Truthfully, working from home has been awesome but I do miss face to face. There is a social component that can't be replicated with remote style interaction. Assessments take a bit more work to make sure they are being done correctly (curb cheaters), but my lectures feel 'mostly' like face to face. Sure, some students can be doing whatever and I have no idea what they are doing...but to me, that's on them if they don't want to learn the material they are paying for. The other students, they'll participate and ask questions just like a regular face to face. I think this whole experience has taught me that classes can be done synchronously remotely and still be effective, but that there always that face to face aspect of accountability that some students will benefit from. I

think remote synchronous might be something to include in the future just as we have been pushing online classes so heavily. I think it is a worthwhile delivery method for courses....I don't think it should necessarily be looked at as being a negative if an instructor would like to choose that method. I mentioned earlier that you lose out on the social component with colleagues, which is true to an extent. That time I am not in the office chitchatting (and not doing school work really) is now at home being productive BOTH with house chores AND getting school work done. outside of creating new exams and that extra work, I get ALL my grading done at home....when I was travelling into school for teaching, I was only teaching...I never got 'work' done when I was at work...if that makes sense...*end ramble*

- Some coordination across campus events would be helpful. Getting repeated messages about an event from different people is distracting. Also, more effort could be put into avoiding overlapping events. Also, consistency between offices about Zoom security recommendations would be appreciated.
- bought a lot of new office furniture. Expensive.
- University support for hardware/software for heavy video lectures that we are producing. Personal external drives? Not comfortable just using the cloud.
- Ending Zoom meetings on time--it's important to honor scheduling blocks (i.e., some participants need the 10-minute break before class).
- We have faculty meetings, Division meetings, and senate meetings but we do not have program meetings to address the concerns about our own program and share the best practices. I hope this will be encouraged.
- Internet is unstable and I'm not paying for higher grade internet for my employer.
- How to get students to cooperate with leaving their cameras on or in some other way engaging in class discussion.
- working at home is so much less stressful than working at work--too much multitasking at work and the number of students physically attending in person has dwindled each week
- Have you spent any of your money making necessary improvements to work at home? I've spent at least \$700 to make sure I can deliver high quality online instruction consistently.

