

Penn State Berks Senate

Monday, February 16, 2009

1:00-2:30 PM, Multi-Purpose Room

Agenda

- **Call to Order**
- **Additions, Corrections, and Approval of Minutes of the December 1, 2008 meeting**
- **Announcements by the Chair**
- **Reports of Officers and University Senators**
 - Vice Chair Dunbar
 - Secretary and Senator Zambanini
 - Senator Aynardi
 - Senator Bowers
 - Senator Nasereddin
 - Senator and Parliamentarian Romberger
 - Student Senator Karazsia
- **Comments and Announcements by Administrators**
 - Chancellor Speece
 - Associate Dean Esqueda
- **Unfinished Business**
- **Motions from Committees**
 - Academic Affairs Committee Motion to Approve the Procedure for the Proposal of Majors and Minors (**Appendix A**);

- Legislative Report on Summer Compensation, Faculty Affairs Committee (**Appendix B**)
- Amendment to the Standing Rules of the Penn State Berks Senate Constitution, Strategic Planning and Budget Committee (**Appendix C**)

- **Informational Reports from Committees**
 - Academic Affairs Meeting Notes from October 17, 2008 (**Appendix D**);
 - Academic Affairs Minutes from November 14, 2008 Meeting (**Appendix E**);
 - Academic Affairs Committee Report on Responses to Comments on Theatre Degree (**Appendix F**);
 - Strategic Planning and Budget Committee (SPBC) Minutes for the December 5, 2008 Meeting (**Appendix G**);
 - Student Life Committee Informational Report on NCAA Division III Athletics (**Appendix H**);
 - Student Life Committee Minutes, December 8, 2008 (**Appendix I**).

- **New Legislative Business**

- **Forensic Business**

- **Adjournment**

Penn State Berks Senate
Monday, December 1, 2008
1:00-2:30 PM, Multi-Purpose Room

Attendees: Khaled Abdou, Katie Amaral, Mohamad Ansari, Jennifer Arnold, David Aurentz, Martha Aynardi, Kira Baker-Doyle, David Bender, William H. Bowers, Jayne Brown, Ruth Daly, Maureen Dunbar, Bob Forrey, Paul Frye, Leonard Gamberg, Laurie Grobman, Hassan Gourama, Zohra Guisse, Bruce Hale, Cleo House Jr., Jui-Chi Huang, Samantha Kavky, Abdullah Konak, Sadan Kulturel, Gary Kunkelman, Mike Moyer, Marilyn Mussomeli, Tami Mysliwicz, Mahdi Nasereddin, Rungun Nathan, Sandee Nevitt, Randall Newnham, Steve Oswald, Lolita Paff, JoAnne Pumariega, Jianbing Qi, Malika Richards, Andy Romberger, Brenda Russell, Daniel Russell, John Shank, Alice Shaparenko, Ike Shibley, Stephen Snyder, Terry Speicher, Rosario Torres, Lorena Tribe, James Walter, Amy White-Berger, Janet Winter, Bob Zambanini, Mitch Zimmer (Faculty); Cindy Balliett, Sandy Kreis (Staff); Pradip Bandyopadhyay, Kim Berry, Mary Lou D'Allegro, Paul Esqueda, Pat Kohrman, Janelle Larson, Jim Laurie, Dennis Mays, Deena Morganti, Belen Rodriguez-Mourelo, Susan Phillips Speece, Blaine Steensland (Administration); Amro Fadel, Timothy Hillert, Nicholas Yeager (Students)

1. **Call to Order** – *This was an abbreviated session of Faculty Senate to allow members to participate in World Aid's Day event.*
2. **Approval of Minutes of the Preceding Meetings – Minutes of October 20, 2008 – approved**
3. **Announcements by the Chair – None**
4. **Reports of Officers and University Senators (Appendix A)**
 - **Vice Chair Dunbar – No report**
 - **Secretary and Senator Zambanini**
 - Cindy Balliett will be leaving the Chancellor's Office and the position of Assistant to the Secretary which she has held for the past 6 years. Cindy has been a valuable asset to the Senate.
 - Dr. Ansari added his appreciation to Cindy for her invaluable service to the Senate.
 - Sandy Kreis joins the Senate as the new representative of the Professional Assistants.
 - **Senator Aynardi** – Senator Aynardi mentioned that issues involving fixed-term faculty should be brought to her attention.
 - **Senator Bowers – No Report**
 - **Senator Nasereddin – No Report**
 - **SGA Senator Karazia (Nick Yeager, Chief of Staff, reporting on behalf of SGA)** – SGA is working on a smoking policy which will be presented to Senate when completed.
 - **Senator and Parliamentarian Romberger** – The University Senate meeting tomorrow at University Park will be brief; however, there will be committee work.
5. **Comments and Announcements by Administrators**
 - **Chancellor Speece**
 - A Memorial service took place today for Howard O. "Mike" Beaver, for whom the Beaver Community Center and the Beaver Endowment were named. Mr. Beaver served on the Board of Directors at University Park. We appreciate all that Mike has done for our campus, the University and the community. He was an integral member of the campus.
 - The IT department will be checking computers for information such as Social Security numbers. The risk is real. A virus has compromised one computer which contained sensitive information. Everybody is asked to cooperate with IT in this venture.
 - **Associate Dean Esqueda**
 - The Celebration of Teaching will be held on December 18, 2008. Attendees are asked to confirm their attendance.

- Commencement will be held on Saturday, December 20. A breakfast will take place prior to the ceremony. Again, attendees are asked to confirm their attendance.
- The Faculty Retreat will take place on January 7, 2009. John Romano will be the guest speaker; his topic will be “Implementing the Strategic Plan.” Review the email you were sent.
- Afterwards, a luncheon will be held recognizing Dr. Mohamad Ansari, Ray Mazurek and Bill Sutherland for 25 years of service. They will be presented with a chair in commemoration of that milestone.

6. Unfinished Business – None

7. Motions from Committees – None

8. Informational Reports from Committees

- **Report of the Senate Ad-Hoc Committee on Free Speech, Executive Committee (Appendix A) – Dr. Randy Newnham**
 - The issue was brought before the HASS Committee, in spring. In particular, it was questioned if there were ways that we could improve the free speech climate on campus. There were some rules impeding the ability of students to present issues which were of concern to them, such as allowing demonstrations or leaflet distribution on campus. More discussion will be needed to work within the campus and University guidelines.
 - The Committee felt that they need to be proactive when it comes to addressing discussions on politics and other controversial issues of society as part of an educational function.
- **Physical Facilities and Safety Committee Meeting Minutes, November 14, 2008 (Appendix B) – Dr. Leonard Gamberg**
 - The Committee is revisiting the issue of emeritus faculty office space. Recommendations will be presented in the spring.
- **Student Life Committee Minutes, November 3, 2008 (Appendix C) – Dr. Ike Shibley**
 - An informational report will be presented at the next Senate meeting.

9. New Legislative Business – None

10. Forensic Business – Scanning for Risk Security Analysis (Pat Kohrman, Chief Information Officer)

- In January 2008, the process of scanning computers for sensitive information as part of the Risk Security Analysis program began with the downloading of software called Spider. Now that the licenses have been secured, we will begin the process of scanning all faculty and staff machines, including ones that had been originally scanned.
- The scanning software is looking for Social Security numbers, bank routing numbers, and credit card numbers. If these items are detected, a report is generated which is put into a secure PDF file and sent to University Park’s Security Office to be analyzed. The report is then sent back, documenting the items found. The computer user must delete those pieces of information. Caution should be taken in deleting files because files could be lost. It is important to work with the IT staff to avoid having this scenario occur. Please cooperate with your IT tech to make this process go smoothly
- It is important to remove items such as those mentioned above from computers to comply with federal and state laws as well as University policy.
- If you plan to travel with laptops, before your computer is scanned, please have a scan done before you leave. This action will prevent problems should the laptop be lost or stolen.

11. Adjournment

APPENDIX A
Legislative Report – Academic Affairs Committee
Motion to Approve the Procedure for the Proposal of Majors and Minors

Introduction:

At the September 28, 2007 meeting, the Penn State Berks Senate approved a motion for the procedure for the approval of new majors to our college. The AAC is charged by the University Senate, as well as the Penn State Berks Senate, to review curricular procedures to ensure that they are consistent with University policy.

Discussion and Rationale:

After review of the University *Guide to Curricular Procedures*, the following changes are being proposed to the current document:

- 1.) The approval of minors must follow the same procedure as the approval of majors. Therefore, minors have been included in the document.
- 2.) Because of the confusion regarding the difference in the types of proposals as well as the procedure for the development of the proposals, the document includes the step-by-step procedure for degree proposals.
- 3.) The following statement was added to the document: “The college representative to SCCA (who is also a member of AAC) must review and sign all final proposals before forwarding the proposal to the dean of the college.” This is specified in the *Guide to Curricular Procedures*.
- 4.) The SCCA committee of the University Senate has stressed that one of the roles of the local curricular affairs committees (AAC) is to ensure that the appropriate consultation has occurred in the development of proposals. A statement to this effect has been added to the document.
- 5.) According to the University Senate, the local committees (AAC) have the authority to approve, reject, or ask for revisions to degree proposals. The document has also been changed to include this statement.

Recommendation:

The Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the current document titled “Procedure for the Approval of Majors and Minors” be approved.

Effective Date: December 1, 2008

Committee members proposing legislation:

Maureen Dunbar, Chair
David Bender
Paul Esqueda
Joanna Garner
Robert Isaacson
Jane Leh
Shiyoung Lee
Deena Morganti
Tami Mysliwicz
Robert Zambanini

**Academic Affairs Committee
Procedure for the Proposal of Majors and Minors
Penn State Berks**

The Academic Affairs Committee is charged by the University with “ensuring adherence to the University's standards of academic quality and curricular integrity.” The University also charges Curricular Committees to “review, evaluate, and approve or reject all course and curriculum proposals including proposals to limit program enrollment submitted by the various departments, colleges, and other appropriate units of the University that have not received delegation or responsibility in this area from the Senate” and to “develop criteria for evaluating courses and curricula and recommend procedures for handling courses and curriculum proposals.”

In addition, the Penn State Berks Faculty Senate Constitution charges the Academic Affairs committee to: 1) Approve or disapprove new courses, programs, and other curricular proposals in accordance with University and campus curricular procedures; 2) Publicize and invite comment all new course, program and other curricular proposals at least two weeks prior to the committee’s final action on such matters; 3) Approve or disapprove all other curricular matters; 4) Review and evaluate academic planning including enrollment projections and faculty requirements; and 5) Review, evaluate, and make recommendations on issues relating to enrollment and retention programs and policies.

Comment [j1]: Should this be “to all new”?

Comment [j2]: Is there any option for revision?

The purpose of this document is to describe the process to 1) offer new degrees at Penn State Berks, 2) transfer existing degrees to Penn State Berks, and 3) make changes to existing degrees currently offered at Penn State Berks.

Types of Proposals:

P-1: NEW UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES/MAJORS, OPTIONS AND MINORS, AND CHANGES IN UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS/MAJORS, OPTIONS AND MINORS

P-1 proposals are the basis of Administrative and University Faculty Senate curricular approval and are used to add or amend undergraduate academic programs, including majors, options within majors, and minors. See *Guidelines to Curricular Procedures*, Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs (http://www.senate.psu.edu/curriculum_resources/guide/contents.html)

P-3: MOVING/DISCONTINUING DEGREE PROGRAMS (Major and Minor) AMONG COLLEGES AND CAMPUSES

P-3 proposals are the basis of the administrative review and approval process that enable a second college or multiple colleges to deliver programs already authorized in another college; that enable a college to deliver an existing program at an additional campus within its purview or through the World Campus; that authorize the closure of a program in a college or campus so long as that program will continue to be offered elsewhere at the University; and that, under extraordinary circumstances, may authorize the delivery of extended degrees.

University procedures can be found at <http://www.psu.edu/dept/oue/aappm/P-intro.html> and <http://www.psu.edu/dept/oue/aappm/P-3.html>.

Prospectus : The addition of a major, option, or minor to the University curriculum requires academic and administrative approval. The first step in the process is the completion of the [Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education](#) (ACUE) [Curricular Programs Prospectus](#). A Prospectus must also be completed to change the name of a major, option, or minor and to discontinue offering a major, option, or minor. The following steps should be followed in the development of a prospectus:

1. Preliminary college and disciplinary consultation and consultation between campus chancellor(s) and Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses.
2. The Associate Dean/Director of Academic Affairs will submit a prospectus to the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses (VPCC) with Chancellor Cover Letter.
3. The VPCC will forward the prospectus to ACUE for consultation. (The Academic Affairs committee is not part of the ACUE consultation prospectus process—the process only requires that consultation occurs with “appropriate disciplines and Chancellors.”)
4. ACUE will review the prospectus and return the prospectus to the College with their suggestions for the degree proposal.

Proposal Process: If the prospectus is approved, a P-1 or P-3 should be prepared that incorporates the suggestions of ACUE. The following steps should be followed in the development of a proposal:

1. The faculty member(s) ~~in~~ within the division will develop a formal proposal, including appropriate consultation, data collection and research. Please refer to the *Guide for Curricular Procedures* found on the University Senate website for development of proposals.
2. The proposal ~~is~~ will then be submitted to the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Penn State Berks Senate. The committee must invite consultation at least two weeks prior to the committee’s final action on such matters, so please plan accordingly. ~~Once~~ When the chair of the Academic Affairs committee receives the proposal, it will be sent to the college faculty for consultation for a period of 7 days to start from the date that the proposal is sent.
3. The Academic Affairs Committee will consider the proposal at its next meeting, taking all college faculty comments into consideration. As per University Senate: “The college committee should evaluate proposals both academically and in relation to Senate requirements as outlined in the *Guide to Curricular Procedures*. The college committee may approve, reject or ask for revisions in the proposal. It may also require additional consultation outside the offering unit”. It is the role of the AAC to ensure that appropriate consultation has occurred.
4. The college representative to SCCA (who is also a member of AAC) must review and sign all final proposals before forwarding the proposal to the dean of the college.
5. Upon gaining support ~~Once the proposal has from the~~ Faculty Senate support (through the Penn State Berks AAC), the proposal ~~is~~ will be sent to the Office of Undergraduate Education for Review. The Provost will review the Office of Undergraduate Education action on the proposed degree.
6. Upon approval of the degree from ~~Once~~ the Office of Undergraduate Education ~~approves the degree~~, a memo ~~is~~ will be sent to appropriate offices for implementation of the degree.
7. The degree is implemented the following semester or later.

Comment [j3]: I’m thinking this is the correct choice between in and within?

Comment [j4]: I just adjusted the subsequent paragraphs to reflect this initial verb form of “will”

APPENDIX B

Faculty Affairs Committee Report on Summer Compensation

Legislative
November 14, 2008

Faculty Affairs Committee Charge

Review the current policy on summer compensation for courses with enrollments between 6 and 10 students, and compensation rate for full time instruction and send a Legislative Report to the Berks Senate with an appropriate recommendation.

Current Policy

Summer compensation policy for full time faculty

Penn State Berks

02/08/2007

For courses with an enrollment of at least 10 students, full time faculty will be paid 1/36 of salary per credit for the 1st course (in other words, 1/12 for a 3 credit course or 1/9 for a 4 credit course). For additional courses, faculty will be paid the adjunct rate of \$800 per credit. Courses that include labs are compensated at the number of credits for the course plus one-half the additional time allotted for the lab. The faculty member decides which course is considered the first one for compensation purposes.

- For courses with an enrollment between 6-9 students, the adjunct rate will be paid. If there are less than 6 students, faculty will be paid \$80 per credit per student, but the faculty member is allowed to cancel the course rather than take that rate.
- Compensation for summer internships:
 - 1 – 5 students = 1 credit at adjunct rate
 - 6 - 10 students = 2 credits adjunct rate
 - 11 or more students = 3 credits at percentage of salary
- Variations from these guidelines when appropriate for special circumstances should be discussed with the division head and approved by the associate dean for academic affairs.
- Contracts for the summer session must be signed and returned by April 15. In signing the contract for a summer course, the faculty member agrees to teach the course if enrollment is at least 6 students.

Background

Some faculty members remember the days when a full-time faculty member could earn more in the summer sessions than during the school year. It is clear that those days are gone and have been for awhile. A version of the current policy has been around for ten years or more. Late in Carl Lovitt's term the number of students needed for "full" compensation was reduced to its current number. The

maximum adjunct rate of \$800 per credit last changed in 2001. Thus, it seems a reasonable time to look at this issue.

A related issue comes in the middle area of six to nine students. At this point the course MUST run, but full time faculty members are reluctant to teach it for the part-time rate. In fact, in the past, a course or two have been cancelled even with the enrollment because it wasn't the required ten and they wanted to teach at the full time rate. Thus at least one faculty has resorted to breaking their contracts. (Note that the vast majority of faculty members are very accommodating regardless of enrollment.) One solution to this, since full-time faculty members have right to first refusal, is to have a list of pre-approved part-time faculty who can be put on notice that in the event the full timer can't teach it, they can take over the course for the summer on reasonably short notice. It is important to keep the course running so that our students can get the class that was promised to them when they registered. Another solution might be a sliding scale for compensation in the six to nine range of students.

Competition

Any analysis of compensation would be remiss if we did not look at what our competitors', both internal and external, pay. The next two tables show the summer compensation for Penn State, and non Penn State campuses, respectively. These campuses/colleges were chosen due to proximity to Berks.

Penn State Campus	Summer Compensation	Adjunct Rate	Comment
Berks	Percent of salary if 10 or more students. Adjunct rate 6-9	\$800/credit	Part timers start at lower rate, tenure track at higher
Brandywine	Percent of salary	\$767/credit	Recently increased
Harrisburg	Percent of salary	\$1000/credit	See Schuylkill
Lehigh Valley	Percent of salary if 10 or more students. Adjunct rate 6-9	\$800/credit	Has remained the same as Berks
Schuylkill	\$102 per credit per student, to a maximum of 11% of yearly salary for full-time faculty	\$1000/credit maximum	Two business faculty members noted plan is generous, but there are rarely enough students to run business courses.

Local Schools	Summer Compensation	Adjunct Rate	Comment
Albright	At adjunct rate	\$800/credit	-
Alvernia	Full timers receive adjunct rate in summer	\$830/credit	As with Berks, rate starts at a lower value and increases with experience.

Kutztown	\$4,598 to \$11,072	Not reported	Varies with range shown going from instructor to full professor.
RACC	Not reported	\$735/credit	Community college

Note that Berks is near the low end for Penn State campuses and in the middle of colleges in the county.

Cost Analysis

In addition to competitive rates it is important to understand the costs/benefits. Thus it is unreasonable to expect the administration to allow courses to run that lose money. In summer, there is little availability of financial aid, so listed tuition is approximately equal to effective tuition. The tuition schedule for summer 2009 is:

Student type	Tuition Rate (\$/credit)
Freshmen/Sophomores	\$479
Juniors/Senior s- EBC	\$554
Juniors/Seniors - Other	\$521

For the cost analysis, it appears reasonable to use \$500/credit as an approximation for revenue. Based on the current policy, compensation for a three- credit course would be as shown in column 3, below. This assumes the average Berks full-time faculty member earns \$60,000 a year (based on Chronicle of Higher Education data for the state and probably overstated for Berks). Finally, for estimation purposes we have assumed that the total cost to run a course is about three times faculty cost, as shown in column 4. This is consistent with some industry/consulting data, but would probably be too low for a similar analysis of fall and spring semesters.

Number of students	Revenue	Faculty cost	Assumed total cost	Assumed profit
1	\$ 1,500	\$ 240	\$ 720	\$ 780
2	\$ 3,000	\$ 480	\$ 1,440	\$ 1,560
3	\$ 4,500	\$ 720	\$ 2,160	\$ 2,340
4	\$ 6,000	\$ 960	\$ 2,880	\$ 3,120
5	\$ 7,500	\$ 1,200	\$ 3,600	\$ 3,900
6	\$ 9,000	\$ 2,400	\$ 7,200	\$ 1,800

7	\$ 10,500	\$ 2,400	\$ 7,200	\$ 3,300
8	\$ 12,000	\$ 2,400	\$ 7,200	\$ 4,800
9	\$ 13,500	\$ 2,400	\$ 7,200	\$ 6,300
10	\$ 15,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 15,000	\$ -
15	\$ 22,500	\$ 5,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 7,500
20	\$ 30,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
25	\$ 37,500	\$ 5,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 22,500
30	\$ 45,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 30,000

Thus, the current policy provides that courses will be profitable no matter the number of students enrolled. Projected total profit for the summer is on the order of \$550,000, but this should be taken as a rough estimate.

An analysis of data shows that the profitability of the summer sessions is highly dependent on the top three or four courses by enrollment. The top three courses accounted for 40% of profit the first semester and 43% the second. Thus, any salary increases must be evaluated carefully as they may leave the campus with many courses that are not profitable to run.

Since, the rate for courses with ten or more students has gone up each year with faculty salaries, it is reasonable to look closely at the adjunct rate. This has not changed since 2001. Adjusted for inflation, the maximum rate of \$800/credit would be just over \$1000 in today's dollars.

Caveats

The above projections assume that 2009 looks like 2008. With the current economic issues that may not be the case. Enrollment may be down as students and their parents feel the pinch. Even in good years, summer enrollment varies. Some students take summer courses so they can get out into the job market faster. With jobs scarce they may see no need to do so.

It would be useful to know what the summer profits are used for. For example, the most profitable courses are primarily in the Science Division. Thus, if the money has been going towards the Luerssen renovation, then that seems reasonable. Overall, it seems reasonable for the faculty to receive some type of increase in compensation.

Conclusions

- The summer program is extremely profitable, but that profit is dependent on a small number of courses. In addition the economic climate suggests caution.
- Faculty members have a strong preference for teaching courses with the compensation system for ten or more students.

- The current structure ensures that the University does not lose money on any summer course run.
- Berks is at the low end of adjunct-rate compensation.
- The adjunct rate, which controls compensation for six to nine students in a course, has not been increased in seven years. Inflation alone would raise that rate to over \$1000/credit. Paying \$1000/credit would increase faculty cost by about \$15,000 a summer, assuming the mix of courses, faculty, and enrollment remains the same.
- The summer program is sufficiently profitable to allow for the above increase in faculty compensation.

Recommendation

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends

- Raising the maximum adjunct rate and summer rate for six to nine students to \$1000/credit. It would be reasonable to do so in stages over a few years. Other per credit rates should be increased a similar amount.
- In the future, the adjunct rate should be evaluated more frequently to assure Berks is competitive.
- Increased compensation for faculty teaching courses with over 20, over 30, etc students should be considered.

Acknowledgements

The Faculty Affairs Committee would like to thank Dennis Mays, David Bender, Valerie Rowe, Tina Scornavacchi, Sudip Ghosh, and Paul Esqueda who provided data or other input for this report.

Committee Members making recommendations

William Bowers
 Paul Esqueda
 Hassan Gourama
 Daniel Litvin (Chair)
 Michael Riley
 Jeanne Marie Rose
 James Shankweiler
 Mitch Zimmer

APPENDIX C

STRATEGIC PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Amendment to the Standing Rules of the Penn State Berks Senate Constitution

January 21, 2009

Introduction: In September 2008, The Strategic Planning and Budget Committee was charged (joint with the Faculty Affairs committee) “to review the annual University Faculty Senate Informational Report on Faculty Salaries as it relates to the Berks Campus and submit an informational report to the Berks Senate.” Over the last several months, the committee has encountered a number of difficulties relating to the length and detail of the University Report and a lack of historical perspective. While the salary history does exist in the form of previous reports submitted annually to the University Faculty Senate, to explore these previous reports exceeds the charge of the committee beyond a reasonable degree, considering their number and that their length and detail are equal to the current report.

Rationale: The committee members agree that in order to develop a reasonable and responsible perspective on the Faculty Salary question, a sense of history is required, and that in order to develop that historical perspective, the committee should review current data annually, as it becomes available, and submit annual reports. Annual reports will enable faculty to stay on top of the salary question and keep our administrators informed so that they may address our salary concerns before they become questions of significant inequity, as currently seems to exist. Annual reports will also enable the committee to review the salary history more easily and completely and make recommendations that administrators may be more able and likely to accept.

Recommendation/Motion: The committee moves that the standing rules of the Berks Senate be amended to include the following charge under Article VI, Section 5 (b):

“Review the annual University Faculty Senate Informational Report on Faculty Salaries as it relates to the Berks Campus and submit an informational report to the Berks Senate.”

(Appendix D)
Academic Affairs - Meeting Notes from October 17, 2008

Members in attendance: David Bender (Registrar), Maureen Dunbar (Chair), Paul Esqueda (Associate Dean), Joanna Garner, Shiyong Lee, Jayne Leh, Deena Morganti, James Walter

The primary agenda item for this meeting was to review the Penn State Berks Procedure for the Proposal of Majors to determine if the document is consistent with University Senate procedures for degree planning. Several issues were discussed:

1. David Bender mentioned that we currently do not have a procedure for the proposal of new minors. According to the *Guide to Curricular Procedures*, the approval of new minors follows the same procedure as the approval of new majors. Therefore, the document has been revised to include minors.
2. Another issue that was discussed was the following statement in the current document: *“The committee sees itself as representing faculty, not as a committee charged with making unilateral decisions regarding academic programming.”* The committee discussed whether this statement was in congruence with the University Senate policy which states that it is the responsibility of the local curricular committees to ensure that not only has the appropriate consultation occurred, but also that the proposals meet the standard set by the University Senate. While the committee agrees that it is the responsibility of the faculty of that division to consider resources as they relate to the new degree(s), it is ultimately the responsibility of the AAC to ensure that the new degrees meet the requirements specified by the University Senate. Therefore, the committee agreed to remove the above mentioned statement from the document and insert the following statement into the document: *“College curricular committees (AAC) can accept, reject or ask for revisions to degree proposals.”*
3. It is also stated in the Guide to Curricular Procedures that the SCCA member, who is also a member of AAC, must sign off on all proposals considered by the AAC. This step was added to the document.
4. Paul Esqueda mentioned that there are a few degree proposals in progress. Maureen suggested that because it is so difficult to navigate through the University Senate website, it may be useful to list the steps involved in the degree proposal process. Future meetings and charges were also discussed. Maureen Dunbar and David Bender are on the Retention Council and will update the AAC on the progress of the Retention Council at a future meeting. Additionally, the AAC has a joint charge with the Student Life committee to provide an informational report on the Academic Recovery Program. This will be the focus of a future meeting.

Future meetings and charges were also discussed. Maureen Dunbar and David Bender are on the Retention Council and will update the AAC on the progress of the Retention Council at a future meeting. Additionally, the AAC has a joint charge with the Student Life committee to provide an informational report on the Academic Recovery Program. This will be the focus of a future meeting.

Respectfully Submitted

Maureen Dunbar, Chair

(Appendix E)

Academic Affairs
Minutes from November 14, 2008 Meeting

Members in Attendance: Maureen Dunbar (Chair) Jayne Leh, Shiyong Lee, Deena Morganti, Tami Mysliwiec, James Walter, Robert Zambanini

Guests: Cleo House and Belen Rodriguez-Mourello

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and vote on the P3- proposal for a Theatre Degree. HASS Division Head, Belen Rodrigues-Mourello, and Theatre Faculty Cleo House, were present to answer questions regarding the proposal. Several comments were submitted by the Berks Faculty. Cleo was kind enough to provide a written statement addressing these concerns/comments. These comments are being submitted as part of the minutes for this meeting.

The AAC voted unanimously to approve the P3 proposal for the Theatre Degree.

Respectfully Submitted,

Maureen Dunbar, Chair

APPENDIX F

November 12, 2008

RE: P3 Proposal for a BA Theatre Degree at PSU Berks

Dear Academic Affairs Committee,

We thank you for taking the time to review our P3 for a BA Theatre Degree. We would also like to extend our sincere thanks to all those within our Berks community who responded with support and concerns.

In our feedback, we received comments of support from 4 individuals, 1 individual comment that asks for job title clarification, and 5 individuals listed comments of concern. We believe this response alone speaks to the support of program from the College Community (and the thoroughness of the P3) that out of all the faculty only 5 had concerns that they would like to have addressed.

We would like to address all of the concerns listed. Even though some of the concerns are addressed in our P3, we believe it is important that we alleviate all doubtful queries by addressing them point by point. We have grouped the appropriate queries together by type: **Market/Competition, Staffing, Career Paths, Course Availability, and Comments of Support.**

Market/Competition

- “There is no evidence that the program can attract a minimum of 10 new students a year.”
 - Response 1: **Based on the current number of student enrollment majoring in Theatre (30) at Ursinus College in Collegeville, PA with a current student body of approximately 1,600 is almost half the size of Penn State Berks . Albright College could also be used as an example. Albright has just under 2500 students and boasts a program with almost fifty majors and minors. Our quote of 10 students is a fair and reasonable expectation. The Market Research (pp. 2,3 of the P3 proposal) is indicative of this interest as well.**
- “The data that shows that some students can't [get] into the program at UP does not mean that students from around PA and from other states would want to enroll at Berks.”
 - Response 2: **The data projected on page 2 in our P3 is not claiming that all students who apply to UP would come to Berks. UP has a longer history and offers a different experience but we both would share in the exact same Penn State degree. What the graph shows is that the interest for a Penn State degree in Theatre is high. And while we are aware that students who are turned away from UP are not guaranteed to attend Berks, the likely prospect cannot be overlooked that they may want to stay within the Penn State system (one university geographically dispersed) for several purposes, such as a transfer to UP or preference for Berks' smaller size. The Market Study (pp. 2, 3 of the P3) supports a strong interest level for Theatre at Berks.**

- “The information on page 7 regarding competition is contradictory, first stating "Currently there are no state institutions in the Reading area offering a degree in Theatre" but then "Kutztown University has a major in Theatre."

Response 3

- **Response 3: Based on our geographical reference, we feel our statement is accurate. In the P3 we specifically state the Reading Area and not Berks County. While Kutztown is in Berks County, it is not in the Reading area such as Albright, Alvernia, and RACC.**

- “No other PSU campus offers a theater degree which suggests that the degree will be difficult to implement because there are no counterparts in the system to provide guidance.”

Response 4

- **Response 4: The idea that we should not have a major at Berks because “no counterparts are in the system,” is not a viable argument due to precedent. Recently, Penn State Altoona implemented a Visual Arts Major and there are NO other Visual Arts Majors in the Penn State School System. They consulted with the appropriate department at UP and received guidance, just as we did prior to submitting our proposal.**

- “Other than a sentence that states that Dan Carter, Director of the School of Theatre at UP, have all indicated support of a BA degree in Theatre at Penn State Berks and that the HASS faculty concur there is no other indication that the theatre faculty at PSU Berks have consulted any other members of the academic theatre community. Have the faculty consulted with other members of the theatre program at UP or even locally at the colleges and universities in our area. I would like to see how their programs function in terms of student enrollment, facilities as well as student outcomes.”

Response 5

- **Response 5: We have consulted with Albright College, Ursinus College, Texas A&M Corpus Christi, Oklahoma State University, Portland State University, and the University of Tennessee. We’ve also garnered responses from listserv members in the Association for Theatre in Higher Education. Our consultations included a variety of topics from career paths, space accommodations, and staffing. Please see responses #1, #10, #14, #15 as indicators of this.**

Staffing

- “Page 8. The cost analysis does not include the cost of release time for the program coordinator, the cost of hiring part-time faculty to teach general education courses because the theatre faculty will be teaching classes in the major, and the cost of additional part-time faculty to teach courses in the major because the proposal states that no new full-time faculty will be hired.”

Response 6

- **Response 6: It was an oversight not to include the Part Time Instructor/Adjunct position on the Cost Analysis page, but the position is mentioned on pages 16 and 17 titled Staffing and Four Year Grid. After speaking with Deb Moller the cost of hiring an Part Time Instructor would be \$650 per credit hour, to teach two courses per semester which would maintain the status quo regarding the availability of General Education courses in theatre and serve as a course release for the Program Coordinator. For two 3 credit courses the total would be \$3,900 per semester. In our**

original proposal we list the Part Time Instructor as teaching one course per semester, it is now clear that two courses per semester would be more appropriate. We have support from Paul Esqueda and Belen Rodriguez-Mourleo regarding this amendment.

- “Page 16. The proposal states that three tenure track faculty will be teaching in the program but this is contradicted by the staffing grid. And there are only two full-time theatre faculty, only one of which is tenure track. The staffing grid does show where one tenured faculty from another discipline will teach a non-acting courses but I wonder whether two full-time faculty in the major can deliver a program.”
- “Offering a degree based on one tenure-line faculty member and another fixed-term instructor (I think Radhica Ganapathy in incorrectly identified as an Assistant Professor) seems ill advised”

Response 7

- **Response 7: The proposal states that three tenure track faculty will be teaching in the program is true. They are Sandy Feinstein, Cleo House, and Radhica Ganapathy. The staffing grid reveals this and thus is not a contradiction.**

Radhica Ganapathy (who is currently a Lecturer) was hired on the tenure track as ABD with intent to finish at the end of the Fall 2008 semester. Her contract states that upon completion of her degree she will be moved into the tenure line.

We have three tenure track positions active within this program. One of which is already tenured (Sandy Feinstein), the second is in his 5th year review (Cleo House, Jr.), and the third was a new tenure track replacement hire (Radhica Ganapathy). We listed Radhica Ganapathy in the grid as such based on the position line (tenure track) she was hired to replace. We were reaching for the most accurate grid that would be reflective of our status when the major would begin.

If we listed Radhica Ganapathy as lecturer, we would have to add an additional course to our grid which does not reduce our course offerings, but would make an additional course possible. If the committee feels that this needs to be revised, we are glad to follow through. Either way, this does not affect our ability to offer a Theatre Major. Please see response #6 as well.

- “The amount of work required to offer a degree will severely impact General Education offerings unless additional faculty are hired.”

Response 8

- **Response 8: Regarding General Education classes in Theatre, we offer on average 5-6 courses per semester. Our proposed four year grid shows that with the addition of an Adjunct Instructor, teaching 2 courses per semester, we will continue to teach 5-6 General Education courses per semester. Thus, a Theatre Major will NOT severely impact General Education offerings.**

- “Someone needs to coordinate the degree which will mean less courses taught by the program coordinator. It seems that the proposal is being overly optimistic about staffing needs.”

Response 9

- **Response 9: Please see response #6 and updated Four Year Grid (attached) which satisfies this query.**

- “Offering a degree with two tenure-track faculty (has Radhica Ganapathy been changed to tenure track?) seems to be unrealistic. The proposal also does not reflect the course release for the program coordinator.”

Response 10

- Response 10: **The research contradicts the above opinion. Our consultation with other Universities/Colleges revealed the following: Until 2007-2008, Albright College had one tenure track faculty member, one Instructor, one tenure track member that was shared with another program, and an occasional Adjunct Instructor (Artist-in-Residence). This successful program (produced professional actors, students who were accepted into the Yale School of Drama, and a performance at the Kennedy Center in Washington D.C.) had functioned in this capacity for over eighteen years.**

Therefore while we understand the concern, we urge you to take into consideration two majors points: **1. The nature of theatre expects its practitioners to partake in all activities of teaching and production, and the number of Theatre generalists that were hired at Berks are proficient in all such aspects with the intention of starting a major. 2. A program existing within our area, such as Albright College, is evidence a program can not only function, but flourish.**

(Another example of a comparable programs are Ursinus College in Collegetown, PA which has 2 tenure track faculty and one staff member.) Please also see responses #6 and #7.

Career Paths

- “On page 7.”Theatre is a recognized “pathway” degree to multiple disciplines...” I have no idea what this means and the generalization that the campus will benefit is not supported in the proposal.”

Response 11

- Response 11: **The contention that a degree in Theatre can lead to multiple professional careers is a well-documented fact boldly listed on multiple college websites, such as Oklahoma State University, Portland State University, University of Tennessee, etc. Careers such as: Marketing, Arts Administration, Screen Writing, Journalism, Teaching, Film Editor, Talent Representation, Producer, Radio, Public Affairs, Politics (Reagan was a former Hollywood actor), etc.**

Regarding the second part of the above statement in reference to campus benefits, please see the following pages in the P3 document: p. 2 (female student numbers), p. 3 (Outreach), p. 5 (recruitment), p. 6 (Scholarships)

- “The proposal does not indicate what the students who graduate with this degree will do upon completion of the degree.”

Response 12

- Response 12: **After graduation students will get jobs in the field of Acting, Directing, Playwriting, Stage Management, Designer, Theatre Management, Dramaturgy, Graduate School, Teaching in the K-12 system. Students in the Berks program will have professional Theatre internships with Theatre Exile in Philadelphia, PA offering them an entrance into professional theatre. The students will be able to look to their own instructors who have BA degrees, in addition to the appropriate advance degrees, as proof of its effects.**

Physical Facilities

- “Even 10 students a year, if that could be achieved, does not seem to make a viable program and justify the resources necessary to support and sustain new major.”

Response 13

- Response 13: **We already have all of the resources available to us as mentioned in our P3 (p. 18). We have offered a specific breakdown identifying such resources. In fact, Theatre at Berks has been operating under the influence of these resources for over two decades. We would like to point out that these resources are inherent to our program, and have been a long standing practice of our campus regardless of this recent proposal for the adoption of a Theatre Major. The only additional resource that our program recognizes is that of an Part Time Instructor/Adjunct Instructor and promotional costs, as mentioned in the P3.**

Additional potential resources are the benefactors who have been meeting with University Development to explore ways to give to the Theatre (endowments, scholarships, endowed chair, and facilities). Having a major relieves the benefactors of many restrictions placed on giving, such as one cannot establish scholarships in programs that do not have a major.

Our P3 projects that we will have 40 majors by our first graduating class in spring 2013. The enrollment in Applied Psychology is the second highest at our campus with a total enrollment of 70-80 students. By this evaluation, our expectation is reasonable. We strongly believe that a program requires time to evolve, and aspiring to half the number of majors in a program that has been in existence for over ten years such as Applied Psychology signifies an appropriate estimation of potential majors in Theatre.

- “Page 18 says that the current physical facilities are sufficient but there is no specificity in the statement to convince me of this. I think that the proposal needs to address how such needs as a green room, storage, construction area, etc. will be met without changing the current infrastructure.”

Response 14

- Response 14: **We won't change the current infrastructure because the number of productions will not change. Our P3 has been reviewed by Dan Carter, Director of**

the School of Theatre at University Park. He found no inconsistencies with our assessment. However as a point of clarification, regarding construction we currently build on the stage, we have on-campus storage (above the stage space in the campus barns), and Perkins 20 serves as dressing room and green room during shows. This has been a part of the campus infrastructure for the past two decades or more. Having a major will not change the current infrastructure. (Please see page 18 of our P3 proposal)

- “The statement regarding rehearsal times and auditorium availability. /Currently the Theatre program must rehearse for extended hours of time due to the lack of experience and classroom training of our non-majors in productions. With the Major in place we will shorten rehearsal time and make the Perkins Auditorium available for other campus uses/. I would be more inclined to believe that a theatre degree would be utilizing the auditorium more than the two shows we have each year do now and thus make Perkins Auditorium less accessible to the rest of the community for other activities.”

Response 15

- **Response 15: It is a known fact in Theatre that classroom training is integral to production rehearsal. In the classroom students who are majors will receive a higher capacity of knowledge that enables them to synthesize material and implement successfully in rehearsal. We currently rehearse 6 days a week for 4 hours each rehearsal for about 2 months. This does not include the show performances. Student in-class training automatically reduces the amount of time utilized during the rehearsal process because a major portion of the background work has been covered in the classroom. This thereby reduces our rehearsal time in the Perkins Auditorium and makes it available for the rest of our community.**

Furthermore, having a major does not automatically mean that we will undertake more productions. More productions have little to do with space, and everything to do with budget. Our mission is to provide a quality experience to our students with a small and purposefully focused theatre season, inclusive of community outreach, research projects, festival attendance, etc. While productions are important they aren't the sole manifestation of our work and research.

A point of clarification: Our P3 states that we have three shows per year, not two.

Courses

- “How will students complete the 400-level requirements if they miss a semester or fail to complete the prerequisite courses to enroll in the upper-level course. The way I read the proposal each 400-level offering will only be offered once every other year. The number of prerequisites for courses such as THEA 434 are not listed in the proposal.”
- “The table showing 400 level courses seems overly optimistic. This table seems to imply that all students will be on track – without taking into account students who, for one reason or another, may fall behind on some of the pre-requisite courses.”

Response 16

- Response 16: **Our degree requirements are identical to those in the PSU Blue Book. If indeed a student fails to complete the prerequisite courses to enroll in the upper level courses, he/she will have the possibility of taking Independent Studies courses to fulfill their prerequisites, as happens in several other programs at Berks.**

- “What about other courses required for the major (other than the 25 credits in theatre and general education credits). They should be reflected in the proposal (the liberal arts credits that are required). How will the offering of those courses be affected?”

Response 17

- Response 17: **I believe that the commenter may have over looked the information provided on page 10 of the P3. Specifically we identified the 37 credits that are unique to the theatre degree. There are no other credits that differ from other BA requirements than these 37 credits. I assume by “liberal arts” that you mean BA requirements. We hope that this answer is what you’re looking for but admittedly we are somewhat confused by this question.**

COMMENTS OF SUPPORT:

- “I support this major and hope we'll bring it to the college.”
- “As a member of HASS, I fully support the BA Degree in Theatre.”
- “I support the addition of the B.A. Degree in Theatre to our campus.”
- “I am thrilled that PSU Berks is considering a Theater major. I have read the proposal and agree with its creators that this major will well compliment what we already offer at PSU Berks as well as contribute towards campus life and community outreach. I am especially excited over the program's commitment to diversity/multicultural education. I commend the faculty and staff of the Theatre program for their efforts in putting forth this proposal.”

Additional note: Just last week alone we had two inquiries (1 transfer student, 1 potential freshman) for coming to Berks to major in Theatre. We are consistently contacted by students or parents about Theatre at Berks. We believe this speaks volumes because this contact has occurred without any advertisement of a Theatre major. There is great potential here for a major at Berks and we appreciate your support and vote of confidence.

APPENDIX G

Strategic Planning and Budget Committee (SPBC)

Minutes for the December 5, 2008 Meeting

Members in Attendance: Stephen Snyder (Chair HASS), Lolita Paff (EBC), Rosario Torres (HASS), Cesar Martinez-Garza (Science), Dennis Mays (CFO)

The meeting opened with a summary by the chair of the previous meeting. The group met on October 29, 2008, but no minutes were drafted. The chair explained that most of the meeting seemed to repeat and rehash previous points of discussion on record in the September 24 meeting minutes. The only significant addition was some discussion of structural preference for the charts to be included in the informational report on faculty salaries. The group, at the October meeting, was able to set some limitations and detail preferences for the structure of charts to be included in our final report.

The group then discussed in greater detail more recent submissions of divisional reports. Members from each division submitted summary charts of salary information specific to their divisions. These charts varied in detail. The group made suggestions for further revision and decided on a more uniform structure for the individual charts. The group also discussed in detail a number of problems and possible inconsistencies that exist within the data provided in the University Senate report. These problems further justify the need for a Berks Senate report. The chair agreed to begin drafting some of the report's textual content regarding these problems and inconsistencies.

A possible recommendation was proposed that the Strategic Planning and Budget Committee review the University Senate Salary data annually. It was the sense of the group that since the data is revised annually, and since it is so lengthy and detailed, it is appropriate to recommend an amendment to the Standing Rules of the Berks Senate to include a charge to review and report on this data annually. This way the Senate and faculty will be less surprised by the figures and will be in a position to better observe these figures evolve. An annual report will also make the report preparation process less difficult and time consuming. The group agreed to the recommendation. The chair offered to draft the recommendation with some guidance from the Senate Chair and to submit the draft of the recommendation to the committee members for approval before submission to the full Senate.

APPENDIX H
Student Affairs Committee
Informational Report on NCAA Division III Athletics

Introduction: Penn State Berks now has full membership in NCAA Division III athletics. This informational report provides details of the sports program as of the 2008-2009 academic year and identifies several key issues related to student life.

Information: Intercollegiate athletics at Penn State Berks has evolved a great deal over the past six years as a result of a decision by the College to move its athletic programs from membership in the PSU Commonwealth Campus Athletic Conference to becoming a full member of the NCAA Division III. This decision was made to align the athletic program with the development of the College's academic programs that now permit a student to begin and finish studies at Berks. As a member of NCAA Division III, no athletic-related scholarships may be awarded to students. Significant emphasis is placed upon the academic eligibility of students who participate in inter-collegiate sports.

Berks has three types of sports programs: Varsity, Club, and Intramural (see table). Athletes participating in a Varsity Sports program are officially recognized by the University as athletes and are therefore covered by University and Faculty Senate Policies. Club sports compete with teams from other schools but are treated as a student organization. Intramural sports involve contests between students on campus and have no special standing.

VARSITY, CLUB & INTRAMURAL SPORTS

	NCAA Varsity Sports	Club Sports	Intramural Sports
Fall	Men's Cross Country	Athletic & Fitness	Aerobics
	Women's Cross Country	Bowling	Badminton
	Men's Soccer	Cheerleading	3-on-3 Basketball
	Women's Soccer	Dance Team	5-on-5 Basketball
	Women's Volleyball	Ice Hockey	Beach Volleyball
Winter	Men's Basketball	Men's Volleyball	Flag Football
	Women's Basketball	Rugby	Indoor Soccer
Spring	Men's Baseball		Golf Tournament
	Men's Golf		Table Tennis
	Women's Softball		Ultimate Frisbee
	Men's Tennis		Volleyball
	Women's Tennis		

The College now fields 12 intercollegiate teams including six men's and six women's teams to comply with Title IX. The total number of NCAA athletes at the conclusion of the 2007-2008 academic year was 112 male athletes and 78 female athletes. Of these athletes 85 are identified as scholar-athletes who maintain a cumulative GPA of 3.00 or higher. Out of the twelve

sponsored athletic teams, the team grade point averages range from a 2.55 to 3.33. Five athletic teams have an average team GPA of 3.00 or higher.

Joining the NCAA was a six-year process that included one year of exploratory membership and five years of provisional membership. In addition to joining the NCAA, the College also joined a new athletic conference, the North Eastern Athletic Conference (NEAC), thus allowing competition with other baccalaureate-granting institutions. (Penn State Behrend and Penn State Altoona are also NCAA members and compete in the Alleghany Mountain Conference. Penn State Harrisburg and Penn State Abington are members of NEAC.) The successful development of Berks as a member of the NCAA and the NEAC has been completed with very little change in staffing. Current staffing includes a 10-month, part-time athletic director, a full-time, 10-month assistant athletic director, a full-time, ten-month compliance officer and sports information director (SID), staff assistant support and twenty-four part-time coaching staff members in addition to athletic trainers who are contracted through an external agency. The 10-month, Compliance/SID position is the only new position added as a result of NCAA membership.

All athletic staff members have a primary responsibility to recruit student-athletes to Berks. The athletic department staff is one of few departments on campus able to recruit students from outside the Berks Campus service area. The athletic department staff places a major focus on recruiting student-athletes into the majors that can be completed at the Berks Campus. The nature of athletics requires that coaches recruit student athletes who are committed to the Berks Campus for four years. As a result of the campus becoming a full member of the NCAA at the end of the 2007-08 academic year, Berks is in the process of hiring a full-time, twelve-month Athletic Director to provide year-round leadership to athletics. Future changes may also include the possibility of adding at least two new sports programs, yet to be determined, as well as the possible development of new athletic facilities related to the Beaver Community Center and the land across Broadcasting Road. The goal is to combine more of the part-time positions into full time which would be beneficial to the College's student-athletes and the program.

Discussion and Conclusion: There are several areas that have been identified as issues facing student athletes at Penn State Berks.

1. **Scheduling:** Student athletes receive preferential scheduling. The scheduling needs of athletes deserve high priority. Advisors therefore should make every effort to schedule appointments on the Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of the week of College Meetings so that athletes are ready to schedule on the following Monday. The preferential advising is designed to minimize the number of missed classes for each athlete. Senate Policy 34-27 (*italics added*): “The registration calendar is prioritized according to the following scheme:
 - a. Students with priority needs (authorized categories include honor students, students with disabilities, and *student athletes*);
 - b. Graduate degree students;
 - c. Undergraduate degree students (descending order of total credits completed plus currently enrolled credits);
 - d. Provisional and nondegree students (register on a space-available basis).”

2. Missed Classes: Varsity inter-collegiate athletic participation is considered to be official representation of the University. University Policy (67-00) requires that varsity athletes who miss class be given the opportunity to make up missed work: “A student-athlete who represents the University in an athletic contest shall be excused from class and provided with an official excuse form.”
3. Facilities: The limited space on campus makes this an issue for everyone including athletics. Developing new facilities for athletic programs will also provide facilities for students to work-out and engage in impromptu athletic competitions. The committee recognizes that mental health is often connected with physical health and therefore the college has an obligation to provide for the physical well-being of students via athletic facilities. More playing fields are needed to accommodate inter-collegiate, club, intramural and general student use. The proposed addition to the Beaver Community Center would enhance all aspects of the athletic and recreational programs in addition to the needs of the Kinesiology program. Long-term planning should include a focus on athletic facilities including a new gym and possibly a pool.
4. Staffing: The limited staffing of the athletics program makes it difficult to perform the day-to-day operations. The athletic department’s needs are in the areas of athletic training, game day operations, maintenance and athletic administration.
5. Retention/New Degrees: The movement into the NCAA has helped to increase the number of students who plan to graduate from the Berks campus. The first year that student athletes graduated from Berks was 2003. Now several graduate each year. In 2007 ten student-athletes graduated with a Berks degree. One of the major factors in student-athletes leaving Berks (and transferring to UP) is a result of not being able to complete their major at Berks. The addition of four-year degree programs will aid the retention efforts to keep students at Berks by attracting more athletes to compete for four years at Berks in NCAA Division III Athletics.

Ending List: Committee members preparing this report.

Tom Gavigan, Jui-Chi Huang, James Karlinsey, Eric Lindsey, Cheryl Nicholas, Ike Shibley, Tyler Washburn (voting) plus Mary Lou D’Allegro, Bruce Hale, Blaine Steensland

Special thanks: Kate Cocoran and Filomena Kilar helped prepare this report.

APPENDIX I
Student Life Committee Minutes
December 8, 2008

In Attendance: Mary-Lou D'Allegro, Bruce Hale, Jui-Chi Huang, James Karlinsey, Eric Lindsey, Ike Shibley, Blaine Steensland, Tyler Washburn

The fourth meeting of the Student Life Committee for the 2008-209 academic year involved the athletics report, information about SGA work regarding student life issues, and an update on the Student Facilities Fee.

The Athletics Report was discussed and a few minor changes were suggested. The committee then voted unanimously to approve the report.

Tyler reviewed some of the projects that the Student Affairs committee of SGA was working on. Eighty new DVDs were ordered for the library so that students have a greater variety of movie choices. The committee worked with John Walker to make a combo deal at Tully's where a student who buys a sandwich can also order a side and a soft drink for \$1.90. A question was raised concerning the possibility of a deeper discount if a student opted for a healthier side such as a piece of fruit. The committee has also begun work on a program called 'PAWS HERE' where local businesses agree to provide some type of discount for Penn State students with a valid ID. The final issue related to smoking on campus. A survey was completed and a policy is being written by SGA for submission to the Senate.

Tyler and Ike provided information about the newly created Student Facilities Fee (SFF). Students at Berks were assessed \$100 in their fall semester bill. The SFF was designed to be used for large capital projects involving student life; no academic buildings can be built with the funds. The SFF committee is working with the Chancellor to help guide the use of the funds. The new workout equipment and the redesigned student portions of the Beaver Community Center will be partially funded with SFF monies. Other projects are under consideration by the committee although most projects are long-term so the funds will gradually accumulate to the point where they can be used for a significant portion of a major project.

The next meeting of Student Life is scheduled for Monday January 16 at 12:00 PM. The discussion will focus on faculty involvement in extracurricular activities.